15:02:55 From Kurt Hegmann to All panelists : You’re spared my mugshot! :) The video part says it has been disabled by the host. (?)

15:06:25 From Lindsey Nielsen to All panelists : hmmm. this is odd. I'll investigate and see what I can find out

15:07:15 From Brian Hutchinson to Lindsey Nielsen(Direct Message) : Thanks Lindsey, I do not have a video option

15:17:25 From John Knoblock to Lindsey Nielsen(Direct Message) : Looks good to me.

15:25:43 From Lindsey Nielsen to All panelists : You all should be able to start video now FYI

15:38:56 From Brian Hutchinson to Lindsey Nielsen(Direct Message) : Lindsey, My video option is absent again. Do not see the ‘hand’ function

15:39:03 From Brian Hutchinson to Lindsey Nielsen(Direct Message) : Option

15:45:41 From Carolyn Keigley to All panelists : Tolling will work only if the cost is higher than bus fare AND if no season bus fare cost. No season bus fare - otherwise individuals will just add that to their cost of skiing. Tolling will work great if people have to pay each time they enter into the canyonS. Also this would discourage Big Cottonwood Canyon being used as a race track for car clubs and bullet bikes that come in on a daily basis usually from 5 to 8 P.M.

15:48:37 From patrickshea to All panelists : The money figures supplied by UDOT was constructed by UDOT and the Gondola supporters to create a false equivalent, as Del stated.

16:02:12 From Nate Furman to Everyone : If you have questions/concerns about the presentation I shared you can reach me at nate.furman@utah.edu. Thank you for your time!

16:02:46 From Brian Hutchinson to Lindsey Nielsen(Direct Message) : May I have 2 minutes, please?

16:06:51 From Don Despain to All panelists : The climbers alliance, while well intentioned, just ask that both bus and gondola options have negative impacts, and by extension, so does the train option, so what is the solution that includes every interest?

16:07:54 From Hilary Lambert to All panelists : Don, I feel like many who have spoken today have stated that enhanced bus service, snow sheds, and tolling without additional lane enhancements is a starting point for meeting all interests.

16:13:27 From Carl Fisher to All panelists : Also it is worth noting the jurisdictional relationship(s) and responsibilities are all different. When you can’t come together to articulate or id the problem, you cannot find agreement or consensus on the solution. While some are playing poker others are playing bridge while others are playing rummy and cribbage. This is the fatal flaw for us and the canyons

16:16:19 From Kurt Hegmann to All panelists : It would be helpful if people could actually see a mode in operation. E.g., At Zermatt, the train is remarkable. it is quiet, can load/unload people far faster than buses, has stops at all the hiking trail spots, doesn’t have to stop long bc of the fast un/load, unlike a bus. Parking is then distributed away from the mouth of the canyon. In short, from what I have seen, Rail is the way to go on a longer-term basis.

16:17:27 From John Knoblock to Everyone : My concern with the bus is that the capacity can only get 20% of the skiers up the canyon, and that is with half standing in ski boots holding skis on a curvy mountain road. Furthermore, any accident or very slow driver brings traffic to a standstill. It does not meet the goal for capacity or reliability.

16:18:44 From John Knoblock to Everyone : A gondola could go to 4,000 people per hour which could essentially eliminate most cars up the canyon.

16:21:42 From patrick shea to All panelists : in the interest of time I am going to send a draft resolution for discussion purposes.

16:22:00 From patrick shea to All panelists : Whereas, the Stakeholders Council (SC) of the Central Wasatch Commission (CWC) has been meeting infrequently, no more than once a quarter.Whereas, important decisions are about to be made by the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) regarding a transportation infrastructure improvement for Little Cottonwood Canyon.Whereas, over the course of the last six years, beginning with the Mountain Accord and continuing with CWC, extensive discussions have been conducted regarding the best and environmentally sustainable transportation alternative for Little Cottonwood Canyon.Whereas, UDOT came out with their Draft EIS June 25, 2021, earlier than expected, and have extended the comment period from 45 days to 70 days.Whereas, it is important for the SC to advise both the CWC as representatives of the public, from which our membership has been chosen, to indicate the SC’s preference of the two transportation alternatives proposed by UDOT (gondola and enhanced bus service).

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, after revie

16:24:08 From Carl Fisher to All panelists : The analysis in the eis says that is impossible to have all skiers, let alone all canyon visitors today, on a gondola. It can only be designed for 1k/hr

16:24:22 From patrick shea to Everyone : The rest of the story:

16:24:53 From patrick shea to Everyone : Whereas, the Stakeholders Council (SC) of the Central Wasatch Commission (CWC) has been meeting infrequently, no more than once a quarter.Whereas, important decisions are about to be made by the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) regarding a transportation infrastructure improvement for Little Cottonwood Canyon.Whereas, over the course of the last six years, beginning with the Mountain Accord and continuing with CWC, extensive discussions have been conducted regarding the best and environmentally sustainable transportation alternative for Little Cottonwood Canyon.Whereas, UDOT came out with their Draft EIS June 25, 2021, earlier than expected, and have extended the comment period from 45 days to 70 days.Whereas, it is important for the SC to advise both the CWC as representatives of the public, from which our membership has been chosen, to indicate the SC’s preference of the two transportation alternatives proposed by UDOT (gondola and enhanced bus service).

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, after revie

16:25:39 From Maura Hahnenberger to All panelists : Pat, still missing the end… might be a character limit.

16:25:39 From Kurt Hegmann to All panelists : for moving the most people, train always wins

16:26:33 From patrick shea to All panelists : NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, after reviewing the many pages of documents produced by UDOT and others, the SC, prefers a third alternative based on the following points:1. An enhanced bus service with satellite pickup and drop off locations throughout Salt Lake and Utah Valleys, which would be less costly than the proposed $99 million to be spent on two “hubs”.2. There is no general public need for snow sheds, which are estimated in today’s dollars to cost $89 million.3. The UDOT enhanced bus alternative requires a third lane being added to SR 210 at a cost of $189 million.4. The combination of the first three paragraphs herein come to a total of $372 million.5. It is the position of the SC that presently, SR 210 is mostly three lanes except where the topography of the canyon requires a narrowing to two lanes.6. SC proposes the following third alternative, which has not been explored by UDOT but would save at least $189 million: Have SR 210 made, where possible, into a three lane highway;

16:27:23 From Brian Hutchinson to All panelists : Two years ago the Forest Service stalled the proposal test for a public canyon shuttle service, “due to the lack of infrastructure (restrooms, bus stops, etc..) SLC0

16:27:27 From patrick shea to All panelists : 6. SC proposes the following third alternative, which has not been explored by UDOT but would save at least $189 million: Have SR 210 made, where possible, into a three lane highway; where the topography requires only two lanes, put a semaphore in place a hundred yards before the convergence from three lanes to two lanes both up and down the Canyon. When a bus approaches the area of convergence, the vehicular traffic would be stopped for sufficient time for the bus to merge into the two lanes, and once it has merged the semaphore would be lifted. When a bus arrives at a widening to three lanes, it would merge back into the bus lane. 7. The approach described in paragraph six would not require the expenditure of $189 million, nor would it run the risk of significant environmental damage to Little Cottonwood Creek, a significant contributor of culinary water to Salt Lake County.8. We urge the CWC to carefully consider this tax-payer money saving approach and recommend it to UDOT. Alternatively, if additional

16:27:30 From patrick shea to All panelists : Alternatively, if additional time is needed to explore the approach, we urge the CWC to recommend to UDOT that they should not make a final EIS until the alternative described herein has been thoroughly researched both as to cost and environmental impacts in contrast to the present two alternatives presently proposed by UDOT.

16:28:17 From Paul Diegel to All panelists : Another LCC EIS issue: there is still no mention of how dispersed recreation will be accommodated in any new transportation system. So this appears to just be another ski lift, albeit one that is paid for by the public.

16:29:43 From Hilary Lambert to All panelists : Patrick, I like your wording as a starting point, but I think it would be beneficial for all stakeholders to read and edit/add to it independently and then have another meeting to come to consensus on the wording before bringing it to the CBC.

16:29:46 From Hilary Lambert to All panelists : \*CWC

16:29:48 From Dave Fields to Everyone : Pat: How does adding a third lane on approximately six of the eight miles of LCC not damaging the watershed? Isn't that doubling down on vehicles, the number one cause of pollution (I'm guessing) in the canyon?

16:29:55 From Michael Braun to All panelists : At the Cottonwood EIS open house, during the UDOT presentation, they never addressed operation of the TRAM during Avalanche Control. Does anyone have proof positive or negative data that: during avalanche control, CAN the TRAM run or is it also shut down?

16:31:18 From Paul Diegel to All panelists : We have been told that the gondola will be paused during explosive avalanche mitigation operations.

16:32:14 From patrickshea to Everyone : It has been suggested that people take a week to review and edit the draft resolution, and then have another meeting of the Stakeholders' Council. Hope our two co-chairs will agree with this.

16:32:26 From Brian Hutchinson to All panelists : Two years ago the Forest Service halted development of the Millcreek Shuttle Program citing the need for infrastructure (restrooms, bus stops, etc…) The county offered a FLAP grant ‘solution’, which we now realize has brought the threat of Federal Highway standards road expansion, which would dramatically alter the character of the upper canyon. Bekee Hotze says “without road widening we would have to close the upper canyons to cars”. Road closure would be more appropriate than road expansion

16:34:45 From Erin Bragg to All panelists : Michael- page 2-75 of the DEIS “The gondola would not operate if artillery is being used for avalanche mitigation since the artillery shells

would pass over the gondola towers and cable (up to six times per year with snow sheds in place).”

16:42:04 From John Knoblock to Everyone : With respect to gondola capacity, it absolutely can add gondola cars to get to 4,000 people per hour. The 1,000 people per hour is what is needed to meet their mobility goal.

16:43:30 From Carl Fisher to All panelists : They have a deficit of about 7k parking spaces , so they cannot do more than 1k.

16:44:31 From Dave Fields to Everyone : Carl, where does your 7,000 parking space number come from? Nowhere near that in LCC.

16:44:53 From Paul Diegel to All panelists : Carl, can you clarify: is that a 7k deficit in parking spaces for those who would ride the gondola?

16:46:14 From Kurt Hegmann to All panelists : It is clearly up to the proposer of a motion. From my view, I’d suggest much shorter motions around which consensus can be built.

16:47:40 From Carl Fisher to All panelists : Yes, a deficit of 7k parking spaces to get on the gondola at the base. I’d assume folks are driving to the bottom and going up, not to the top and riding down. This is Utah and UDOT so of course, not immune to backwards and irrational conclusions.

16:48:35 From Carl Fisher to All panelists : It’s in the eis.

16:49:34 From John Knoblock to Everyone : How can we as a group encourage the CWC to fully fund bathroom cleaning and pumping that the USFS can not do and to fund a second CCF Trail Maintenance crew?

16:58:44 From Hilary Lambert to All panelists : Will, my opinion on the first item is that “updates” can be easily read, while discussion can only happen when we are gathered. So, I find it best to use meetings for discussion, and have everyone commit to read updates beforehand.

16:59:15 From Hilary Lambert to All panelists : As for item two, can we meet to review Patrick’s resolution July 27 or 28?

16:59:38 From patrickshea to Everyone : Let's have a meeting for discussion.

17:00:47 From Hilary Lambert to All panelists : Patrick, can you email everyone your resolution?

17:01:42 From patrickshea to Everyone : I don't have everyones email address, can Lindsey or Blake send me the entire list.

17:01:46 From Brian Hutchinson to All panelists : I’m sure there would be input on Pat’s resolution

17:02:06 From Lindsey Nielsen to All panelists : pat you do have everyones email addresses

17:02:16 From Lindsey Nielsen to All panelists : they were sent out via email this week

17:02:22 From patrickshea to Everyone : Where is it?

17:02:29 From Lindsey Nielsen to All panelists : check your email from me

17:02:43 From Megan Nelson to All panelists : Thank you Will.