



MOUNTAIN ACCORD

Vision, Goals, and Metrics Report Comments

Name	City	Comment
Joni Dykstra	Salt Lake City	I've read the goals and metrics and feel that they more than adequately address the concerns and desires that I have as an individual who cares passionately about the Wasatch Mountains.
Vinc Desimone		<p>Greetings:</p> <p>Please include the following comments I tried to make int the public record and let me know this has been done.</p> <p>Please include these comments in the record:</p> <p>The future of the Wasatch should be dictated by values of preservation of the natural resource.</p> <p>Recreation for local residents should take priority over out of area visitors A low priority should be given to montizing and the proifit motive of those who wish to use the natural resources for profit at the expense of the local public.</p> <p>Transportation impacts should be evaluated in terms of who benefits with every attempt made to have those that benefit pay for any transportation changes. Thank you.</p>
Matthew Galvin	Park City	I like the goals, vision and metrics except, I think the time frame to implement this plan should be brought down to 10 - 15 years. This is very much attainable timeframe goal. All components of the accord will change in such way that new visioning, goal adjustment, and new metrics will and should be redone at that time. 2040 is now 26 years out and to far to reasonable to implement. It will become to easy to push implementations off till "next year"
Doug Smith	Heber	The economy system group "Vision" states in several placed about developing high quality "Wasatch brand" however in the goals and metrics there is nothing noted on regulating this. How do we require high quality? Do we rely on high property values and high price points? I am a planning administrator and this has always been a tough questions. Regulating is difficult and you cant depend on political will. I get the idea that there needs to be a sense of place but that is not defined and no way to regulate. Somewhat the same issue on the environmental system group. The first goal is to protect water quality. There is no metric stated on how to accomplish this. Monitoring? Done by who? State oversight? I agree with the last goal that talks about developing regulatory oversight. Thanks for the opportunity to comment
Robby Curry		This page needs some better QA work for Chrome browsers.
Buck Boley	Alta	Hi, In the Goals and metrics there needs to be wording about travel time. Thanks Buck.
Christopher Biltoft	Salt Lake City	There appears to be some fundamental incompatibilities between some of the goals & metrics under different headings. Consider, for example, Recreation (increase visitor usage) and Environment (preserve water quality). Bringing more resort users into the watershed is simply not compatible with preserving water quality, particularly with expansion of on-mountain restaurants, retail sales, etc. The desire by some resort owners to turn their properties into amusement parks with all sorts of non-natural attractions should also be resisted. A fundamental problem not addressed is the web of private land ownership derived from archaic mining laws. A mechanism is needed to encourage the return, to the maximum extent possible, of watershed to the public domain where the land can be managed properly. There is also a need to prioritize goals, with watershed management being at the most important concern. Actions such as helicopter skiing and ski resort interconnects simply opens more terrain to (mostly wealthy) resort users and reduces the recreational options and quality of experience for others (mostly not wealthy) who should also have reasonable back-country terrain access.

Dennis Borup	Salt Lake City	I have had a cabin on Big Cottonwood Creek since 1959. There has been alot of development during that time. Development and use have increased significantly. I am increasingly concerned about the watershed. In the last few years I have noticed moss and/or algae growing in the creek bed. This is something I have not seen before. I am sure it is being caused by fertilizers, human/animal waste and whatever else we humans bring to the canyon. We should stop promoting development and use. We are destroying our watershed. Water is precious and impossible to replace.
Rick Spedden	Clarksbile, MD	As someone who visits Salt Lake City regularly to enjoy the mountains (summer and winter, ski resorts and backcountry), I am concerned about the wording in the vision and what might be done in the names of transportation and/or economics. Part of the value in the Wasatch is the ability to quickly get into areas where development is not visible - and here I want to specifically mention the trail to White Pine Reservoir and any possibility of lifts being dropped into White Pine Canyon(though the proposed Skylink would have a similar impact on its proposed path). The character of wilderness is defined as much by what you can see and hear. There is plenty that can be done in existing transportation corridors and in developed recreation areas without resorting to negatively impacting the character of the Wasatch which draws people to the area in the first place.
Peter Lev	Salt Lake City	Dear Mtn Accord, As a member of the Transportation Committee I want to re-state the necessity of using the U-210 Alternative Transportation Route on the south side of Little Cottonwood Creek. I have provided both map and aerial photo to Mtn Accord. This is the best solution to the serious avalanche safety problem posed by the current U-210 road. Further, the best use of the Alternative Route would be, in my opinion, a train. Peter Lev
Heidi Schubert	Salt Lake City	I think one thing that's going to matter in how changes are adopted is how fair they are. If changes are optional and there is no penalty for NOT changing then those that go out of their way to adopt change are in turn penalized (time/flexibility). For instance, increased public transport needs to be matched with SOV fees, or faster ski lift access. I think this is a good start. Heidi Schubert Wasatch Mountain Club board member 2002-2009
Katie Storrs	Salt Lake City	I think everybody needs to leave our mountains alone. Our mountains are our only source of water. And after living most of my life in semi to serious drought conditions, I believe we need to honor our few sources of water. We don't need all the ski resorts to be linked. It isn't going to help traffic. It will increase traffic because we will need buses running between resorts for people who don't feel like riding back or didn't make the last lift etc. It will increase human presence there which will damage the animal life. We have already taken over the entire valley and all the foothills in the valley. Enough that I regularly see a group of deer each time I pass the university cemetary because they have nowhere to go. We keep pushing wildlife out of their environment and then complain about them on our property. I believe we need to respect the mountains and all the life they provide because without them, we cannot survive here. We need to keep them clean by not having a million tons of construction equipment and workers in the back country contaminating the land and our water shed, we need to keep them wild. We are so blessed to have such magnificent mountains so close to us. I have lived out of state where the mountains are 2-3 hours away and being far away from them has made me appreciate them so much more. Leave them be. Let the people who are prepared and know how to properly be in the backcountry be in the backcountry. Not everything needs to be accessible to everyone. That is why it is called backcountry, because it isn't controlled, regulated, or owned by a company. It is wild, it is pure, it is real and we need to keep it that way. we shouldn't need a public forum to "decide the future of the Wasatch Mountains" because changing them should not be an option. Katie Storrs
David Wirth	Cottonwood Heights	My major concern is the continued development and ski resort expansion in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. We have developed and expanded enough in these beautiful irreplaceable resources. Please be sure to include limits and perpetual preservation on any development in these canyons. Preserve the canyons. Stop development. Stop ONE WASATCH! Also, why is there not bus service into the canyons during the summer? This would allow great loop hikes, limit traffic and pollution, and prevent overcrowding. My family would love to use public transportation in summertime for the canyons.

Lance Newman	Salt Lake City	The health of the Central Wasatch environment is a fundamental condition for successful outcomes in the other three areas (recreation, economy, and transportation). Conservation and restoration must come first.
Pam Murray	Salt Lake City	<p>Thank you for letting the public comment on the process, the Draft Vision, Goals and Metrics document released July 28, 2014. On page 3, Economy System Group, Vision Goals and Metrics. The Metrics need development and refinement to be measurable. Overall this is the weakest System Group outcome. Goal #1, Grow the year-round destination-based, the Metrics given are total annual skier spending and Quarterly hotel utilization. Metrics also need to capture total annual non-ski season spending for example summer concert revenue, October Fest revenue, equipment rental revenue, tours, weddings, restaurants Residents utilize existing infrastructure to attend events and participate in activities so the hotel utilization is only part of the story. Goal #2, Central Wasatch Assets: needs to be defined. Goal #3, Improve quality experience Metrics need to include how to understand perceived quality of visitor experience something like ongoing outreach and customer feedback with surveys, focus groups etc. If it is purely by the numbers then crowds (high number of visitors at the same place at the same time) will indicate a better measure of performance. Whereas I visit the mountains primarily for the experience of quiet and nature. The opposite of crowds. The Metrics for this goal need more development/detail as they are not measurable in their current form. Goal #4, Improve quality of life for residents. Residents need to be defined. I define resident as anyone who lives within a 2 hour drive to Snowbird. Quality of Life or (QOL) is much broader than the metrics offered allude. What is missing in QOL is cost of living, ease of transportation and variety of transportation options, health (health-care access, clean air, clean water, low noise, low crime, low natural disasters,) climate, access to goods/services/higher education/jobs/recreation/nature/cultural activities, religious and ethnic freedom, attractive community for vibrant educated work force. The Metrics state "Resolves land-use and property rights conflicts"so that is only true for people who own property in the canyons, the larger community does not care unless the conflicts inhibitaccess. "Compatibility with community character objectives" also needs to be defined. Thinking broadly, if this means that future generations will look at the decisions being made now and say the decisions best fit their idea of compatibility for community character or how we want to see the community develop that upholds current values in to the future. I personally want the mountains to remain wild. To stay wilderness into perpetuity, time without end. Having this much wilderness so close to a major urban center is fantastic. Better than Denver and all of California. Personally QOL means I can live and work in a community that has variety and access to pristine wilderness for active recreation and quiet contemplation in the scenic beauty. That is why I live here. On page 4, Environmental System Group. Overall well done. Goal #3, Protect and restore functioning and connected instead of "degree of fragmentation of corridors connecting core areas" how about degree of fragmentation and positive restoration/mitigation efforts connecting wildlife to core areas (improvement of indirect impacts as part of the plan). Goal #6, Develop legal, regulatory. Bullet 2 reword to: degree of impact to agencies/structures and implement strategies to mitigate"for example create a new hybrid agency or fund position with existing agency to manage long term environmental goals. Page 5, Transportation System Group. Overall well done. Goal #4,"The transportations system supports the natural", add new bullet:"Avoids and reduces cumulative and indirect impacts to natural environment, seek areas to improve/restore function of ecological systems including migration areas." Page 7, Recreation System Group. Overall well done, great details in metrics will help to keep goals on target. Goal #6 Establish an organization with authority to act based on public support (when I read this I think that means create a new organization that has the authority to manage and coordinate the ongoing needs. when when I read the metrics it seems like</p>

		existing solutions rather than measurable items leading up to the creation of a new organization. This is confusing and should be rewritten to be more clear.) Under Metrics the first bullet says number of participating agencies with authority to act and the means to provide and secure ongoing funding giving examples of the US Forest Service and Salt Lake CITY --was that a typo? Why would SL City have any authority in the canyons except for land the SLC corporation owns? The thought frightens me with the constant political flux and pull of that agency. This Mayor is passionate about this, in a few years the new Mayor is passionate about that. The mountains are not the city. Thank God! Please change to (what I think was meant here) Salt Lake COUNTY. But really the goal of creating a new hybrid organization whose sole purpose is keeping the Central Wasatch transportation project a long term success. We really need to do this project right :)
David Rabiger	Taylorsville	I frequently spend weekends or evenings (30-40 X a year)in the Wasatch hiking, snowshoeing, or back-country skiing. Preservation of wild open lands is what I favor. In years past I was a more active resort skier, now it is once or twice a year.
Maura Hahnenberger	Sandy	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Vision, Goals and Metrics for the Mountain Accord process. Overall the guiding principles seem to align with the needs of the Central Wasatch. Some specific comments on each System Group are below. Economy: -It is important that economic growth is not at odds with equal access to federal lands. Ski areas and lodging in the Central Wasatch have become too expensive for many residents of northern Utah. It would be inadvisable, in the pursuit of increased "total annual skier spending," to continue this trajectory and create resorts that cater primarily to out of state, high income tourists. -The Central Wasatch is a limited resource and unlimited growth would cause first major degradation and eventually total loss of this invaluable place. While some economic growth is possible it must align with the preservation of the character of these lands. There should be analysis that considers limiting growth to certain levels, or perhaps utilizing areas outside of the Central Wasatch (e.g. the Salt Lake Valley) to support economic growth for residents and businesses of this area. -The inclusion of triple bottom line thinking is important for this group. Namely, that economic, environmental, and social goals must all intertwine and guide thinking. Environment: -A key missing piece is education for residents and tourists as to why this areas needs to be "conserved, protected, and restored." This is important as participation in preservation is needed by every person who visits the Central Wasatch. Further, in discussions of the future of the Central Wasatch stakeholders need to understand the vulnerability of the area to degradation and destruction. It is very easy to destroy an ecosystem, but very difficult to restore it. Transportation: -As mentioned earlier in economy, it is important that transportation options considered are in line with providing equal access to public lands. Equal access for vary socioeconomic groups is critical, but also considering for different recreation user groups who have varying transportation needs. Recreation: - While recreation development in some high-use locations can reduce environmental impacts, it is important to preserve the opportunity and access for dispersed recreation use. -Again and aspect of environmental education is important to help foster the stewardship discussed in the vision. Thank you for you work, Maura Hahnenberger, PhD
Mark Levin	Sandy	The ONE Wasatch concept is great! The connection of the ski areas will have insignificant environmental impact, and may in fact move some traffic to the east side of the Wasatch range that would otherwise be in Big or Little Cottonwood canyons. The opposition is basically a just bunch of crybaby activists.
Bill Malone	Park City	Great work... Think you are doing an admirable job in trying to include a variety of subjects into this analysis. My only comment at this point is the obvious void of any mention of "One Wasatch"... This can be such a powerful piece of both a way for people to enjoy our mountains and do so without large amounts of infrastructure. Its benefits are far reaching in both the economy and transportation sectors. It just surprised me to see no mention of it. thanks...

Brian Doubek	Salt Lake City	This comment is regarding Visions, Goals and Metrics analysis. specifically the goal: "Preserve special, unique recreation areas and settings to maintain opportunities for solitude and naturalness." and the metric: "Aggregate score based on checklist of areas to be preserved with a suggested level of management" The Wasatch Powder Birds operate on UFSF lands under a special use permit which allows their operation in areas designated as wilderness. THIS type of loophole will cause the goal not to be achieved because it is not quantified by the metric when scoring areas to be preserved. I suspect there are other examples of this type of loophole but more research is needed to identify them.
Carolyn Frankenburg		The document seems very comprehensive. I think the air quality issues as they relate to transportation are the single most critical piece of the project. There may be some very established metrics available to use in the process of measuring the best transportation practices for our central Wasatch Mountain access. I am thinking of the European methods used to move many people in and out of mountain destinations through public transportation such as buses, rail, tram ways etc. Some ski resorts in CO do not allow private vehicles to park at the resort base. Zion Canyon is closed to cars during the high season of April to November. I did not get much of a sense in the Accord document that there is an effort to seek models currently being used to handle traffic congestion in sensitive areas. I don't think it can be a voluntary/ economics driven decision. Air quality is not just the particulate matter but is also the spiking of Ozone and the very dangerous conditions this creates for outdoor enthusiasts. With climate warming and drying, Ozone is even more of a threat to our way of life in both the valleys and the canyons of the heavily populated central Wasatch. In my opinion, transportation solutions need to lead the charge of any project to preserve our way of life in this part of Utah. It won't be popular especially by the economic interests that want their clients to have unfettered access to their resorts, hotels or businesses. But, it is about preserving the resource for everyone.
Brian Doubek	Salt Lake City	As I was writing my last comment, it struck me that it could be useful to index the goals/metrics to facilitate referencing them, e.g. economics goal 1 and metric 1 could be indexed: EG1 - EM1A, EM1B, EM1C EG2 - EM2A, EM2B, EM2C
Mark Menlove	Salt Lake City	The second paragraph of the "Why Mountain Accord" section states, "The Central Wasatch mountains are home to 7 world-class ski resorts. They form the iconic backdrop for Utah's population centers and serve as the gateway for the state's 12 billion-dollar- a-year tourism industry which draws regional, national, and international visitors." If taken literally, this statement says it's the ski resorts that form the iconic backdrop for Utah's populations centers rather than the Wasatch Mountains, which, I assume is the intent. To clarify, and to recognize the value of undeveloped recreation, I suggest this statement be revised to read, "The Central Wasatch mountains are home to 7 world-class ski resorts and renowned backcountry recreation opportunities. These mountains form the iconic backdrop for Utah's population centers and serve as the gateway for the state's 12 billion-dollar- a-year tourism industry which draws regional, national, and international visitors." Thank you!
Martin McGregor	Midvale	The first statement of the Economy area goal is in contradiction with all the remaining goals - grow, grow, grow, money ,money, money. Without details and going back to the 30 year old Master Plan, the answer is simple: the ski resorts are confined to their current (1985) boundaries, large constructions are discouraged (no interconnect), small constructions blend with the surroundings, public trans. is provided and encouraged. We already know the sickness but don't want to take the medicine.
Shane Duncan	Salt Lake City	we need reliable, public transportation winter and summer. I know a lot of people who wont ride the bus in the winter because its too crowded and does not stop at back country skiing trail heads. No more ski resort expansion! I have been a pass holder at most of our ski resorts, and again I say no more ski resort expansion!

Molly McFadden	Salt Lake City	I have reviewed the Mountain Accord and the Wasatch Canyons tomorrow reports and feel that the Mountain Accord duplicates much of the work of Wasatch Canyons tomorrow. The key difference is the role of economic development in the canyons. The Mountain Accord would do better to focus its efforts here and adopt what has already been done by Wasatch Canyons. The Mountain Accord would do better to focus on the impact of economic development in the canyon in the following ways: The Economy System Group initiatives and metrics should go beyond downhill skiing and its impact. How can we attach value to the other recreational uses of the canyons, esp. in the Cottonwoods and Millcreek? Would the institution of day/season passes for the Cottonwoods during peak times offer a way to protect more of the natural areas in these canyons? What checks and balances can be instituted to prevent short-term economic gain for the few at the expense of long term benefit for the many future visitors and residents of the Wasatch? Thank you for your time and work on this project. Yours, Molly McFadden
Kerry Doane	Salt Lake City	Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I have six specific comments: 1) The recreation and environment groups each have a goal regarding a governance or organization. This should be an overarching goal for all groups to adopt because there should be only one governance structure designed to consider all elements of the Wasatch. 2) Another overarching goal ought to address how each group needs to consider the others. Otherwise, I see little effort to try to come together to a single program to address the issues. I worry about how to address conflicting goals. 3) Maybe in the same category of overarching goals, I'd like to see a goal on how user conflicts will be addressed. Perhaps attached to governance. 4) In the Economy group, the phrase "attractive for employers/employees" in the last metric bullet should go under the first goal; it has nothing to with residents. 5) In the environment group, no mention of wildlife? 6) In the recreation group, I feel like the two separate access goals could be one. The issue is the amount and appropriateness of the access. The considerations to get that access should be the same regardless of the land owner. Sincerely, Kerry Doane
Ulrich Brunhart	Salt Lake City	The draft visions, goals, and metrics as stated all sound good. The one over riding concept that seems to be missing is there are no limits acknowledged or built into this approach. The Wasatch "resource" is not infinite. Yes, we need to be efficient as possible with our water, transportation, skier days, dollars per visit, etc, but in the end the overall resource needs to be protected. Where is the cross over point where greater utilization yields degraded experiences and benefits? An agreement that allows well thought out development in restricted areas combined with more wilderness protection is imperative. A central Wasatch Recreational and Enviromental Agency funded by the Forest Service along with Salt Lake and Summit counties is a good idea. Thank you.

Walter Haas	Salt Lake City	<p>Greetings. I believe that the transportation plan should include winter maintenance of the Guardsman Pass road between Park City and Brighton. This would enable a practical shuttle service among five resorts, so that any tourists that want to can easily ski them all. A shuttle bus would also be vastly faster than the proposed network of chairlifts, and would not impact the existing use of public lands. Furthermore that route has much less avalanche hazard than the lower part of Big Cottonwood Canyon, providing access to the upper part of BCC when snow safety is a problem. Residents of Big Cottonwood regularly complain about driving down to the Salt Lake valley in the winter. I was a regular at Zion National Park before the shuttle there and have been a regular since, so am personally aware of the difference it has made in the visitor experience. Before the shuttle Zion Canyon road looked like a parking lot at the mall, and bicycling there was a life-threatening experience. The shuttle eliminated almost all traffic, so bicycling is now pleasant and a good way to enjoy the park. In addition, for those doing routes like Mystery Canyon, starting from Weeping Wall and ending at Temple of Sinawava, it is no longer necessary to arrange a car spot. I've also heard from informed sources that hiking in the Narrows has increased since the shuttle. It seems that what limited visitation there was the availability of parking at Temple of Sinawava rather than lack of interest. The biggest limitation on the Zion shuttle is parking outside the canyon. For me this is not much of a problem because I stay near the mouth of Zion Canyon and leave my car at the motel or campground and walk to the shuttle. For tourists not staying in Springdale who want to park at the visitor center, this is much more of a problem, because the parking lot there fills by 10AM in the high season. Translating this to the Cottonwoods would be difficult. The existing UTA bus runs infrequently and is expensive, and there is little parking near the mouths of the Cottonwoods. Furthermore there are residences at the top of both Cottonwoods and it would be difficult to eliminate the driving of private cars to them, thus removing one of the biggest benefits of the Zion shuttle. Also it would be difficult to create the necessary parking near the bottom of the Cottonwoods. Bus transfers are not a viable option because of the hours of travel time they would add to the visitor's day. Walter Haas</p> <p>717 Ninth Avenue Salt Lake City 84103</p>
-------------	----------------	--

Tom Berggren	Salt Lake City	<p>While the sixth (last) goal under the Environment Systems Group (which states "Develop legal, regulatory, financial and integrated governance structures that provide long-term and sustainable support for achieving the environment system goals" sounds fine, there is no reference to one of the most critical elements of a long-term management plan for the canyons that will achieve that goal. The Mountain Accord should include a policy that, subject to the County's, the City's and the Forest Service's contractual obligations and the demonstrable legal rights of property owners, they should not support any new development or facility, or any modifications to an existing development or facility, in the canyons whose purpose is, or whose effect will be, to increase usage of the canyons. Each entity should agree that when it is entitled to exercise its discretion in deciding whether or not to approve any proposal, it will be guided by such policy. Of course, health and safety measures can be exempted. Its core purpose is to prevent, where legally possible, new developments and improvements which are intended to attract more people to the canyons. Many businesses, organizations, and individuals make proposals for a variety of projects in the canyons to serve the public, increase availability of activities and provide commercial opportunities. Most of these proposals will require approval of one or more agencies. Although a number of such approvals, like building permits for permitted uses under Salt Lake County ordinances, are obtainable as a matter of law, from time to time applications for significant projects will be made for which approval is more discretionary. For example, developments on private land may require a re-zoning of the property by Salt Lake County, and projects on Forest Service land must comply with the Wasatch-Cache National Forest Plan and other Forest Service policies and directives. Each of these processes allows the decision-makers to exercise various levels of discretion in determining whether to grant approval of the project involved. It is entirely proper for these entities to take into account the possible adverse effect on the canyons and the watershed from increased usage of the canyon by people and vehicles. This policy recognizes that it is impossible to determine exactly what such negative impact will be solely as a result of a particular project. Based on historical experience, both locally and nationally, however, it is clear that the cumulative impact of many individual activities in a watershed over the years can be detrimental to water quality and to the experience of users. We should acknowledge that usage of the canyons will inevitably expand over time as the local population grows and the proportion of people who take advantage of the canyons increases. This will be true no matter what the Mountain Accord says. For example, commercial enterprises will continue to advertise regionally and nationally and internationally to bring more out-of-state visitors here. Salt Lake County, Salt Lake City and the Forest Service have no or little control over those pressures. But to the extent a new project or significant modification is proposed, these land managers can have an impact on future usage. They can "slow the grow" on a perfectly legal basis. This policy will be beneficial to the watershed and the canyons in the long run, and to the residents of Utah. I also strongly disagree with the wording of the first goal in the "ECONOMY SYSTEM GROUP", unless it is expressly qualified to state that it is subject to the existing zoning and permits, and that no support for upzoning private property, additional overall density, new permits or other increases in legal development rights is implied by the goal. The first goal in this section states "Grow the year-round, destination-based travel, tourism, and recreation economy." This could be taken by developers as a green-light to approach Salt Lake County, Salt Lake City and the Forest Service with proposals to change zoning or permits to all additional developments in the canyons, beyond what is already permitted under existing laws and permits. It may be interpreted by these governmental decision makers that they should approve such proposals. Accordingly, a policy discussed above should be adopted by each of the applicable land managers.</p>
Susie Albertson	Granite	<p>I don't see anything that addresses all of the traffic created by,Ski Resort Employees. According to Canyon Patrol, most Employees drive alone. That is 2500 in Little Cottonwood Canyon alone. This year Snowbird started to encourage car pooling. Most,Employees should be required to ride the Bus. Employees recieve Bus passes from the Resorts. UTA should work with the resorts to adjust schedules to accommodate Employees. A train up Little Cottonwood Canyon would never pay for itself. It would be a unacceptable burden on Taxpayers. Thank you.</p>

Dr. Robert Moody	Sandy	<p>The train is an unacceptable option up the canyon. Not only will it spoil one of the most beautiful pristine canyons in the United States, it would be a much greater source of pollution than natural gas powered busses. Remember, the ski season is short, and the greed of the owners of snowbird should not be allowed to industrialize this canyon. And..... Let's get real, there is no way that the cost of this project could be put apron the already over taxed burden of the tax payer. We do not want it, we will fight it with every means possible. The train would be a crime against nature. Most of the traffic during ski season would be resolved if the 2500 employees of snowbird had to ride a bus up the canyon. Do not destroy our canyon! Please!</p>
Margaret Bourke	Alta	<p>Mountain Accord Draft Vision, Goals and Metrics Report Comments Paramount in all the planning should be preserving the natural ecosystem of the Central Wasatch watershed, air quality, wetlands, flora and fauna habitat maintenance and improvement. If the region were not a natural resource, its economic and recreational value would be lessened. With that decline, the economic benefit from tourism and travel would also decline. To maintain and preserve the natural ecosystem, continual growth of visitor and residents is unsustainable. Quality of life is already diminishing with increased usage in the Wasatch of roads and trails. Providing improved, and faster mass transit access may improve local air quality, but the degradation to the quality of life of residents near trailheads and resort destinations will likely concomitantly decline. Have not studies shown that with an increased density in populations of laboratory animals, in a measured environment, there follows an increase in aggression? Perhaps a metric for the air quality goal would be an annual reduction of the number of days in which the valley inversion reaches resorts in the mountains. Despite growing demand for access to the Central Wasatch, we recognize that there are too many people to allow continued unlimited, unfetter access. Despite a multi-modal transportation system already in place providing residents and visitors choices (buses, single vehicles, vans, bicycles, pedestrians) air quality, safety and efficiency have been sacrificed to the preferred personal vehicle choice. Because roadbeds whether vehicular or rail, transverse terrain that is home to wildlife, reduced transportation corridors and frequency of operation is paramount. Many National Parks, in the state of Utah and elsewhere, limit visitations seasonally, or dictate particular modes of transportation beyond specific high use areas. Continuing to allow unfettered access at no charge to the user is unsustainable. The economics of the Wasatch are driven in large measure by the environment snow accumulation in the winter draws skiers and boarders, and in summer, hikers and bikers flock to recreate in the mountains. There are natural limits to both the numbers of skiers/boarders that can be safely managed in uphill transportation at the resorts, as there is also a limit on the number of skiers that can safely navigate down the slopes. While identifying high use nodes and quantifying the average number of users in those areas is helpful, the metrics in the recreation group all lack specifics: checklist of desirable high use nodes, aggregate score based on checklist of areas, score based on checklist of desirable trail connections, qualitative assessment of trail system quality, aggregate score based on checklist of key areas, qualitative ranking of responsiveness are all non-specific. Establishing an organization is ludicrous! None of the agencies identified will cede their authority to another agency: the US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, the US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, the counties, the State of Utah, Department of Transportation, the municipalities, the resorts, the chamber of commercesâ€¦. And, using as a measure the annual recreation funding provided is a poor measure of the success of a recreational system goal. Although the American economy as a whole may be coming out of the 2008 recession, regionally the matter is less certain. Snow pack and timing are large contributors to the length and strength of the resorts winter season. Snowfall that does not accumulate sufficiently until after late November and the Thanksgiving week, may turn an otherwise profitable ski season into one that is not. Growing a recreation based year-round, destination-based travel, tourism economy is questionable in light of the above. Further, measuring the success of that goals is not accomplished by evaluating the total annual skier spending. Obviously skier spending is not year-round, unless climate change scientists are very wrong and we are entering an ice age rather than global warming with shorter, lower snow winters.</p>

	<p>Similarly, measuring year-round growth does not come from quarterly hotel use. This metric ignores economic increases from locals who recreate. As the Valley populations increase, folks that might have stayed in hotels in the past, are now in dwellings closer to the Wasatch, not using hotels. Before one can evaluate whether there is an improved quality of life for residents, one has to define a resident. If residency is determined by someone in Herriman who would benefit from a faster commute to the Wasatch, their quality of life would be improved by greater mass transit. If on the other hand we were to evaluate from the perspective of a resident in Sandy, Cottonwood Heights, Holladay, Alta, Brighton, Solitude, of other areas immediately adjacent or within resort areas, their quality of life would be negatively impacted by more people, more congestion and with it the lesser amount of solitude and tranquility, more trash and sanitation required generated in their communities by visitors. Learn from our National Parks, more is NOT better.</p>
David Andrenyak	<p>Mountain Accord: The Vision, Goals, Metrics document has much merit. Many of the goals are a balance between use of the Wasatch for recreation / economic purposes and the need to protect the watershed and ecological values. One specific concern is on page 5 transportation. The acronym non-SOV needs to be explained. Is it single occupant vehicle? General comment. A significant portion of the Central Wasatch is designated Wilderness. However the Vision, Goals, Metrics document does not mention Wilderness. Some of the Environment System Group goals relate to Wilderness. However, I am concerned that the Mountain Accord process is directed to develop a plan for managing the Central Wasatch for the benefit of the Central Wasatch users and the community. I hope that this process does not result in the urbanization of the Central Wasatch. It is also important that the plan also considers the importance of protecting the forests and mountains of the Central Wasatch for the benefit of the eco- system. It is difficult to define a metric for the importance of wilderness and nature. Yet, I feel people will continue to visit the Central Wasatch as long as the natural character of the area is preserved. Thank you for considering these comments. Dave Andrenyak 1495 South 2100 East Salt Lake City, Utah 84108</p>