

**Comments below were received on the Mountain Accord website from October 7th through November 20th and were not submitted as part of the original questionnaire. Comments are sorted by jurisdiction of commenter.**

Name	City	Comment
James Brown	107 lodge at Snowbird	Very much in favor of the transportation plans that run rail from Sandy up Little Cottonwood to Park City. If the miners could do it with donkeys, it should be easy with modern equipment
Gary Brown	Alpine	
Cliff Curry	Alta	<p>The transportation solutions for Little Cottonwood Canyon are Bus Rapid Transit and an improved State Route 210. We should improve and protect the road, build a transit center near the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon, and put in high-comfort Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). Bus Rapid Transit means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Realistic capital cost: current estimates put BRT at 25% to 50% the cost of rail or aerial tram.</li> <li>• Flexible capital investment: improving the roadway and bringing rapid bus service will take a lot of money, probably well over \$100 million. It will not, however, take a massive capital investment dedicated to one predetermined solution. Capital investment will happen in phases and will benefit the entire transportation corridor.</li> <li>• Flexible capacity: bus service can evolve as rider demand evolves. Rapid bus service does not require a single top-down solution, such as a train or tramway, with an attempt to predict the needs of riders 15 to 30 years in the future. Capacity and routes can evolve to meet demand.</li> <li>• Flexible technology: rapid bus service and an improved roadway promise technological evolution as cleaner and better vehicles evolve, and as information technology evolves to allow vehicles to travel faster and more safely, and to respond dynamically to changing rider demand. In the near future, transit schedules will probably become a relic of the past, as information and communication technologies allow quick, green and nimble vehicles to respond immediately to ridership demands. Train and tramway systems lack the flexibility to use this evolving technology. Unlike a centrally planned solution, BRT will not leave the system frozen with old technology.</li> </ul> <p>Bus Rapid Transit needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convenient and ample parking; a comfortable transit center near the canyon mouth in Granite/Cottonwood Heights with comfortable restrooms and food and beverage; and a transit center in Alta.</li> <li>• An expanded SR-210 right of way corridor.</li> <li>• Purchase of the site for a transit center should be an early high priority – regardless of the preferred transportation solution.</li> <li>• Very frequent service at all times of day, especially during the (entire) ski season, but also year-round. The biggest reason people do not ride the bus is inconvenient scheduling, with the prospect of being stranded for an unreasonably long wait time. Buses should depart every 10 minutes in winter and every 30 minutes year-round, until the time when dynamic rider-driven scheduling is in place. Convenient evening and off-season schedules are essential in order for visitors, residents and canyon employees to rely on public canyon transit.</li> <li>• Very comfortable buses. The second biggest reason people do not ride the bus is an uncomfortable riding experience. BRT buses should be nothing like current buses; rather, they have to be equivalent to a high-speed train, or better, including very spacious seating and free passenger movement, restrooms and wireless service. In order to succeed, bus service has to be not just adequate – it has to be an appealing and enjoyable experience that motivates riders to ride again and share the experience with friends and family.</li> <li>• Convenient covered ski, snowboard and bike storage.</li> <li>• Comfortable and convenient station stops.</li> <li>• Wireless fare collection via mobile app.</li> <li>• Charges for private vehicle use on SR-210, so that the costs of private vehicle use are actually paid by the users. Tolls; season road passes; favored parking areas for high-occupancy vehicles; carpool incentives.</li> </ul> <p>State Route 210 needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Four lanes, the full length of the roadway, with two lanes reserved for transit and public safety, plus passing lanes and bike lanes</li> <li>• Realignment of the roadway at mid-canyon to avoid major avalanche paths</li> <li>• Adjustment of the wilderness boundary for roadway alignment</li> <li>• Elevation of the roadway at mid-canyon and upper canyon to avoid major avalanche paths</li> <li>• Snow sheds at mid-canyon</li> <li>• Snow fences in the upper canyon</li> <li>• Gaz-ex units in the upper canyon</li> <li>• Safety barriers</li> <li>• Turnouts for slow vehicles, viewpoints, etc.</li> </ul> <p>Finally, about connecting road or rail through Grizzly Gulch to Big Cottonwood Canyon: there is no realistic proposal for this, but the costs in money, in degradation of our little mountain environment and in loss of open space would be overwhelming, in comparison with limited benefits. There's no light at the end of that tunnel. Cliff Curry Council Member, Alta Town Council October 15, 2014</p>

Ian Klepetar	Alta	IT'S INTERESTING TO EVEN ASK THE PEOPLE WHAT IS IDEAL. WHEN DEALING WITH THE "ENVIRONMENT" WE MUST BE REMINDED THAT A SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY, TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS AND RECREATION ALL DEPEND ON A HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT. WHEN CONSIDERING ALL OPTIONS AND POSSIBILITIES, WE CAN BETTER UNDERSTAND WHAT WE SHOULD DO BASED ON WHAT ACTION STEPS WILL CAUSE THE LEAST HARM TO THE ENVIRONMENT. AT THAT POINT, WE WILL UNDERSTAND THE IMPORTANCE TO IMMEDIATELY CURB AND LIMIT AUTO TRIPS UP THE CANYON (FULL CAR LOADS, TOLLS, AND CERTAIN TIMES?) AND MAKE THE CASE FOR A RAIL LINE IN PLACE OF A ROAD WOULD OFFER A LOW IMPACT ON THE SURROUNDING ENVIRONMENT...EVERYONE WANTS A CONVENIENT WAY TO MOVE UP AND DOWN THE CANYON AND SURROUNDING AREA AND ULTIMATELY WE WILL PAY THE PRICE IF WE DON'T GET BEHIND A SYSTEM WHERE SACRIFICES MUST BE MADE IN OUR VIBRANT MOUNTAIN ECONOMY AND OUR TRANSPORTATION FREEDOM. A GOOD FIRST STEP WOULD BE TO GET THE TOLLS SET UP, REQUIRE FULL CAR LOADS, A HITCHIKING SHELTER AND OTHER BARRIERS TO ease CONGESTION, pollution, stress to the natural ecosystems and trailheads...something that may not benefit a non-sustainable economy of tourism...we won't be able to optimize all of those systems overall health so we should start by optimizing those that give us life.
Maren Askins	Alta	Transportation does need to be improved in the canyons. I think that increased bus service within the canyons would encourage people to take public transportation up the canyons rather than drive. This would involve more frequent buses; more connect between the buses running up the canyons, the trax system, and the valley bus system; and buses that run earlier and later daily. With these changes, canyon employees and tourists alike would be more likely to take public transportation, cutting down on air pollution and traffic, while helping people avoid the hassle of 4WD vehicles and bad road conditions. Another way to encourage people to take public transportation and to cut down on cars going up Little Cottonwood in particular would be charging cars to go up the canyon (similar to the Millcreek charge). I do not support one Wasatch Ski Connect. I think that will discount the individuality of each canyon and their ski resorts, while not necessarily helping the economy. Realistically, people do not want to ski more than one or two ski resorts in one day nor do they want to pay for more than one or two day passes, so people may not even use the connect that often. It'll also disrupt the backcountry ski areas between the ski resorts that make the Wasatch such a great recreation area. While a lift system seems silly, since it only aids skiing multiple resorts in one day, not transporting people to and from work or evening activities, a train between LCC and Park City could be advantageous. It would be nice for bikers in the summer to easily get from one canyon to the next. It would also be nice to easily access other canyons for food, bars, concerts, etc. People could more easily work in one canyon and live in another, taking public transportation back and forth. Although it's a nice idea, it may also be unrealistic, considering the cost of building such a structure and the disrupt it would cause to the environment and recreation areas. In summery, I think the easiest fix is a better bus system. Everything else seems a bit overkill and more expensive than it's worth.
Justin Higginbottom	Alta	I think Alta should give everyone horses (or camels). Horses do not contribute to green house gasses and they like carrots. One time I rode a horse. It was so pretty it made me cry. Note: Names of horses should be heavily regulated
Bob Kuehn	Bend, OR	There are domains upon this planet that demand being left in a natural undeveloped state. Such is the Wasatch. I stand with those whose aim is to protect and preserve this environment.
Bill Mackie	Big Cottonwood Canyon	Top three Environment actions: Preserve conservation values on Federal lands through more protective administrative rules and/or legislation; Restore impaired streams; Identify and protect key wildlife corridors and minimize fragmentation. Top three Transportation: Mountain connection between Salt Lake, Little Cottonwood, Big Cottonwood and Park City; Big Cottonwood Canyon, Other: open Guardsman Pass year-round). Top three Recreation: Complete key non-motorized urban and mountain trail connections to provide a more robust trail network; Provide year-round public transit service to connect users with recreation destinations; Establish transit-focused nodes to reduce vehicle use in the canyons. Top three Economy: Invest in transit solutions connecting the Valley with the mountains and Park City area to support our growing regional economy; Consider the connection of mountain resort areas with ski lifts to handle growing tourism; Protect the aesthetic and natural environment of the Wasatch from degradation.

Tim Hollingsed	Big Cottonwood Canyon	<p>Top three Environment actions: Preserve conservation values on Federal lands through more protective administrative rules and/or legislation; Identify and protect key wildlife corridors and minimize fragmentation; Pursue funding for land conservation and ongoing land stewardship. Top three Transportation corridors: Little Cottonwood Canyon; Big Cottonwood Canyon; Top three Recreation actions: Secure wilderness exchanges to complete the Bonneville Shoreline Trail along the foothills; Complete key non-motorized urban and mountain trail connections to provide a more robust trail network; Establish transit-focused nodes to reduce vehicle use in the canyons. Top three Economy actions: Invest in transit solutions connecting the Valley with the mountains and Park City area to support our growing regional economy; Protect the aesthetic and natural environment of the Wasatch from degradation; Develop effective tools and approaches for resolving land-use and property-rights conflicts.</p>
C. Brooklyn Derr	Big Cottonwood Canyon	<p>Top three Environment actions: Preserve private land with conservation values while respecting private property rights; Preserve conservation values on Federal lands through more protective administrative rules and/or legislation; Pursue funding for land conservation and ongoing land stewardship; Top three Transportation actions: Mountain connection between Salt Lake, Little Cottonwood, Big Cottonwood, and Park City; Little Cottonwood, Big Cottonwood Canyon; Top three Recreation actions: Preserve lands that provide unique recreation experiences, are currently used for recreation, and adjacent to existing open space; Complete key non-motorized urban and mountain trail connections to provide a more robust trail network; Establish and fund an organization to provide long-term recreational planning, management and public education; Top three Economy actions: Protect the aesthetic and natural environment of the Wasatch from degradation; Increase resources available for reinvestment in the Central Wasatch natural and built environments that support our quality of life and economy; Develop effective tools and approaches for resolving land-use and property-rights conflicts.</p>

Mark Menlove	Boise, ID	<p>Dear Mountain Accord, Please accept the attached letter sent to Governor Herbert from 183 outdoor industry business leaders and participants in the semi-annual Outdoor Retailer show as comment in regard to the Mountain Accord Idealized Systems. The letter speaks to the critical importance of protecting the remaining undeveloped lands of the Central Wasatch and of maintaining the current balance between developed resort skiing and undeveloped backcountry winter recreation opportunities.</p> <p>Thank you,  Mark Menlove  Executive Director  Winter Wildlands Alliance  910 Main St., Ste. 235  Boise, ID 83702</p> <p>208.338.2373 Dear Governor Herbert, As exhibitors and participants in the semi-annual Outdoor Retailer Market each of us and the companies we represent extend our gratitude to you and the State of Utah for your warm hospitality and we compliment you on Utah's unparalleled outdoor beauty and recreation amenities. As active participants in the outdoor activities we represent, we are drawn to Utah – and many of us have moved our businesses here – because of the spectacular backcountry recreation opportunities. We appreciate the important balance Utah has achieved between developed and undeveloped recreation. It is about preserving this balance that we write. In light of recent promotion of the Interconnect proposal to link the seven resorts of the Central Wasatch via ski lifts, we urge you and other state and local leaders to be mindful of the important role backcountry recreation plays in Utah's attractiveness as a winter recreation mecca. We call upon you to lead the way in ensuring the critical balance between resort and backcountry winter recreation opportunities is preserved. While there may indeed be viable options to connect the Wasatch resorts in a way that maintains the current balance and avoids negative environmental and watershed impacts, any consideration of an Interconnect system should take place within the context of a broad and inclusive public planning process such as the current Mountain Accord initiative. Furthermore, this process must incorporate an overall transportation solution for the Wasatch area. We also call upon you to listen to the citizens of Utah who overwhelmingly support maintaining the current recreational and environmental balance. As you know, in the 2010 Wasatch Canyons Tomorrow report sponsored by the State of Utah, Salt Lake County, and Salt Lake City, 94 percent of Wasatch Front residents supported limiting future resort expansion in a way that it would not infringe on existing winter backcountry ski areas and have little or no effect on environmental resources. Given the significant growth in backcountry skiing and snowshoeing in the face of declining or flat resort skiing numbers, it is evident that backcountry skiing, snowshoeing, winter mountaineering and other forms of human-powered winter recreation are increasingly important contributors to Utah's economy and quality of life. Indeed, the future of Utah's recreation and tourist economy may very well lie more in what is protected than in what is developed. The Wasatch Mountains are an ecological and scenic treasure, a vital source of drinking water, a place to find solitude and respite from the noise and stress of city life and to experience wild open spaces and wilderness on their own terms. Please, be vigilant and wise in preserving this irreplaceable resource not just for today but for future generations. We, as members of the outdoor recreation industry, look forward to participating in partnership with you and with the Utah ski resort industry, local governments and other stakeholders to ensure recreation and transportation solutions worthy of the splendor of the Wasatch Range.</p>
Bert Young	Bountiful	<p>I've reviewed the Idealized Systems. My primary interest is recreation but realize all other factors need to be considered as well. I like the idea of a connect between little, big and Park City ski resorts, hiking and climbing. Would like to see hiking trails and car parking areas in big and little canyons for cleaner access to rock climbing areas. Not sure that a train up little makes sense - but certainly up Parley's to Park City works as that is already a heavy travelled corridor. Would like to see increased traffic kept to a minimum with bus or purchase/pass system for cars to access the canyons. Thanks for the process that is being completed and appreciate the opportunity to comment.</p>
Chris Kautz	Bozeman	<p>I travel to the Wasatch regularly to ski both front and back country. I do not support the expansion of any existing ski areas; quite simply, they are big enough. However, the backcountry, and the wild beasts that use it (of which humans are the least important) are already hemmed in enough to warrant the need for further protection. What is needed is the expansion of public transportation through the canyons and creative means to build economic success. Bigger doesn't automatically mean more money- except to some minds who will try to make it so.</p>

Bob Cameron	Brighton	<p>Top three Environment actions: Mitigate invasive weeds; Establish integrated governance structure with appropriate authority, funding, personnel to implement land protection/restoration actions; Ensure no net increase in greenhouse gas emissions and minimize climate change impacts through preparedness and action; Other (Toilets at trailheads); Top three Transportation corridors: Mountain connection between Salt Lake, Little Cottonwood, Big Cottonwood, and Park City; Little Cottonwood Canyon; Big Cottonwood Canyon; Top three Recreation actions: Complete key non-motorized urban and mountain trail connections to provide a more robust trail network; Establish transit-focused nodes to reduce vehicle use in the canyons; Establish and fund an organization to provide long-term recreational planning, management and public education; Other (It seems like there is too much inappropriate wilderness in this urban interface. Top three Economy actions: Invest in transit solutions connecting the Valley with the mountains and Park City area to support our growing regional economy; Support increased development at existing and new transit hubs, focusing on lodging; Increase resources available for reinvestment in the Central Wasatch natural and built.</p>
Barbara Cameron	Brighton	<p>Top three Environment actions: Mitigate invasive weeds (and Bark Beetles); Establish integrated governance structure with appropriate authority, funding, personnel to implement land protection/restoration actions; Pursue funding for land conservation and ongoing land stewardship (while realizing that the management of those lands costs real money); Other (year-round restrooms are needed); Top three Transportation corridors: Mountain connection between Salt Lake, Little Cottonwood, Big Cottonwood, and Park City; Little Cottonwood Canyon; Big Cottonwood Canyon; Other (Parking is needed at transit hubs); Top three Recreation actions: Complete key non-motorized urban and mountain trail connections to provide a more robust trail network; Establish transit-focused nodes to reduce vehicle use in the canyons; Establish and fund an organization to provide long-term recreational planning, management and public education; Other (Year-round restrooms at major trailheads; More wilderness is not appropriate in this busy area. Managed recreation and forest land is needed.) Top three Economy actions: Support increased development at existing and new transit hubs, focusing on lodging accommodations and mixed-use development; Protect the aesthetic and natural environment of the Wasatch from degradation; Increase resources available for reinvestment in the Central Wasatch natural and built.</p>
Brian Reynolds	Brighton	<p>Repeating my comment, should you not have received the previous one. It seems that all of the Concepts are part of the same plan with the only distinction being the time frame of the Planning horizon. Concept D constitutes the favorable plan from a long term perspective, with Concepts A - C representing intermediate steps to that Plan. Concept A, while an admirable initial step, does not seem sufficiently scalable to accommodate the transpiration needs of a rapidly growing urban center. I do, however, agree with the Concepts B - D to provide access to and across the Wasatch Range, and, to distribute visitors within the range, with minimal impact to the environment.</p>

Kelly Paasch	Canada	<p>First of all I apologize for grammatical and spelling errors as I'm writing this from my cell phone, in Canada. I've spent my past not only growing up in the wasatch ski, bike, hiking, and running community, but also as a construction group leader for ski lift expansion during the olympic building, and as a professional ski patroller. I'm familiar with the effects of ski resort expansion on not just the environment but also the revenue, jobs, and future use of the mountains. In just the last few years ive spent substantial time in Colorado and Utah skiing. In fact, the previous year I spent about half my time in Colorado. I also have extensive experience skiing France, Switzerland, Alaska, and most of the good US skiing. Ive seen the effects of over development and under development. With all that experience you can guess I have a lot of opinions about the expansion of the wasatch, and the views expressed here only touches on the issues. Ill try and summarize the what, and leave out the why. However don't hesitate to contact me for more information. First of all, we need better transportation to the canyons and park city. However, comparatively to say Colorado, its already really good. Adding trains to the system seems the most logical, but not at the expense of causing harm to the ecosystems and access. The bus ride is already borderline too expensive for the local. If a ticket costs more than about 4 dollars it becomes more practical to drive. Also if the train doesn't run early to late say 400am to midnight, it will also be wasted. And even more importantly if it leaves out alternate stops (and a lot, not just 1) it becomes useful only to the resort traffic, which doesn't help most of your local citizens. Park city and LCC seem the most useful, and possibly BCC, but not more. Trains should NOT split the wilderness between the two canyons or PC unless its on an already established road like guardsman pass, and access for wildlife AND alternate users must be maintained. Regular interval crossing zones must be established and maintained for the public. Over air options are not the answer either as they require as much or more damage as a train. As a lift builder and mechanic, access to every tower must be maintained through a system of roads, emergency evacuation areas have to be established along the entire lift line. Tower structures also need constant maintenance creating substantial damage to the local eco system and as far as sound pollution goes, one squeaky lift can be heard anywhere thats line of sight. Alta's constant noise can be heard from grizzly gulch to mount superior. The quickest way to ruin a pristine wilderness is through the noise of a ski resort. A note on that point, ski resorts are the number one mountain polluter, leaving trash, baried cables, even dangerous explosives, construction debris etc. what seems like the best option would be using 2 trains, 1 up parleys, 1 up LCC, and possibly 1 up BCC and the a full length tunnel from alta to brighton without disturbing the open space above (not a train up grizzly with a small section of tunnel through twin lakes pass). Speaking of the very small area between alta and brighton, it is of paramount importance for winter backcountry users as it has the longest winter conditions, sometimes its the only backcountry available for months of a season. In fact, from superior to catherines pass is probably the highest used non lift access area in the entire wasatch due to its proximity to the road, excellent terrain, and high altitude. I would guess these areas have more non resort use than the entire rest of the wasatch combined. PLEASE dont take it away from the people and give it to the resorts. I would say it is also paramount in drawing the new skier to the area because of its high publishing rate. You dont see photos in powder magazine of in bounds shots at snow bird, but you do consistently see photos of 'brighton backcountry' or 'alta backcountry' etc. as you hopefully know the new wave of skiers wants slack country like this area, if you add a lift, train or new in bounds terrain, you will lose that skier to whistler, fernie, big mountain, big sky, and bridger. In closing we will flight to stop all ski lift expansion outside of the current boundaries. The wasatch is too small, and once the damage is done, the people will stop coming and the wilderness will be lost forever. The wasatch is small and fragile, lets protect it for future generations.</p> <p>Captain Paasch</p>
Terry Lofthouse	Castle Dale	<p>I have been trying to promote my new tourism company for 2 years with no success. We have many things to do in Emery county with many lakes, rock formation, Indian writing, state parks, and much more. If Emery county is one of the top four county,s with tourism in mine, a representative ought to be sent to France or Germany or other country,s to contact people directly.</p>

Jacob Kon	Charlotte, NC	Having been to the Wasatch multiple times before, I firmly believe that the status of the mountains should be fixed as a multi-use area, rather than purely a ski-industry resource. If interconnects are built all over the Wasatch, the limit of environmental intrusion will have no bounds for the amount of forest it will take. I wish for the Wasatch to remain as it has been, a multi-use recreational and environmental safe-haven. Please consider the desires of the community on a national scale, as there truly is only One Wasatch left in the world. Please keep the environment the way it has been for millions of years and incorporate a similar Bus system to Summit County. I have heavily utilized the Summit County bus interconnect system and it has provided dozens of individuals, including those who have cars and can drive, an environmentally-friendly option for transportation. Many Thanks, Jacob Kon
Mike Manelli	Chicago	I believe any transportation investment must include link between Park City and cottonwood canyons either via rail or aerial tram (option b). A link via rail or tram is far superior to link up proposed via chairlift in the one Wasatch Plan as it would enable year round access. Adding additional business service up the cottonwood canyons does little to alleviate current. I ski ~30 per annum mostly in Cottonwood canyons and staying in SLC. On average I drive 40 miles a day to from the mountains. If Park City were linked via rail or tram I would lodge in Park City and take rail line or tram to ski in the cottonwoods. Outside of traveling to and from airport (which would likely be accomplished via a shuttle) I would have little need for a car as I'd leverage Park City excellent bus service while staying there.
John Glauser	Cottonwood	Top three Environment actions: Mitigate invasive weeds; Pursue funding for land conservation and ongoing land stewardship; Other (Bark Beetle); Top three Transportation corridors: Mountain connection between Salt Lake, Little Cottonwood, Big Cottonwood and Park City; Little Cottonwood Canyon; Big Cottonwood Canyon; Top three Recreation actions: Provide year-round public transit service to connect users with recreation destinations; Establish transit-focused nodes to reduce vehicle use in the canyons; Establish and fund an organization to provide long-term recreational planning, management and public education; Top three Economy actions: Consider the connection of mountain resort areas with ski lifts to handle growing tourism; Protect the aesthetic and natural environment of the Wasatch from degradation; Ensure development and infrastructure to enhance community character.
Ken Kiss	Cottonwood Heights	I support a rail or similar line from Park City to SLC via the I-80 corridor due to the large traffic volume. I support efficient bus system with express buses and transit hubs for travel in Millcreek Canyon and the Cottonwoods. Rail in these areas would damage the sensitive environment and threaten our water. I do not support tram lines or lifts within the Wasatch area to connect PC to SLC. Our wilderness is a unique resource that should be preserved for future generations. This is the big dream - preservation for future generations.
Gwendolyn Adams	Cottonwood Heights	Hello, Thank you for taking comments. I am a born-and-raised Utahn who loves the mountains. I snowboard, climb, hike, and roadbike. I enjoy and use our mountain more than the average Utahn. 1. I like the idea of working on the Bonneville Shoreline Trail but would like more info as to what that entails. A trail in BCC would be great too! 2. I totally support placing areas into special management to protect against future development and preserve natural landscapes. The more the better! 3. Yes, please do preserve lands that provide unique recreation experiences, currently used for recreation, and are adjacent to existing open space. 4. Truthfully, I am ok with attracting folks to our current resort and resort areas but don't want to see a lot more building of hotels and restaurants. Right now, our mountains are pretty accessible to everyone. When you build businesses up there, it only supports those who have money. I DO NOT want to see a lot of change there. 5. I support managing key recreation areas for increased use while maintaining existing character and recreation opportunities. I don't want a lot more building and changes - just better use of current resources 6. Complete key nonmotorized urban and mountain trail connections to provide a more robust trail network. *I don't know enough about what is implied here to comment 7. Provide year-round, public transit service to connect users with recreation destinations. *I support this as long as it is very affordable and still gives options for personal vehicles. I have no interest in connecting the Valley with the mountains to Park City. They are 2 separate wonderful things that should be worked on separately. This isn't an amusement park after all. Please leave our mountains with their wild and inaccessible areas and work on making money another way. Thank you, Gwendolyn Adams
Justin Martin	Cottonwood Heights	Water, water, water!!! All other things must come secondary to water. We must protect and maximize most every aspect of our water. Without it, we risk non-sustainable living. I love to backcountry ski - it is great exercise, great for the soul, but without water - we don't live. Transportation? Well perhaps getting their
Andy Agardy	Cottonwood Heights	In regards to a train up LCC.. really? This ridiculous idea was being circulated around 25 years ago. Build trains to the mouths of the two canyons instead, and one up Parleys to PC
Seth Orton	Cottonwood Heights	I see the future of the Wastach Front having a train system that allows workers, locals, and tourist to access the mountains from any train stop in the city, and one that will allow Park City and Salt Lake to be connected via train.

Shawn Draney	Cottonwood Heights	I've lived nearly my entire 57 trips around the sun very near the Cottonwood Canyons. I have spent my best days in these mountains and canyons. Watershed and the natural environment top my list of concerns by large measure. I do not think these values are the least bit inconsistent with concerns for a vibrant, diversified economy that creates good jobs. I believe two things in particular will drive the Utah economy of the future: 1) The quality of life here, particularly unique, nearby, year-round, back-country recreational opportunities, will continue to attract and keep highly skilled young people here, young people who will develop new, clean industries. 2) A very strong education system will continue to be the incubator of innovative, clean, new industries, and the source for the skills critical to the labor force of the future. Please do not focus unduly on one industry that seems much too much in love with the illusion of being European. I care a great deal more for those who would come and stay, then those who might come and play briefly. If you miss the mark on the side of too little development in the canyons, you leave future generations with choices. If you miss the mark on the side of too much development in the canyons, you leave future generations with a bad genie that cannot be put back in the bottle. There has been, and will be, much said about "respecting property rights." These include the property rights of SLCPUd in and to the use of canyon stream water. Those property rights include the right to insist on no impairment of quantity or quality of water available to those rights. The city holds these property rights in trust for the public it serves, the true owners of these rights. The majority of the land in the canyons belongs to all Americans. Please do not let the voices of a few with property interests drown the voices of the very many with property interests. No private property is free from planning, zoning and safety requirements, which of necessity must change over time. Too often "respect private property rights," is code for "I wish to be free from regulation." The land in the canyon that belongs to all of use, the land in the canyon that has been developed, the rare bits of land that can in fact be developed yet, and the properties in the valley below, all have value in no small part because of natural beauty of these canyons and mountains, and the quality of life they add. When you think about property rights, have a complete tally of relevant property rights in mind, please. The singular opportunity to get this right is now. What we decide to leave our children and their children has never been more important. What we have an opportunity to leave them is particularly rare and beautiful. Thank you so very much for your time and talent.
Ben Ricketts	Cottonwood Heights	In my idealized Central Wasatch the public access to this area would not be hindered by more commercial interests. All ski resorts would be locked to their current boundaries. As the Salt Lake valley's population continues to grow the ability experience this amazing area free of commercial interests seems to be continuously threatened by the demands of the ski resort industry to generate more revenue and profits. It seems the easiest way for them to do this is to expand their footprint in the Central Wasatch. I would love for these companies to be more profitable with a smaller footprint. I don't think these companies should be shut down or removed but I think it is their responsibility and challenge to grow revenue without expanding into land currently enjoyed by the general public.
Edward Zimowski	Cottonwood Heights	I support concept A with no Ski Link Between the cottonwood canyons and Park city
Zac Johnson	Cottonwood Heights	I'm curious if there has been discussion of trax expansion along wasatch boulevard. It seems like this could go a long way toward keeping some personal vehicles off the road, servicing Millcreek Canyon, Big Cottonwood, Little Cottonwood, as well as The east side of Millcreek Neighborhoods and Cottonwood Heights. Transportation is not my field of study; I fully recognize that my suggestion may include major challenges, but I doubt that the costs involved are not commensurate with ideas outlined in the drafted idealized systems.
Jan Kennington	Cottonwood Heights	First and foremost I am against any ski linking system in our mountains. It might get tourist here to spend their money but they will soon realize it is not fun to spend so much time on a ski lift going different places instead of just skiing. There needs to be a plan for transportation in the canyons. I would even support a fee based system/pass to support a future transportation system. I believe that the cost of the pass should be based on annual income. That there be options for pass purchases, daily, weekly, monthly yearly. I was shocked last summer doing Ben Lomond peak in Ogden that they allow MOTORCYCLES on the trail! It was an awful experience. I would support NO motorized vehicles in the canyons during the fall summer and spring months. I hate snowmobilers but they already have a presence in the canyon (unfortunately) We need to limit development around the mouth of the canyons to residential and minimal business development and keep the height of the building below 3 stories.
Rick Pieros	Cottonwood Heights	Light Rail along I-215 or Wasatch Blvd., linked to a transit hub for both Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. Preserve opportunities for unconfined recreation in the Wasatch Mountains. Keep ski resorts within their existing boundaries. Expand wilderness areas.



Andrew Greetis	Cottonwood Heights	Expansion of roads, parking lots, and ski lifts in the central Wasatch is counter productive for Salt Lake's recreation, environment, and economy. The fastest growing group in snowboard and ski recreation is back country users. I moved here for just that reason! My friends who live here and visit salt lake come for the back country access as well. Many of the proposed plans, like One Wasatch, will ruin much of the back country access and popular back country areas. For example, a lift in the One Wasatch proposal will run through Grizzly Gulch, probably the most popular back country area in the Wasatch. These proposals for expansion will negatively affect back country tourism and summer hiking tourism. Wasatch expansion has already scared people away from Salt Lake. I still have some hope for this place. But expansion will probably make me move north to a more pristine mountain environment with good back country access (what the Wasatch is now). Economically, expansion of ski areas, plowed mountain roads in winter, etc., seem like a good idea. However, the ski industry has shrunk in the last few years except for back country equipment purchases. Summer outdoor use has also increased in national parks and forests. Summer users and back country enthusiasts come to the mountains to get away from the city. We want a pristine mountain environment. More lifts and open roads take away from this. Some of the proposals for expansion cite being more like the Alps as a reason for expansion. I have been to the alps, which are a much bigger mountain range, yet less pristine than the Wasatch! Back country users and summer hikers are not impressed with mountains full of gondolas, lifts, and roads. So although ski resorts might see an increase in profit from expansion, I doubt the overall economic impact on Salt Lake will be positive. Finally, we all see how much use the central Wasatch gets and the environmental impact this has. More parking lots, lifts, etc., negatively affect water quality. I am a fly fisherman, I see how dirty the water after the parking lots compared to higher elevation water. And each ski run cuts into the forest. I know your report will include stats on all of the issues I mentioned. But I hope that my, and hopefully other Wasatch user's, anecdotal evidence will help you come to the right decision.
J Wilz	Cottonwood Heights	It now seems that a vast "interconnect" or something similar is going to happen. All I request, with great humbleness, is that when it happens, please, I repeat, PLEASE do NOT let people off on the ridge lines. Make it a Base-to-Base transportation system. Do NOT destroy our backcountry!!!
Jason Borro	Cottonwood Heights	Went up for a ski tour over the weekend. With all the resorts closed to uphill traffic and not enough snow at lower elevations, tons of people were crammed into one small area (grizzly gulch). And now the resorts propose to take over more of the last remaining scrap of land for early season skiing (and close it for use)? That is ludicrous. The resorts already have the good spots, please save the little bit left and prevent expansion.
Jennifer Homel	Cottonwood Heights	I understand the need for transportation solutions, but I think until we have a culture change and people give up their single cars in favor of using mass transit in the valley, building additional mass transit solutions in the mountains beyond the existing bus services (i.e. trains, tunnels, trams, special bus lanes, etc) is ridiculously irresponsible from an environmental and financial perspective. Expanding and linking ski resorts, additional commercial development, and bulldozing transportation corridors through the mountains for economic development is like shooting yourself in the foot on a bet. Sure, you made a little money in the short-term, but you can't undo the damage you caused in the process. And what happens later when you realize you needed that foot for something you couldn't have seen coming. Transportation options A and C are to be preferred. We have one set of mountains and we can't fix them once we ruin them. Wild and undeveloped places need to exist as they are. Every blank space on a map does not need to be filled and who are we to presume the right to destroy and develop every square inch of usable space for human consumption. Growth for the sake of growth is the ideology of the cancer cell, and humans need to learn to live in harmony with the environment, not parasitically overuse every available resource, destroying other species in the process. Development is destruction. Growth is not infinitely sustainable and the economy should not be the priority in the Mountain Accord. Please, don't let our mountains be spoiled by greed, commercialization and consumption. Stop One Wasatch. Focus transportation and pollution strategies in the valley where there is low hanging fruit and a much larger impact. Beware of unintended consequences. Protect our mountains as pristine and priceless resources to be preserved as they are, not rationed and ruined. Thank you for listening. Jennifer Homel

Jenny Barba	Cottonwood Heights	Based on the proposed plan, I would like to share my input on three areas of concern: 1) Safety. Should there be an avalanche or ski accident in the expanded terrain who would be responsible for safety patrol? And who's insurance would cover the area? Does Mountain Accord have the safety resources and insurance to handle this? Would Board Members be liable? 2) Unused Capacity: Is the skier population growth increasing at a rate that would make this investment worth the damage to the environment and natural habitat? Based on my industry knowledge, the ski industry is not growing as fast as the resort developers may lead on. Two years ago I skied almost 5 days a week, and only had to wait in a lift line less than 5 times and for less than 5 minutes. The resorts are not at maximum capacity, and there is plenty of terrain for everyone in-bounds. 3) Nordic Skiing: More outdoor recreation use can be added with little disruption to the environment if we encouraged more use of Nordic ski areas. The backcountry access should be preserved. Do not build an interconnect tram. Thank you for your time. Jenny
Keith Eagan	Cottonwood Heights	My main concern about all these projects is the very real potential to load the mountain with even more people. Packing them in wall to wall isn't not an improvement to anything, expenditures of vast sums of tax money aside. I understand the desire and intent to improve transportation, but there are always consequences. Currently parking, both at ski areas as well as trail heads are limited by parking. These transportation alternatives eliminate any and all restrictions. I'm afraid that any reasonable approach to limiting access will involve draconian measures, perhaps even permitting of individuals. River rafting access has already implemented this approach. The gorilla in the room is expanding population. These alternatives do not provide expanded resources or areas to recreate in. The current process is really only kicking the can down the road. The resource of the Wasatch is limited. Now is the time to focus on that limitation.
John McNeil	Cottonwood Heights	Transportation Comments: I agree that automobile transportation has to be curtailed. Transportation now serves primarily those that are utilizing commercial recreation sites at resorts. UDOT has done an abysmal job serving the thousands of non resort users. Rates are prohibitive. UDOT does not offer any reasonable season passes for the buses for non resort use. Routes serve a bare minimum of non commercial sites trail heads. Car use needs to be curtailed. A train would be great but only if it serves other non resort recreational activities. UDOT has a tendency to build transportation projects that focus on serving business owners not the lower income individuals. A train would probably only stop at the resorts. Resort Expansion The Wasatch has gone beyond capacity concerning ski resort use. The business types only measure dollars not benefits to the public. Our state and local governments only place value on money. The innumerable benefits of non commercial use of the Wasatch have never been considered during the last decades of cancerous ski area growth. The ski areas will actually suffer when the lat of the back country is gobbled up. Where will they take the glossy pictures that sell the ski resort, not at the McDonalized Wasatch resorts. Skier number will decline with the climate change and after the initial excitement of the connected ski resorts. The resort owners always talk about the jobs but most resort jobs are low benefit jobs which the tax payer has to subsidize. Most Wasatch Front residents can not afford these resorts. When the last of the high ground that has snow pack is taken by the greedy resorts, where will the less financially able recreate snow shoe sled etc. ? Recreation only for the rich has been considered in One Wasatch type projects. John McNeil
Eric Ramirez	Cottonwood Heights	I oppose One Wasatch. It isn't what I want for my public lands. I enjoy the land the way it is. Resort Expansion isn't necessary for us. I am no transplant. I grew up in Park and I live at the base of the Cottonwood canyons. While I endorse the idea of train travel up parley's I hope it only shows that I know we need to solve transportation problems which Resort linking does not do. Changing the mountains because people don't change their travel behavior shouldn't be on the menu.
James Brown	Deruyter, NY	I spend 5 months in my unit at the Lodge at Snowbird and am excited with the new peak development. We are in great need of a new transportation system up the mountain. If the silver miners could do it with no modern equipment, why can't we. Great to control pollution in the valley as well. Jim Brown
Quint McClannan	Draper	No Train - A train up Little Cottonwood canyon is a crazy idea. The costs, noise and affect on wild life will be unacceptable
Thomas Ward	Draper	I support Transportation option A with improved natural gas or other low emission bus service to Park City and the Big Cottonwood/Little Cottonwood Canyons to Salt Lake City. This supports a sound preservation of the ecological, recreational and water resource protection values of the Wasatch while addressing the transportation needs. Like Zion, at some point the goal will be to use transportation to keep the volume and impact manageable, yet enhance and preserve the access and value of the recreation, economic and environmental resource. Once we allow it to be spoiled we wont be able to undo the damage.
Suzette Joh	Draper	One Wasatch is pollution. Leave the Wasatch to the people, not the businesses.

Sawyer Wylie	Eagle Mountain	Ideally we would leave it as is. Ultimate goal being that. Other wise, limit development as much as possible as to leave the environment and recreational options as pure and clean as possible.
Stephen Stern	Grand Junction, CO	I am in favor of keeping the Wasatch as undeveloped as possible. Connecting resorts through ski lift, tunnels, or other means would negatively impact the area not only in terms of environmental and watershed damage but also for recreation and therefore the economy. The view shed is an important aspect to users enjoyment- hiking or biking the Wasatch Crest trail would not be the same if continually passing under ski lifts or dodging ski area maintenance equipment. Transportation is obviously an important issue with such a close, large metropolitan area. A more extensive public transit system would be ideal. Connecting the canyons for private auto transport would add to congestion.
Sid Johnson	Hawaii	I visit Utah from Hawaii every winter and spring break. I bring my family of 6 and dump my cash into your beautiful economy. I visit the Wasatch specifically because of the ease of backcountry access. I love the pristine nature of Mt Superior and the Flagstaff basin across from Snowbird and Alta. Don't "pave paradise to build a parking lot" for Vail resorts or any other corporation. I feel like Utah/Wasatch is on the verge of being "sold out" to corporate interests. The day Alta runs a lift up Flagstaff is the day I take my family and friends to Canada to ski (because there are still open spaces uncluttered by 3rd homes). Be grateful for the beauty and gifts you have in the Wasatch (I am). Don't spoil it for yourselves for a mess of corporate pottage. Thanks, Sid Johnson MD
Doug McKay	Heber	I do not support ski resort expansion in the Central Wasatch. We should consider light rail over Parley's into PC and onto Heber and Provo. This would serve the entire area better down the road compared to light rail in the Cottonwood canyons. That may need to go towards expanded bus service only for access to resorts in winter.
Bill Stenquist	Heber City	This is an odd survey, or if it is a survey, I never did find the link to the questions. Here is my two cents. Water and water quality are going to be the key to supporting the burgeoning population so the Mountain Accord has to place protection of the environment first. This has always been the case so why does every study think it can be ranked equally with transportation, recreation and economy? Economy has to rank at the bottom. There is really no room for more development in the tri-canyons and that has to be accepted. Snowbird, Solitude, Alta, Brighton must accept their is a limit to their expansion. I am all in favor of making sure they continue as world class areas, but they must accept the finite resource. Transportation up both Little and Big Cottonwood on the weekends in the winter is a nightmare. I used to come around to ski the Wasatch Front but no more. The traffic is unbearable. There probably isn't a good solution here, people want to drive their own cars so they can leave when they want and bring all their gear with them. I am no exception. The only way to force this is to totally restrict individual vehicles and make everyone ride the bus. The train is a stupid idea, expensive and not in the realm of reality. Recreation, the bane of the canyons--a most beautiful place located far too close to far too many people. You are going to need to build parking areas for the lazy mountain bikers who are too lazy to ride to the top of Guardsman Pass, the Guardsman Pass road needs to be improved and paved decently. This will solve a lot of problems with getting from Park City to Big Cottonwood. What about improving the existing trails? Many of these have not seen improvements since they were built and making them better and adding to them where possible will help disperse some of the hiking/biking population. Kill the ski interconnect idea once and for all. God, this stupid idea raises its head once every 10 to 15 years--can people not realize that the interconnect would just mean spending all day riding chairlifts? We do not want the tri-canyons to be Europe. If you are serious, protection of the water and watershed will be sacrosanct and then everything else falls into place, with economy being the least most important thing to consider. Well other than maybe changing the stupid liquor laws!
Joseph Snyder	Herriman	I want to voice my opposition to any tram or transportation system being developed between the cottonwood canyons and park city. The potential environmental impact to this critical area would be irreversible and is not worth the short term gains of a few. I also want to voice my support for developing/expanding park and ride lots at the base of the canyons with an increase in the frequency of bus service between these lots and the canyon attractions. It may be worth pursuing a usage fee for the cottonwood canyons similar to millcreek. The proximity of wilderness area to the salt lake valley is unique across the globe. We should strive to retain this fragile system for all future generations.
Jason Hawkins	Highland	I love the canyons just the way they are. I regularly hike and archery hunt in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. Please do what is necessary to limit development but maintain recreational access. They are also a critical source of drinking water for SLC. Thank you.
Dan Cirenza	Hoboken	Keep the backcountry wild; there are too many negative impacts by creating One Wasatch
Tim McKinney	Holladay	I support public transportation, trains, buses, vans, and etc. Not Chairlifts.

Tim McKinney	Holladay	The Wasatch Mountains should be preserved for the sake of the mountains, nature, and our children. Please limit the expansion of private, for profit enterprise in our national forest.
Baden Brewer	Holladay	I grew up in Holladay, UT and always enjoyed my time in the Wasatch Front mountains. From backcountry snowboarding, snowmobiling, mountain-biking, hiking, fishing and riding motorcycles. I really do love it all. My "Ideal System" would include a lot more trails for snowmobiling, hiking, biking and motorcycles. I really believe the solution to congestion/over-use is to make new areas and MORE trails available. I find it disheartening there is literally only 1 motorcycle trail (Mineral Fork) on the wasatch front. I would propose a system similar to Millcreek canyons Odd/Even days for Hikers/Bikers. A system where motorcycles could enjoy trails on 1 or 2 days a week and hikers and mountain-bikes on 2 or 3 days each. Adding more and better maintained trails would be amazing. I was recently mountain biking in Oregon and was amazed at their trail systems and quality of trails. I think the biggest thing is to really make the canyons a "land of many uses". Opening more new trails would alleviate congestion, provide new experiences and allow for all types of uses. It's hard to put emotion in text, but I hope the committee REALLY takes a serious consideration of my proposal here. Thank you so much. -- Baden Brewer
Steven Lewis	Holladay	
Gretchen DuBois	Holladay	Consider the idea of not designing branded areas that attract high use in ALL of the canyons. Use this idea in more developed canyons like Little Cottonwood rather than less developed canyons like Big Cottonwood. Don't treat all canyons the same - Big Cottonwood is less developed and should continue to offer a different environment than Little Cottonwood. Do not connect ski areas! This is a for profit idea created by developers that is not in our best interests. There is not a need for this. I am also against transit concepts B and D and do not believe in connecting the Wasatch Front canyons to each other or connecting the Wasatch Front/Back areas. This is too much development of the fragile canyons and in our watershed. Consider rail or rapid transit up to the top of each canyon but not making connections into other canyons. This is not included in any of the concepts.
Jeff Sorenson	Holladay	I oppose One Wasatch, and any other proposal that further develops the Wasatch for both recreation and environmental reasons.
Steve Glaser	Holladay	In evaluating what would constitute an ideal system for the economy, the projections for population growth that are major drivers for recreation and transportation should be remembered. Unless the ski resorts screw up massively, there will be major increases in the number of skier days just from the increased number of local skiers. In other words, there will be economic growth at the resorts with no action. The need for additional action to promote economic growth should be evaluated in this context.
Hilary Lambert	Layton	Each of these ideals is spot on for the particular stakeholders. How can we compromise everyones' desires while meeting the needs of the environment first? Without environmental preservation of the ecosystems of the Wasatch, there is no ski or tourism economy or recreation opportunity.
Travis Child	Layton	I rock climb in the SLC valley at least once a week. I just want to ensure that access to this kind of activity remains open. The current systems seems fine, My only hope is that we (rockclimbers) don't get areas shut down to us.
Drew Hurst	Layton	Trains are the only solution to the canyon transportation problem. Make the trains a natural gas converted diesel engine to satisfy the environmental nutjobs. You will be able to haul thousands up and down the canyon quickly and safely in peak hours. This will put the Canyons and the ski industry on the map for progressive thinking and satisfy the growing needs of the State. You will have to put four trains up little, big cottonwood canyon, parleys, and weber canyon. The initial cost will be high, but the payoff will be huge!!!! Anybody that has a brain knows this is the way to go so do it.
Skyler Brinley	Layton	Utah's population expansion does not need to include more access to the mountains. There is a good structure in place in the mountains. Focus on valley public transport and air quality.
Frank Anthony Nederhand	Lehi	No ski resort and private land expansion in the Wasatch Mountains! Expand wilderness areas and improve current access to trails. Clean up the air in the Salt Lake and Utah Valleys by enforcing current air regulations (which the State is not doing!) and improve on the Federal air quality regulations by changing state policy ... we can do better than the Feds!

Joshua Udall	Lindon	To whom it may concern - I am concerned that the wasatch back be available to public skiers and hikers. If the land use is allocated much in the way the One Wasatch wants it, too much public land will be locked up by private interests. One of my favorite uses of that area is back country skiing, particularly in the Willow Creek and Grizzly Gulch. Private development on those public lands will take from the 'have-nots' and give to the 'haves'. There remain very few regions that are as accessible and as enjoyable as these drainages. If any development should exist, they should cater to the wants/needs of the backcountry users. BC skiing is increasingly popular. Instead of building more ski resorts., there are creative ways to develop and sustain private businesses by catering to that clientele. Other creative options have not been fully explored IMO. What about NO lifts, but a lodge/facilities at the top only to support up-hill traffic? What about support of skimo race series in these areas? These may not be high-profit enterprises, but they would likely engage more people in outdoors than those riding the lifts. With the new consolidation of PC, Canyons and Deer Valley - solitude, there will continue to be several world-class ski resorts of any visitor. They do not need to grow any further into public lands. I understand that their growth and installation of lifts will limit the use of public lands since they would be the primary steward and liable entity for accidents. The stewardship of public lands should not be transferred to a resort, but remain for the public good and use at their own risk. In addition, existing resorts on public should have clear up-hill policies on their web-sites etc. They should provide methods and maps for up-hill ski traffic to enjoy the public lands occupied by the resorts.
Joshua Udall	Lindon	There needs to be backcountry available for public recreation. BC skiing is growing like crazy. Developing more resort skiing does not fill the need of the increasing number of users in the backcountry. People come to Utah to ski in the backcountry (or side country), not just to ski at resorts as resorts would have legislation believe. These skiers also spend money outside of the backcountry and contribute to the economy.
Tyler King	Logan	Hello, I would like to express my appreciation for the winter backcountry recreational opportunities that the central Wasatch mountains have to offer, opportunities that will be impacted by the expansion of ski-resort access and terrain. I am afraid that it can be easy to overlook the value of backcountry experiences because there is no revenue stream from which an easy estimate of economic value can be assigned. But I assure you the "white space", if you will pardon the pun, between the development has tremendous value. In your time discussing alternatives, please do not overlook the recreational value in undeveloped land, they are greatly enjoyed as well. Sincerely, -Tyler
	Midvale	Do not run a train up Little Cottonwood Creek Trail
Debbie Stover	Midvale	I heard you were thinking of running a train up LCC taking out the little cottonwood creek trail. that trail is very popular with both hikers and mountain bikers. Increasing bus runs would be much cheaper and better.
Cary Hobbs	Midway	Your maps should include Midway... we have two large resorts, the Homestead and Zermatt, the Wasatch Mt. State Park with it's miles of trails and recreation. As a volunteer at the park, I can say that the majority of our visitors come from the SL Valley with Utah Valley next. The traffic into here from Guardsman Pass or Park City down Pine Creek road is substantial in the summer months. Soldier Hollow is hosting events that draw many thousands each year. Omitting Midway is a mistake.
Cindi Grant	Midway/Guardsmans Pass	Do you like waiting hours in an idling car in the smog on Wasatch blvd to drive up the cottonwood canyons to the fresh powder that ski patrol is already tracking out? Do you like circumnavigating the central Wasatch for 40 miles from Park City to be at Alta only 6 crow fly miles away? Do you remember when you could see peaks from Salt Lake City in January? Did you move here because in the past you could be from peak to airport in less than an hour? Things have changed, I've witnessed an explosion in Utah's population in my short life here; we are set to double that by 2040. This is why I think a FREE or at least affordable train and/or aerial tram from sandy to park city and down parleys is a good solution. The price will be small compared to what we are currently paying with our health by breathing the thick toxic air we contribute to with our cars. Of course utilizing the current roads and busses would be most economical but it is obviously not working to sway drivers from going up the canyons in their own cars. I do not think adding more chairlifts should even be a consideration right now. We need transportation solutions that are accessible to everyone not just skiers rich enough to afford a mega resort pass. Ski Utah can still market the close proximity of the resorts with out connecting via chairlift. In fact I think it would be more incising to visitors if they could get off an airplane onto a train and be where ever they are looking to go without buying a mega resort pass. In compromise to this proposed transportation solution I also think making the Wasatch a national monument to protect it from any future development beyond this train and/or aerial tram is in the best interest of every Utah resident. Yes we need transportation solutions but we also need to protect what is left of the wildness of this place otherwise all our efforts are for nothing more then toxic money. The Wasatch is unique and priceless it deserves our upmost respect!

Jemina Keller	Millcreek	I BELIEVE: that the wilderness areas of the Central Wasatch should be preserved and expanded in toto for the use of generations to come. I BELIEVE: that existing ski area resorts should be confined to their current footprint. I BELIEVE: that we DO NOT need an interconnect. I BELIEVE: that we should have dependable, reliable and highly frequent transportation systems to and from canyon sites for all residents and visitors to the Wasatch Range (read: DO NOT leave this up to UTA). I BELIEVE: that the pristine view sheds, water sheds and eco-sheds that are the Central Wasatch should continue in their current stasis. I BELIEVE: that the ZAP tax should be expanded to include underwriting for the Central Wasatch and all NGOs that support the Central Wasatch (SOC, UT Open Lands, etc) so that ALL CITIZENS, ALL RESIDENTS who enjoy this unique landscape participate in the funding, maintenance and support of the land we all love. I BELIEVE: that visitors to the Central Wasatch be assessed a use fee for the funding, maintenance and support of the land they love.
Jason Ritthaler	Missoula, MT	More ski lifts are not the answer. Keep the non mechanized terrain that we do have and remove the helis from the cherrystemmed wilderness boundary from 1984. Get with the times and recognize the backcountry user is a stakeholder that generates income and growing clout to the wasatch front community.
Russ Talmo	Missoula, MT	I do NOT support the expansion of wasatch area ski resorts or ski link. Keep the wasatch wide open to backcountry users and recreation. These are public lands. Not for sale or profit.
Scott Jones	Mountain Green	i live in a resort town community and love the canyons. I also love recreation and being in the canyons and mountains. I know we need to have a balanced approach with real solutions to manage the beautiful resources here in Utah. I am worried that if we do nothing we will all lose because of our growth and so many wanting to utilize these resources. As a citizen of Utah I would love to become involved with your organization and help in any way possible.
Kristin Thompson	Murray	Transportation - I think that concept D would be great not only for the ski season, but for the spring/summer/fall biking, as well as for people getting to work in PC/SLC. Rail seems like such a great way to go. I understand the reasons for wanting to expand transportation from park city into the canyons, but I REALLY DO NOT AGREE with ski-link, Wasatch-one, etc. We need to PROTECT our land, and PRESERVE it. We do not need the entire Wasatch becoming one giant ski resort. I do not think this will increase tourism the way that people are assuming. If environmentalists are worried about watershed, and invasive weeds, how can we allow even more destruction to our mountains? keep the backcountry. we have enough resorts
Vince Fishbaugh	Murray	I believe that we should be focused on ways to reduce the pressure in the Wasatch Front canyons, not increase the number of people in them. Plowing Guardsmans Pass so that is open during winter just adds more pressure. Additionally, there should be more buses available for transportation along with incentives to use them instead of so many cars through BCC and LCC. These are our main source of water and we cannot make any mistakes on this vital resource. Additionally, more people in the canyons affects wildlife. One of the amazing things is that these somewhat pristine canyons are so close to SLC and easily accessed. I love to go hiking and feel like I am in a remote area away from civilization. My friends from other states and countries share this feeling and opinion. We need to preserve this amazing aspect of the Wasatch Front. It doesn't exist anywhere else. The ski area are big enough and get enough business and money. Expansion is ridiculous! When is enough, enough? I own season tickets to Snowbird and Deer Valley and Brighton. I also do a lot of backcountry skiing and support the Utah Avalanche Center. Allowing the ski resorts to expand and connect via One Wasatch is catering to the few. All of Utah needs to preserve the canyons and our watershed not cater to an industry that, in reality, is only one or two percent of GDP and is a small percentage of the total population. One Wasatch is a novelty and will maybe increase skier traffic initially but not in the long run. Who wants to spend more time riding lifts? Each resort now is big enough that it is very difficult to ski all of it in a single day. The resorts have enough. Additionally, more lifts hurts the hiking experience. I go into the mountains to enjoy the wilderness and get away. The last thing that I want to see is more lifts. Furthermore, the resorts will use this as a foothold and will continually look for more ways to expand. The claim that they have to compete with Colorado is hollow! We already have the better snow. If they really want more skiers then change the perception that people have of Utah. I participate in online skier forums and many skiers do not come here because of what the perceive regarding the liquor laws and the main religion. Whether those perceptions are correct doesn't matter. Work needs to be done to change it. In the long run, it won't add enough to the economy to make the damage worth it.
TQ Stevenson	New Cumberland, PA	I feel the Option D of the Transportation section is the best, but it must of necessity, be the most costly and the longest to bring to fruition. However, with population growth, it is the one which may impact the environment least and provide the best long term experience for the sojourner away from the urban situation.

James Martz	New Haven, CT	Hello, I am an east coaster and I am a frequent visitor to Park City. I love Utah and will continue to travel to Utah for my vacations because of the mountains and the backcountry recreation opportunities available. For me, connecting all the resorts has no appeal at all. The resorts are already so big, it seems like half of my lift rides are just to get to another part of each resort. Connecting the resorts would not increase my perceived value of my vacation whatsoever. Additionally, I come to the Wasatch specifically because of the backcountry access. If you start reducing backcountry skiing, I will probably start finding a new place to vacation and spend my tourist money every year.
Richard Bolin	Ogden	The Mountain Accord is a terrific effort. There definitely needs to be more strategic planning like this throughout the U.S. I'm wondering if there is any similar efforts planned or in progress for Ogden and the Snowbasin/Powder Mountain area. If so, I'd appreciate the contact information so I can get involved in my local area. Thank you.
Parker Cross	Orem	I believe the benefits of increased acreage of wilderness far outweigh any economic benefits that could be achieved through development of these areas. There's always a struggle between private land ownership and public access and how much should be wilderness and how much the government should be involved. Those are all considerations and they're important. For me, since less than 2% of the surface area of the state is designated wilderness, and because I value that so much, I usually lean toward any resolution of that could bring about an increase of wilderness. For that reason, among others, I am opposed to further development in the central Wasatch by either the ski resorts or the private property owners.
Jack Donaldson	Orem	I would plead for balance between economic interests and environmental and historical preservation. The undeveloped spaces in our Wasatch are only going to be more valuable through time. Please consider the future as you make these incredibly important decisions. Leave a legacy we will all be proud of.
Nicole Heddens	Park City	There should not be a train put into Little Cottonwood Canyon. This will cause more problems, rather than solve them.
Larry Hardebeck	Park City	Transportation - I believe Concept B is the most practical solution. Aerial/tram systems should be limited within a canyon or group of resorts without crossing the Wasatch Mountains. The rail system costs will most likely be prohibitive. Environment - The ideal plan presented seems like a good idea. Economy - This should be the lowest priority. Ski lifts between the Park City area and the canyons should be discouraged because of environmental degradation and infringement on back country activities. Recreation - Most of the proposed ideal plan makes sense but there should be less focus on attracting high levels of use. Planning for high levels of use does make sense as long as it doesn't stimulate more high usage.
Michael Kaplan	Park City	I'm excited! Mountain Accord is off to a great start. Thank you for developing a comprehensive plan encompassing the key issues and citizen' concerns. Speaking as a marketing professor and avid skier, linking the resorts (most resorts already nearly touch each other) will add as much as 20% more revenue to local businesses as well as providing a world-class experience for sporting enthusiasts.
Eileen Kintner	Park City	We definitely need light rail transport installed from Salt Lake to Park City on I80 before any discussion of a rail system through Cottonwood Canyon should take place. There is already a need for this service from SLC to PC. This should be budgeted for the next fiscal year.

Hadley Dynak	Park City	Thought the questionnaire deadline was extended but don't see link on website. General comments below. The idealized systems descriptions are clearly products of a long, thoughtful process and it will be interesting to see how they can be combined and overlaid. 1. Transportation-- increasing public transit is a key strategy that runs across the 4 systems and it seems like increasing/extending bus service is a logical first step while the remaining more contentious options are considered/debated. Establish some quick wins and collect/analyze data on use patterns to justify further expansion. 2. Environment--Definitely agree with protecting/preserving more and more open space to prevent sprawling development. Would have liked to have seen more (some at least) policy recommendations around air quality controls. Additional public transit options will help but there are other options (e.g., HOV lanes, public awareness campaigns, etc.) that could be part of the plan to mitigate significant impacts of pop growth on this significant problem. 3. Economy--Definitely think infill and density development around transit hubs is an important option. Would like to see policy statements that require new developments to include a set-aside for low/moderate income housing. Would like to see emphasis on attracting and supporting local businesses and entrepreneurs. Also would really like to see clear intentions to support growth in the arts and entertainment sector as a economic driver for the region. 4. Recreation--Need to coordinate development of Round Valley/Snyderville with environmental sensitivities identified in this area. Pleased to see additional open space acquisition as an important element of this group as well. Clarify policies that create recreation use corridors (permit only vs. open multi-use) to maintain integrity of sensitive areas.
Joan Benson	Park City	The 'One Wasatch' idea is contrary to past goals to leave considerable wilderness and open forest between and surrounding our resorts. This open area with abundant trails and terrain for b/c skiing is a main reason for our decision to continue living here and a hallmark of the Utah experience. We shouldn't strive to match the European model, which is onerous if any of you have skied in france or italy you know what I'm saying. This is Utah, a beautiful, rural state. Let's not destroy it over misguided ideas of what progress looks like. Progress can mean preservation in the face of other states are ruining their environments.
Shirin Spangenberg	Park City	Connecting Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons to Park City does not make a lot of sense to me. It's too disruptive to nature, cost too much money and cost too much to maintain. A link between Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons makes a lot more sense to me for avalanche evacuation.
Bryn Carey	Park City	I love that we are looking this far ahead. I do worry, that many folks that are attending these meetings are making decisions based off things today and not what they will be at 2040. I am also worried that climate change is not part of this talk. According to reports, snow lines in the year 2040 might be half way up Park City Mountain Resort. This should be considered. In terms of transportation, high speed train system, that links the airport, to Little Cottonwood, to PC, back to SLC/airport would be ideal. This is a huge culture change and big cost, but 2040 will be much different than 2014. If we plan and budget for it and market it, it will work and it will attract more visitors. In the short term to cut down on traffic up Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon, I would recommend to increase the size of the parking lots at the base of the canyons and put in a Gondola that goes up to the resorts. A gondola, in the short term, would cost way less than high speed train up these canyons and to be honest, customers would flock to park and go up in a gondola, as long as the gondola is fast. If this was an option, then maybe we focus on phase 1 of the high speed train to Park City and phase II of the train in the canyons about 10 years later since traffic would be cut down due to the Gondola. In terms of protecting the land, it is important but if we can't bike, ski on it, then I don't think it is the best use. Preserving the land but allowing non-motorized vehicles on it would be best case scenario. Improved parking lots and bus stops to access hiking/point of interest points is a must. Economy - would love to see us be a renewable energy economy. Welcoming this new technology to our community, both is using it and having the companies that develop it here in our neighborhood. The Wasatch and Park City will not be what it is today, if we don't protect the environment.
Marion Klaus	Park City	I'm in favor of light rail up Parleys Canyon. Also I favor public transport of some kind required in the Cottonwood Canyons. I am not in favor of the One Wasatch ski link. I think they can do more by coming up with a pass that skiers can use at whatever Wasatch ski area they want rather than trying to connect all the areas with a number of lifts.



Nancy Pinnell	Park City	I think that a underground light rail system connecting Little Cottonwood, Big Cottonwood to Park City would be an amazing to help access recreation. i live in Park City and know many people who drive around to Little Cottonwood for recreation. I think this should be done instead of Wasatch One as you could still ski all resorts in 1 day but the resorts would not have liability of skiers in the back country. There are already tunnels between the resorts. I know they would need work to bring them up to current code but it would be less impact than building lifts. Also light rail in both Big and Little cottonwood to reduce the traffic and congestion in the canyons and finally light rail from Salt lake to Park City. I know there is a bus and obviously the number of riders is not great. I often got to Salt Lake for work and would take the bus but the trips are limited. there is no way to go down midday for a few hour or come to Park City and enjoy dinner and some night life and return back to Salt Lake
Julius Hyatt	Park City	There is no doubt that a system should be devised that can responsibly allow skiing/snowboarding between Park City/Deer Valley/Canyons and the Big and Little Cottonwoods. Good luck.
Clayame Stuard	Park City	Transportation Concept A is my preferred option. Transportation Concept D SHOULD BE AVOIDED AT ALL COSTS, as it would ruin Park City's unique Small Town character, inundate local Park City roads and bring unwanted congestion and other environmental impacts to Park City. Sandy is the only beneficiary of Concept D...at Park City's expense.
Scott McIntosh	Park City	I would like to see a method to travel from the west to east (and vice versa) of the Wasatch that is more direct than I-80, Wasatch Blvd. These corridors have a long travel time, and cars via this method contributes to traffic along these routes. Possibly winter access via Guardsman pass, or (less desirable but still an option?) tunnel access connecting Big/Little Cottonwoods and Guardsman/Deer Valley area.
Benjamin Lignugaris/Kraft	Park City	Backcountry skiing is one of the largest expansion areas of the ski industry. Ski resort expansion will squeeze backcountry skiers into smaller and less desirable areas. Do not move forward with any recommendations for resort expansion.
Steve McDonald	Park City	Transportation- Simple; A Train and a Loop Building more ski chairs, destroying more beautiful nature in our Wasatch are terrible ideas. The ski tickets are already 'much' to expensive and more chairs will get even more expensive...and sitting around ski chairs (crazy!???). The Future Lopp- BCC, LLC, Snowbird, Alta, Brighton, Park City, to SLC and back!!! This idea would be better for Environment, Economy, Recreation, AND Transportation. Please, NO MORE chairs and corporate greed! Thanks, Steve
Roy Crandall	Park City	We enjoy a nice balance between ski areas and backcountry. I'm against further expansion of the ski areas into the national forest. I hope Mountain Accord will address the Powderbirds helicopter operation. The Powderbirds enjoy a political special interest carve out that has no place in the national forest. In an egalitarian national forest system the rules should be the same for all participants. No single special interest, such as the Powderbirds, should be allowed special privilege.
Jonathan Hall	Park City	I DO NOT support ski resort expansion in any way...one Wasatch is not for locals...it is for the "ski industry" to lure more people to our tiny central Wasatch mountains and whomever that benefits...we all know that people come here to experience the backcountry terrain in its most pure form...backcountry gear sales speak the truth...backcountry with lifts all around sounds like a nightmare to me.
Jason Travis	Park City	I speak with and know many people in the Park City, Midway, Heber area who are in favor of the expansion of the ski areas based solely on the prospect of increasing their property values and that it might be "cool" to have the largest ski resort/resorts in North America right out our back door. Not much thought other than that it seems. Certainly no thought put into watershed issues, back country skiing terrain, impact on our public mountains, who will profit from these expansions, etc. The list goes on and on. I am NOT in favor of ski resort expansion in any way what so ever and I personally stand to profit quite a bit if property values increase. It's just not worth it to me or to the future of our limited lands. I'd like my kids to enjoy these mountains too. I vote NO!
Alex Gavic	Park City	#stoponewasatch. It doesn't sound logistical for someone to start at Deer Valley and ski over to Snowbird to catch some runs on their slopes and then return back to Deer Valley. Skiers will still continue to drive up all the canyons. Prices will rise for the public. The pristine Wasatch watershed will be further disseminated.
Polly McLean	Park City	As part of this process please highly prioritize NOT expanding existng ski resort boundaries. There is little space for other users currently and there is more than enough ski terrain. Concentrate on getting people to the resorts in an environmentally friendly way without expanding the resorts. Thanks,

Mandy Antinori	Park City	With regards to the Mountain Accord project, I have some reservations. I am concerned about the invasiveness it could have on our backcountry. The quality of life of having open space is a main reason we chose to live here. Access to this backcountry for recreation purposes, peace of mind (read mental health), low stress on both the environment and inhabitants (human and animal), and improved air quality is unsurpassed. I the nearly 4 years of our living here, we have witnessed tremendous growth in the Park City area. Already leading towards a decrease in the quality of life that we came here seeking. And currently there is a concern about the watershed nearby, to the extent that dogs are unable to visit with their handlers. In my observation, dogs are much less prone to destroying the environment than people and infrastructure. I strongly urge you to use caution, and quite frankly I hope you do not choose to connect ski resorts via the backcountry. Purchasing one pass that allows access would be much more preferential and will preserve all current modes of recreation.
Mindy Wheeler	Park City	In attending meetings, it was exceedingly clear that there is a dearth of site specific, detailed data at applicable scales regarding natural resources within the project area. This includes data regarding vegetation communities (and associated existing and desired ecological conditions), wildlife habitat, wildlife presence and abundance, riparian corridors, and wildlife corridors among others. This information is critical in order to make informed decisions on the location and scope of proposed projects. The environment group needs these data to import into Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to create a basic map from which to accurately assess environmental impacts of project proposals. Neither meaningful nor defensible impact analysis in any forthcoming project proposals can occur without this information. Further, the use of the word "preservation" is much too broad as a goal and/or objective. Specific objectives are needed to define "preservation" as it applies to the Wasatch Mountains. The word implies the land will be set aside and is thus "preserved", however in reality, in order to have sustainable landscapes and ecosystems, adaptive and active land management will be necessary. The amount of human activity occurring in the area makes this particularly pertinent. Ultimately, quantitative thresholds should be set for each natural resource in order for land managers to strive toward and/or maintain in its current condition. Thank you for your time.
Dwight Benson	Park City	Hi Mt Accord, I have read the Goals and Mission for each of the system groups and see a wide range from major development to conservation and preserving the natural landscape. I do NOT want to see ski resort expansion of any sort, especially NOT One Wasatch. I prefer to preserve the natural beauty of the Wasatch. I liked the open landscape and scenery photos you have on your site, but I'm concerned with the photos of traffic jams in LCC & BCC. I would like to see better access up the canyons utilizing public transportation including busses and trains. This could support minimizing private vehicles, traffic and the need to increase size and number of car lanes up the canyons. What an experience for destination skiers to land at the SLC airport and never get in or need a car! Also, residents could enjoy the mountain trails (all seasons) w/o having to use their vehicles. These public transportation initiatives would support the natural environment, reduce the terrible pollution in the valley (and moving further up the canyons every year), conserve resources and provide more public access to the Wasatch and finally provide a healthier and higher quality experience. In summary, I enjoy the natural beauty of the Wasatch and want people to have a quality experience. Further development will limit this beauty for all future generations. Thanks for taking my comments and concerns, Dwight
Allison Stuart	Park City	I do NOT support "the connection of mountain resort areas with ski lifts to support tourism." A plan like this might give tourism a brief boost, but it will see little use as it becomes old news. It will not enhance the guest experience to spend more time on chairlifts. In the meantime, the land on which those lifts are built will be damaged. Let's take a long term view and focus on preserving what we have, rather than continuing to scar the landscape. People don't come here to look at lift towers. Wouldn't it be ironic if in the effort to attract more tourists, we destroy the very things that bring them here in the first place? By the same logic, there is no need for ski area expansion at this point in time. As a season pass holder, I am consistently amazed by how many empty chairs I see (with the exception of major holidays). Regarding Transportation, I support Concept A. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

John Lawrence	Park City	I realize this is a complex issues with money at stake for individuals, but looking at what has endeared so many of us to Utah over the last decades, I want to speak out towards our responsibility as worthy stewards of the land. Resources are limited and open land is finite. What we love, what tourists love, what we hope our children love is that within a short distance of our cities and towns, we have open land that deserves protection, not more strain on an already tapped and divisive watershed. Let's look forward and invest in resources that will maintain those pristine areas for all time.. I would prefer to see private vehicle access completely eliminated from the canyons and a public transportation system built avoiding risky travel, overload of vehicles and air pollution - than see any further building in the canyons. Again, I realize this is an issue-opinion discussion with a deep line of divide, but its protecting the canyons and mountains for everyone, for the future generations to enjoy versus individuals, be they people or corporations, seeking profit...the recreation is there and accessible for everyone, there are ways using foresight, to continue to expand the accessibility without further destruction of the reasons we enjoy those mountains.
Daniel Tomasovic	Port Orchard	
Jacob Adams	Portland	I am a native of Sandy currently living out-of-state for grad school. I am concerned that we're doing the strategic planning process wrong. First off, there is no one unified vision but rather four competing visions. Rather than each system having it's own vision, we need to have a unified vision and each system has a specific mission in meeting that vision. Without this, there will just be constant struggles between each system. While forming a unified vision and appropriate mission statements may possibly well be a contentious process, isn't it better to the fight that battle once rather than every step of the way? The goals stated are sensible, but some of the metrics are not. This is extremely applicable in the Transportation system where many of the listed metrics are more outcome statements than objective measurements (although some do mention specifics, such as VMT). I applaud your willingness to address climate change, and feel that it ought to be a component of all systems because they all either contribute to it or are affected by it. Finally, I am concerned that none of the systems address questions of equity. I fear that development in the name of economic prosperity may lead to the degradation of lands that are publicly available during one part of the year for the sake of improvements that only benefit a relatively affluent subpopulation during another part of the year (such as ski resort facilities on National Forest lands, where construction and the very presence of towers and runs may spoil the natural beauty during the summer for the sake of paying customers in the winter).
Walter Stewart	Provo	With conglomerates taking over resort after resort, what we need to worry about the most is getting the entire mountain wrangled over by these corporate interests. I have to believe the next move will be to revive some other rendition of Ski Link.€¶If you are anyone who loves seeing these mountains in their pristine current state; this has to be concerning when they start discussing â€œplans for the mountains.€¶There is one plan that benefits everyone, even ironically the corporate ski owners. Do you consider at that not everyone of your clientele is going to be impressed with the largest ski area on the planet€¶There are some out there who want seeing that experience of pristine mountain atmosphere, not the super agglomerated messed over Disneyland that is just plain wrong on so many levels!!!
Anson Call	Provo	After reviewing the idealized systems document, I like the ideal plans for environment, recreation, and some of the plans for transport. However, I think the ideal Economy system places too much stock in our ski resorts. I think it's been established that backcountry skiing and rock climbing are much faster growing sports than resort skiing, and it seems likely that their economic importance will exponentially increase while resort skiing's importance flatlines. Resort skier visits have remained relatively constant over the last decade, while I have witnessed firsthand an explosion in climbing and backcountry skiing (I even started touring last year!). BC skiers and climbers DO NOT like the idea of lifts criss-crossing their recreation areas, and will look elsewhere for recreation if One Wasatch happens. Why would we even CONSIDER interconnected resorts when it comes at the expense of an economy focused on real growth? Backcountry skiers and climbers do not buy lift tickets, but they do spend money in hotels, restaurants, bars, shops, and elsewhere. Although resorts will use the money they made 20 years ago to lobby for self-serving plans in the future, the Mountain Accord needs to recognize that real growth will come from user groups that ADAMANTLY OPPOSE the idea of lifts criss-crossing their favorite backcountry terrain and climbing areas. Sincerely, Anson Call NOT an activist, just a concerned citizen.
Amanda Styers	Salt lake City	I wouldn't like the train up in little cottonwood canyon because it would ruin the trails and others' property.
Jacob Splan	Salt lake City	I agree with the Recreation map. I agree with Concept D of the Transportation map as long as the transit is not "overground" at the passes...

Brian Cone	Salt lake City	here is what I HATE seeing over and over again... ski resorts trying to take public land and convert it to private use. Utah ski resorts already have 75% of the clustered excellent skiable acreage in Utah. leave some for the public. quit wasting people time by proposing aerial trams that would effectively section off and annex public land. I do support the increased transit platform plans for rail up to Alta, but no further those seem worthwhile. connecting big and little cottonwood would also remove wilderness area of grizzly gulch which is some of the prettiest in the range and I strongly oppose this.
Clovis Lark	Salt lake City	The density of nearby population, the easy access to the Wasatch, and the overt intent of developers to exploit what they can in the Wasatch makes preserving the environment of the range the highest priority. The integrity of the watershed is primary. With that comes preservation of forest and vegetation to insure natural water filtration. Without this preservation, Salt Lake loses its water supply. New York City has taken extreme steps to preserve its reservoir system and feeder habitat, and we must do likewise. Once this is guaranteed, through maximizing wilderness in the Wasatch, other activities, such as recreation and motorized access must be designed to leave negligible impact.
Dave Douglass	Salt lake City	I believe that the first priority of the Mountain Accord should be to preserve and protect the irreplaceable watershed that the Wasatch Mountains provide. This can only be accomplished through limited development. To base increased development on projected population growth is inappropriate and counter productive. The population of the Wasatch Front will grow no matter what. The Wasatch Mountains and its watershed cannot grow to meet population growth. If development matches population growth we will kill the goose that laid the golden egg. At some point economic growth and mountain development have to take a back seat to preserving the Wasatch in something that resembles its natural state. Managed and highly selective growth and development within limits is the only reasonable course we can take.
Jill Christensen	Salt lake City	First and foremost is the issue of protecting our natural environment from the damages done by human activity: pollution generated by oil and coal industries and motorized vehicles (especially all terrain vehicles that continue to intrude into more and more of our precious natural lands, disrupting wildlife and eroding delicate environments). Our SLC air quality is progressively deteriorating and compromising our collective health. These environmental issues are no longer merely "tree-hugger" rhetoric but rather in-our-faces reality. We must combine our efforts collectively, across political party lines, and bring our citizens together, especially on the grassroots level, to change our lifestyles and our laws so that we can begin making positive changes to protect and preserve what's left of our delicate earth, starting here with our own State. Jill G Christensen
Sarah Behle	Salt lake City	I do not support additional expansion of any resorts, the Wasatch is too small and fragile. I believe in a fully integrated transport system, the 4th plan with rail links is the best option in my opinion. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
Mark Baer	Salt lake City	As a simple, practical matter, Guardsmen's Pass should NOT be improved and opened year-round. If this were to happen, two very negative things would happen: (1) Big Cottonwood, with all of it's private land, would be converted to Park City East, ending that Canyon as a haven away from our growing megalopolis. (2) The watershed will be severely compromised. Make no mistake, no amount of 'after-the-fact' attempts at control will work once that canyon's private land is quickly accessible from the Wasatch Back.
Coleman Worthen	Salt lake City	I'd like to see more frequent bus travel options in the Cottonwood Canyons. Specifically in the winter but also a basic summer option. If I'm dreaming big then I'd like a rail option someday too.
Noel Stewart	Salt lake City	Why don't we quit trying to save the mountains and just leave them alone, period!!! We do not need the corporate greed mongers out there chopping up the mountains to put some monstrosity together for the nonsense of having the largest ski area on the planet. Do these idiots realize that not everyone on Earth shares their vision of the world put under another ski lift to destroy it for the sake of some tubby clientele that is too lazy to go out and see the Earth using some efforts of their own!!!
Robert Barth	Salt lake City	Recreation development in the canyons should be directed toward less fossil fuel and non renewable resource dependent activities in the future. There has already been enough energy and natural research dependent development. Hiking, biking, wildlife observing, open space and wilderness "simple" appreciation should be given priority. Expanded skiing, boarding, and other mechanically driven activities should be vigorously discouraged. There are already plenty of opportunities for those uses now. What is lost to fossil fuel and mechanically dependent activities will never be regained. Our canyons and the adjacent wilderness are an irreplaceable treasure and will become increasingly precious as the population along the Front grows exponentially over the next 100+ years. Their exploitation for commercial profit, and their regard as an economic resource to be consumed, should be stopped now well before they become simply another amusement park and hotel/shopping complex.

David Coyne	Salt lake City	I strongly oppose ski resort expansion as it poses threat to the use of the Wasatch Mountains to Valley residents and our guests. Currently the proposed areas of expansion are FREE to enter, with resort expansion, one will be charged upwards of \$100 a day to visit these mountain peaks, wildflower meadows, and backcountry ski bowls. This is unfair to large population of folks living on the Wasatch front who already have enough constraints with their leisure time in a "free" environment. Let us not add a greater boundary for them to cross.
Stephen Brown	Salt lake City	I support Concept A for several reasons. First, I strongly oppose further resort expansion, especially connecting resorts via lifts and tunnels. The Wasatch tri-canyon area is simply too small to sustain both wilderness and further infrastructure development. Second, though I love the idea of rail connections between SLC and PC via Parley's Canyon, I don't think the cost can be justified at this point. A much cheaper alternative is to invest in a good bus system. Commit to that for a decade then decide about a train.
Bobbie Porter	Salt lake City	I support a shuttle system built for the canyons, similar to the one in Zions national park. I do NOT support building any connecting roads or ski link. If our cities air quality is so ugly to look at, you come here to ski and can not even see the view from your hotel room, how will ski link solve that problem? If you want to improve the economy, work on the air in the valley that is keeping tourists from coming back, employers from putting down roots and large companies from planning meetings here. Adding Bike lanes in the canyons would be a good idea as well. I would love to see Bonneville Shoreline linked up and think it is absolutely necessary to stop building and start protecting the areas near and in our canyons from further development.
Harold Sears	Salt lake City	The Mountain Accord has defined well the idealized manner in which Economy, Environment and Recreation should continue to be developed with awareness of the community of people living in the Wasatch Front and Back. In particular, the Transportation Plan is likely to impact citizens the most profoundly. I support the suggestions of Save Our Canyons on the Transportation Plan, i.e., develop more extensive and convenient shuttle bus alternatives for public transport into the Cottonwood and Millcreek Canyons, without large scale construction of rail and other large scale construction. Using existing roads, with improvements to Park & Ride features, can be implemented far quicker than other alternatives, and make an impact upon the traffic overcrowding (esp. in ski season) far quicker than other alternatives. I do not think that road use fees would be strongly opposed by citizens, and would help with the overcrowding at peak traffic periods.
Jan Ellen Burton	Salt Lake City	I am very concerned about the part of the proposed transportation system which suggests rail transportation for Big Cottonwood Canyon. This would clearly disrupt the ambience of the experience for both wilderness advocates and for skiers. I no longer ski, but I did so for many years; the concept of One Wasatch will be ruinous to the Wasatch, in terms of wilderness. I loved downhill skiing, despite waiting in lift lines, because the mountains were so wonderful, in terms of the wildness of how they looked, and in terms of the snow. One Wasatch and rail lines do not belong in this ecosystem. However, I do applaud many of the proposed ideas. I am of course accustomed to driving my car up the canyons. A bus system would be better for the air quality, and I can imagine using it. Additionally, a rail system to Park City would likely be quite positive--less traffic on Parley's and more efficient transportation to Park City.
Chris Entzel	Salt Lake City	We need to protect our wilderness lands. Opening up boundaries for development does nothing for the overall public good; it just pads the pockets of contractors and developers. When making decisions on how best to utilize our back country we need to focus on preseving and protecting these lands FIRST, and then accomodate the transportation and economy. If we were to lose the gift of our wild lands...they will be gone. We will always have transportation and economy to develop. That is human nature.
Brendan Nicholson	Salt Lake City	I would like to see more public transportation in the canyons to reduce single vehicle pollution. An ideal system would be a train. I would also like to see a rejection of a SkiLink or OneWasatch idea of connecting the resorts.
Aaron White	Salt Lake City	I would like to see public transport for both the canyons with rail, stopping each 1 mile to let off passengers. I would like to see this run all hours of the night, with limited schedules in off season and night hours. I would like to see NO MORE expansion of ski resorts, lift towers, or any more mechinazation of the canyons. We have enough access points currently that anyone can travel easily, but still have the backcountry feel after 1 mile of walking. Any more disturbance to the natural habitat will make the Wasatch feel more like one huge resort, with no way for solace in the backcountry. I would also like to see dogs allowed in the canyons, as we have ample means to treat water for their waste, and the pollutants that come from all the cars up the canyon FAR outweighs the impacts that our animals would have.

Nik Aksamit	Salt Lake City	Protect the environment. The economic and recreation success of national parks is directly related to the untrammled nature of the area. Providing the utmost protection for the environment guarantees pristine mountainous areas that will continue to draw tourists, climbers, and skiers. As the Wasatch front and back become more and more populated, the contrast between protected wilderness and development will become more stark. It is exactly that change of scenery, that escape from the suburbs and the cities, the roads and the noise, that lures everyone from environmentalist tree huggers to big buck hunters into nature. Don't roll the dice with a corporate agenda, or a municipal development plan. Our hubris has surprised us time and time again. Let nature do what it does best. On its own. Naturally. People will be attracted. Just look at the Tetons. (Note, I am not suggesting designating a National Park in the Wasatch, just making the environment the priority.)
Dana Holmes	Salt lake City	A "Zion Park" style shuttle system (for non-residents of the canyon) would best serve the goals identified for the study. The right-of-way needed to provide transit shelters with heating/seating throughout the canyon would be a much more cost effective than any rail option. A shuttle will alleviate congestion; improve air quality and support economic and recreation goals by improving access for all users. The personal automobile should be heavily restricted in our canyons.
Kyle Price	Salt lake City	Human powered recreation should be the priority. No lifts connecting resorts and canyons. I like the idea of acquiring more wilderness shoreline areas. Let's really ramp up FCOZ and protect our beautiful canyons from further development. Preserve backcountry ski areas especially up LCC. Thanks!
Derek Hardman	Salt Lake City	I already believe a perfect model is available for study and implementation for Mill Creek, Big Cottonwood, and Little Cottonwood Canyons: Salt Lake City's City Creek Canyon. City Creek Canyon has managed to strike a balance between recreational, environmental, and economic interests all while remaining a critical/primary source of water for a large portion of the City. While City Creek Canyon would hardly be cited as an "ideal" balance of stakeholder interests, it may, in fact, be the only workable solution to the future the Salt Lake Valley faces: more people, greater demand for water.
Eric Murakami	Salt Lake City	Transportation within the mountain recreation communities desperately needs help. Driving cars and taking buses should not be the only option. It is time that the state follows a European model of transportation and develop a type of railway, tramway, etc.
Forrest Gladding	Salt Lake City	I am not ok with the interconnect proposal for Wasatch Ski Areas. It's bad enough that two ski areas, one that operates on public land that doesn't allow snowboarding but to then expand these ski resorts is a crime. Also the state of the Quarry Trail in LCC is not cool. Graffiti and other issues abound but we can expand ski resorts while our canyons suffer is not a good idea. Stop ONE WASATCH!!!
	Salt Lake City	Please consider expanding the reach of resorts to where people live- American Fork, Soldier Flats, etc. Keep busses moving during peaks and limit access to cars. Save the money on trains up any canyon and spend it on routes where the population will use them daily. Stop wasting money on huge studies like this for a bunch of consultants that like to ski at Alta and think it would be neat if we where more like Zermatt.
Michael Brehm	Salt Lake City	Each of these systems seem to be nicely developed and well-considered - separately. When you begin the next phase of merging them into some set of synergistic options, how will you avoid or measure any unintended consequences of trying to satisfy divergent systems? The Wasatch Mountains must be preserved above all other interests, because the success of each of these systems depends on that. The Wasatch Mountains are their own Idealized System, designed by someone's very special hand.
Neil Burk	Salt Lake City	I was born and raised in Salt Lake and have recreated in the Wasatch Mountains for over 25 years, whether its resort skiing, backcountry skiing, climbing, rock climbing, hiking or camping. Yes the Wasatch needs help with transportation options. I do think a bus/shuttle system is ultimately what will work as trains or trams would be very expensive and likely have environmental impacts. Parking is a joke in little cottonwood canyon in the winter and I think that people should pay to park at Snowbird and possibly Alta. This is how it is in a lot of places. Parking fees should go back into the transit system. This will encourage people to take the bus or carpool. However, UTA needs to do a better job, with more buses, stops and park and ride lots. I also think that Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons should be a fee area, like Millcreek and American Fork canyon. A season pass should be available for frequent users like myself. Parking and user fees would provide money to have year round bus service with frequent service and additional stops to accommodate different activities (climbing, skiing, hiking, biking, etc.).
Steve Summers	Salt Lake City	More busses from Summit county to and from the Wasatch front. This would include BCC and LCC.

Hansel Halverson	Salt Lake City	I strongly support almost all aspects of the ideal recreation plan. I would like to see public transit up each canyon and well established connector trails up each canyon for non-motorized users. I would like to see separate bike lanes and pedestrian lanes up each canyon. I support in theory the idea of a public transit connector bt the cottonwood canyons and Park City. However, I am concerned about the impact on the undeveloped areas, especially if transportation requires new right of ways. I would want to know that any public transit option would stick to existing roads and would not interfere with current users(for example barriers which prevent hikers and skiers from crossing roads or rails.) I am in support of the environmental proposals. I would like to ensure that wilderness proposals recognize the negative impact on mountain biking, which is not allowed in wilderness areas. I would want to ensure that classic bike routes such as the crest trail are preserved and that there are additional options for bike recreation through the wasatch. However, I also recognize that mt biking can be rough on trails and incompatible with heavy use by hikers. I would like to keep economic growth in the valley and inside Park City limits. The Wasatch should be managed to preserve it's natural character. Economic considerations should be transporting people from the valley to recreation and back again rather than commercial development in the Wasatch itself. I most support option D in the transportation plans. Although as mentioned earlier I have serious concerns about new transportation corridors. This is why I am concerned that nearly all the plans show rail service through Little Cottonwood Canyon rather than the existing corridor over Guardsman pass. I am also concerned about a connector between Big and Little Cottonwood canyons that would impact in any way the current recreation opportunities between the canyons. It there is a tunnel between the two I'm in support if a new road is created I am strongly opposed. I would also like to see any new transportation corridors be available only to public transportation and not open to personal vehicles. This would encourage ridership and reduce impact. I am strongly opposed to the proposed "over snow" connectors and trams. Those options are not sensible and would create a visual eyesore.
Evan Johnson	Salt Lake City	Completing and connecting the Bonneville Shoreline trail would be awesome, and would not have to intrude deeply in to any wilderness areas. Having a high capacity two-way rail loop up Little Cottonwood, past Brighton, through Park City & Kimball Junction, and down Parley's Canyon alongside I-80 (aka CONCEPT D) would be AWESOME. I try to reduce my car usage, but a car is the only practical way to access the Wasatch at this time. I think a rail line would make a great long term improvement to air quality, congestion, safety (slippery roads, drunk driving), trailhead size (parking) and generally reduced environmental impact while still supporting growing numbers of users. An express bus might be a temporary solution - still more efficient than cars - but I have an unfounded hunch a rail would be better, once built. I can picture a rail line tunneling under avalanche paths, reducing the need for avi control in the canyons. If nothing else, a better transportation option to Park City would be magic, I always feel guilty making the air worse by driving up there to get away from the bad air. The cable car between Park City and LCC would be very European, but it seems like a two-way rail line would be higher capacity? I would hope a rail line would be more subtle too, using tunnels instead of cutting tress and throwing up roads and towers all along the path, but maybe I'm wrong on that. I am against any development that is simply for marketing purposes (One Wasatch). We need to only make the changes that are necessary to provide environmentally friendly access to the mountains - nothing more, even if "it would be cool". The more well thought out, maintained and convenient access that is provided to the central Wasatch in existing corridors, the less pressure there will be on other, less-protected parts of the range. I am in favor of expanding protections on wild lands, and for all restoration projects. Parts of the range are pretty beat up from decades of mining and misuse, and protecting and improving what is left if very important. Like many I moved to Salt Lake City because of the Wasatch, which I love recreating in. It's a daunting and contradicting challenge to provide access to increasing numbers of people while protecting the environment, and I appreciate the efforts being make here to do that. When in doubt, please err on the side of protecting the environment and watershed, and make all decisions with a keen eye on reducing impact. Thank you for your efforts.
John Rudolph	Salt Lake City	Hello, Let me start my comments by saying "thank you." This project is a fantastic step toward a sustainable and accessible mountain environment. In my opinion, as a 140+ Little Cottonwood visitor, the long term transportation needs of the canyons needs to be some kind of mass transit such as a train or monorail. It must happen. This will have a positive impact on all System Group goals. Short term, I think more bus service is necessary. Direct service buses at peak hours can help visitors and employees expedite their commute. Thank you for considering my comments. Looking forward to see the action made due to your work. John
Jennifer Miller-Smith	Salt Lake City	It is a very pretty document, and relatively easy to understand. You-all use a lot of "corporate speak" though, so remember if you want regular people to read and comment on it, you might want to use some regular words.
Jay Dash	Salt Lake City	Leave the backcountry skiing areas as they are and prevent lifts from being built that would connect the ski resorts

Brittany Bane	Salt Lake City	I support one Wasatch!
	Salt Lake City	As a daily public transit user who works downtown and skis frequently, it seems to me that Concept D would provide the best system of transportation for locals and tourists to enjoy Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons as well as Park City. If the purpose of increasing transit options is to increase ridership, I can say from my experiences and the experiences of others who are less frequent users of public transit, that rail options attract non-users more quickly than bus options because the rail routes are more well defined and well known than bus routes, because of their visibility. Thus, I believe more people will be quicker to adopt rail options than they will bus options. However, I fear that all of the concepts miss a key component of an integrated transit system. That is the necessity of a route cutting through the east side of the valley as shown on page 7 of the Idealized Systems Draft. This route would be essential granting east Salt Lake City locals direct access to the canyons without unnecessary transfers, or without traveling west to FrontRunner or TRAX before connecting to the canyon lines. A possible route could be similar to the northern half of the current 220 bus route, connecting downtown to the U of U (perhaps sharing a station with the TRAX red line at Rice-Eccles Stadium) then continuing south on 1300 East or 1100 East, potentially sharing a future station with the S-line, then continuing on Highland Drive as demonstrated on Page 7 and thus east to connect the business park at Cottonwood Heights and then south proceeding to connect with a Little Cottonwood/Big Cottonwood/Park City Connection, as show in concept D. This east side option is crucial to providing the downtown and east side local with a viable option to connect to the mountain transportation system, as well as being extremely convenient for commuters, students, and patrons of U of U events to connect the east bench with downtown. The most likely users of a mountain transportation are those who can use the transit system as a daily or relatively frequent use as well.
Rob Metcalf	Salt Lake City	Hello, I am not sure if this is the place I am supposed to be writing or even a relevant organization but I hope it is. I saw on a sign up Little Cottonwood that the proposed route for the trail takes out the Little Cottonwood Canyon trail. I have to voice my opinion on this matter. I love that trail and that area of Utah above many. It provides climbers, mountain bikers, and hikers an accessible recreational opportunity that, despite it's proximity to civilization, is extremely enjoyable. Losing that trail would severely affect our communities access to quick and fun trails. I am not even sure if you guys are for or against the trail but I would bet you are for it. I saw a sign that told me to write a note to try to keep this trail ridable. Thanks a million, Have a great day. Rob
Mary Walton	Salt Lake City	We are steeling ourselves to pay the crushing property tax on our small family cabin in Big Cottonwood Canyon. Because we are taxed at 100% value as a second home, our property taxes are twice as much as our home in Salt Lake. In fact, this is an old summer cabin with great sentimental value but no foundation and a spring that runs underneath. Property taxes are changing the character of BCC. The old family cabins will disappear. If we were a business, we'd get a break. Why can't we use it as a family and get a break?



Margo Provost	Salt Lake City	<p>To the Members of the Recreation Committee: We are writing on behalf of Log Haven Restaurant and its private land owners. Our comments will relate specifically to how the draft Recreation Plan may affect Millcreek Canyon and us. As you may know, Log Haven is a fine-dining restaurant that is located in a historic log building. It is on private property half way up Millcreek Canyon. The building is almost 100 years old, and the restaurant is more than 50 years old. Hundreds of people come up the canyon every week to enjoy dining in the natural outdoor environment or in the historic log building. In addition, dozens of weddings, parties and other special events are held in these settings every year and are attended by many thousands of Salt Lake residents. Local businesses and organizations bring their out-of-town guests when trying to recruit key employees or solicit new investments or contracts. The fact that the Salt Lake community has continued to support Log Haven for more than five decades is testimony to its role as an important recreational opportunity. Especially for seniors and others who do not or cannot hike or bike in the canyon, Log Haven provides the kind of diverse recreational activity in Millcreek Canyon that the Mountain Accord purports to promote and to preserve for future generations. Yet, unfortunately, we find the proposals and ambiguities in the draft Recreation Plan, as they are currently presented, to be potentially threatening to Log Haven rather than supportive. Our primary concerns regarding the draft proposal are its recommendation to create special management zones. Our questions and comments regarding the intent and ambiguities of these proposed zones are as follows. 1. Are the special management zones intended to apply only to federal lands, or are they intended to apply to private property as well? Reid Persing has advised us verbally that they are intended to apply only to federal lands. If that is the case, then the committee needs to make two simple fixes to improve the way it states its Desired Outcomes. In point #2, the vague word areas should be changed to federal lands, and in point #3 the vague word lands should be changed to federal lands. 2. If the preceding fixes are not made and the committee thereby signals its intent to have the special management zones apply to private property, then this creates a major problem for us and many other land owners. The problem is that the goal of the zones is specifically defined to "protect against future development. Their true purpose is stated so clearly that their proposed name is really just a euphemism for No Development Zones. Millcreek Canyon and the other canyons are already subject to two layers of extensive governmental land use control the zoning ordinances and the FCOZ. These make sure that any and all development is consistent with strictly protecting the environment and the water. Building permits are already so difficult and expensive to obtain under these laws that, after spending a significant amount a few years ago merely attempting to make a minor improvement, we had to abandon the process. Adding a third layer of government control that prohibits development under any circumstances would make it impossible to obtain the permits necessary even for minor repairs and improvements. That would quickly put us and others out of business. That is certainly not the balanced approach that the Mountain Accord purports to be taking. In fact, it would completely contradict the goals of the idealized Economic Plan. We believe that, if a No Development Zone were applied to our business or our land, it would constitute a governmental taking that would require full compensation for their fair market values. If the committee does propose to honor and protect private property rights, why not say so, as the Environment Plan and the Economic Plan do. This intent certainly cannot be implied from the special management proposal. 3. Even if the special management zones are intended to apply only to federal land, what are their proposed targets and boundaries supposed to be? For example, Reid Persing advised us that the two marks appearing above Millcreek Canyon on the map are intended to designate Grandeur Peak and Mt. Aire. If that is the case, the committee once again needs to clarify its intent in a sentence under the Desired Outcomes. As the plan is now, no one other than the committee knows what the 5 boxed marks on the map are supposed to represent or how far and how low they are intended to extend. 4. Do the regional governments or even the State of Utah have the authority to impose "special development zones upon land owned by the federal government? If not, why propose them at all? 5. Wouldn't imposing the no development zones strengthen Save Our Canyons new proposal to establish a National Monument from Parleys Canyon in the North down to the Provo River in the South? SOC not only wants to stop all development by means of local government control, but they actually want to eliminate all local government control and even State of Utah control. In fact, they apparently do not even trust the National Forest Service because, if we understand correctly, a National Monument would transfer management to the National Park Service. Does the committee really want to promote this greater federal control at an even stronger level? In addition to the special management zones, our other concern regarding the draft Recreation Plan is that the large yellow circle on the map is shown precisely at the location of Log Haven and Porters Fork. We need to know whether this circle is intended to affect Log Haven in any way or just the NFS amenities near Porters Fork. Thank you for this opportunity to present our questions and comments. We live and work here in Millcreek Canyon every day, and we hike on the trails several times per week. We love the entire Wasatch Range, and we truly want to see a wide range of diverse recreational opportunities preserved including Log Haven. For Log Haven Restaurant and the Owners of the Log Haven Land, Margo S. Provost</p>
---------------	----------------	---

Margo Provost	Salt Lake City	To the Members of the Transportation Committee: We are writing on behalf of Log Haven Restaurant and its private land owners. Our comments will relate specifically to how the draft Transportation Plan may affect Millcreek Canyon and us. As you may know, Log Haven is a fine-dining restaurant that is located in a historic log building. It is on private property half way up Millcreek Canyon. The building is almost 100 years old, and the restaurant is more than 50 years old. Hundreds of people come up the canyon every week to enjoy dining in the natural outdoor environment or in the historic log building. In addition, dozens of weddings, parties and other special events are held in these settings every year and are attended by many thousands of Salt Lake residents. Local businesses and organizations bring their out-of-town guests when trying to recruit key employees or solicit new investments or contracts. The fact that the Salt Lake community has continued to support Log Haven for more than five decades is testimony to its role as an important community location. Especially for seniors and others who do not hike or bike in the canyon, Log Haven provides the kind of diverse recreational activity in Millcreek Canyon that the Mountain Accord purports to promote and to preserve for future generations. We here at Log Haven are concerned about the nature of the committees's proposals to initiate bus transit in Millcreek Canyon. While we would welcome bus transit that would supplement personal vehicles and offer an option to them, we would be strongly opposed to mandatory bus service intended to replace all personal vehicles. We are concerned about this because, when the recent traffic study in Millcreek Canyon was being conducted for the National Forest Service, the imposition of mandatory bus service was discussed on several occasions. We feel very strongly that a bus-only option would have a significant adverse effect upon our business. As you can understand, not all of our customers would be amenable to being required to use a bus to reach Log Haven for dining, parties and special events. The necessary deliveries from our vendors might also be affected. The resulting decrease in our business volumes and profits would hurt not only the value of the business but also the land. It might even put Log Haven out of business. Therefore, a mandatory bus requirement might amount to a governmental taking that would require compensation for the fair values of our losses. For the preceding reasons, we respectfully request that the committee revise its draft Transportation Plan to state more clearly that its bus transit proposals are intended only to reduce vehicle traffic rather than to completely eliminate it. Thank you for this opportunity to present our concerns. We live and work here in Millcreek Canyon every day, and no one is more aware of the traffic levels than we are. We love Millcreek Canyon and the entire Wasatch Range, and we truly want to see easy access to a wide range of diverse recreational opportunities preserved including access to Log Haven. For Log Haven Restaurant and the Owners of the Log Haven Land, Margo S. Provost
Margo Provost	Salt lake City	Based upon the reduced-size maps sent to the public via email, it is difficult to tell whether the committees's published 2014 map highlights the lower portions of Millcreek Canyon in light blue, thereby suggesting that it is a watershed where the water supply is currently protected. As most of you probably know, Millcreek Canyon is not currently a protected watershed. Dogs, horses and other animals have always been and are still allowed. In fact, hiking with dogs is one of the most common and cherished activities in Millcreek Canyon, especially since dogs are banned from the trails in the other beautiful canyons. We would strongly object to the committee suggesting that Millcreek Canyon be designated as another protected watershed and thereby eliminating dogs from the trails of the last canyon where they are welcome. Based upon the large number of dog-lovers who throng Millcreek Canyon, we believe that a significant number of other Salt Lake City residents would object as well.
James Garrett	Salt lake City	I look forward to being kept up to date on these numerous issues.
Tony Calderone	Salt Lake City	The work done at the grist mill site is awesome! Little Cottonwood Canyon looks so much better. Thank you from the bottom of my heart.
Sydney Hartsell	Salt Lake City	Many of the Ideal Systems that propose transportation methods between existing resorts, a reminder of conservationist Aldo Leopold's 1949 essay "The Land Ethic" is sorely needed. For reasons both scientific and moral, Leopold called for the same amount of respect in our treatment of land that we would show in our treatment of other human beings. Perhaps if we view the Wasatch Mountains as our neighbors, not as our commodity, the preservation of this irreplaceable environment stands a chance. Sadly, 65 years later, the greater public consciousness is still struggling to embrace Leopold's ideal. By stepping away from One Wasatch, Utahns have the chance to exemplify "The Land Ethic" for locals, tourists and future generations worldwide. Now THAT would truly be a service unrivaled by any other ski industry. So please, stop and consider Leopold's wisdom, which remains urgent and relevant today. "Recreational development," he would remind us, "is a job not of building roads into lovely country, but of building receptivity into the still unlovely human mind."

Stuart Derman	Salt Lake City	I strongly believe that it is essential that we find a balance between economic development and conservation with this project. We must find a way to create a lasting transportation system that is responsible from both environmental and economic perspectives. Without such considerations any outcomes would be a failure. We must seek to protect the integrity of the Wasatch and in doing so save out community from destroying the backbone that holds us together. While protection and conservation is necessary we must create a sustainable transportation solution. This is part of conserving our mountains.
Brad Clinch	Salt Lake City	I speak from an admittedly biased position in that I do not believe the resort industry should expand beyond current foot prints. This would include any over-snow plans such as "One Wasatch." The environment of the Wasatch is extremely small and fragile and should be protected at all cost. Previous public comments and adopted plans in the mid-80's fully endorsed this approach. This should continue going forward. Perhaps the resorts should be asked to subsidize improved public transportation as the resorts are the reason for the increased traffic. I applaud the Mountain Accord efforts and am very impressed with all that I have read, it just seems that the resort industry and their political supporters will do as they please irregardless of the process and outcome of the Accord efforts. After all, the One Wasatch plan was released to the public after the Accord process began. That is a clear indicator of the contempt the resort industry has for the Accord. Keep up the good work!
Dean Raynes	Salt Lake City	A rail system that has personal electric cars that fit 6 to 8 people. You choose the destination in the canyon and it drops you off. When you are ready to leave the closest empty car comes to pick you up at a push of the button at the stop. No cars go up the canyon in the winter, everybody takes the rail system.
William	Salt Lake City	I have used the canyons for several decades now. I hike them, bike them, and I used to ski them. I have watched them become more overrun, noisy, and trashed up as the years have gone by. It is sad. The absolute guiding principle for the future should be to keep a lid on usage. It should not be to perpetually expand tourism, development, and construction projects. We are long over-due in requiring an entrance fee for the cottonwood canyons. I happen to detest tolls and fee-roads more than most people, but in this case we have to rely on simple economics: if we want less of something, we need to apply a cost to it. Just like in Millcreek, there needs to be fee-per-vehicle. Buses have a role to play in canyon transportation, but the thought of trains running up there is repulsive. Only in Parleys' canyon could I remotely see a role for a new railroad. Placing trains in the Cottonwoods is abhorrent. There should be an ordinance in place and actively enforced that restricts the use of super-noisy vehicles in the cottonwoods and Millcreek. I am mainly referring to some of the loud motorcycles that frequent these canyons that are so loud it physically hurts the ears to be near them. The noise pollution from these machines can be heard miles away, echoing up the canyon like an invading column of military vehicles.
Melly Paasch	Salt Lake City	Concept C is the only real option without increasing development into important wildlife corridors and maintaining a small but very important high altitude backcountry between brighton and alta. This area in and around grizzly gulch is very active for new BC skiers, snowboarders, and wildlife. Its also the only early season BC available.

Kate Bowman	Salt Lake City	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the mountain accord plan. As a Salt Lake City resident and a skier, it is very important to me that this plan addresses transportation concerns in a way that preserves the natural environment of the Wasatch mountains and the incredible opportunities for world class recreation, both at the ski resorts and in the back country. RECREATION The decision to manage branded areas to attract high levels of use while maintaining the existing character of recreation areas outside of the branded areas is foresighted and will allow the ski areas to manage more visitors and traffic without negatively impacting the surrounding land and the recreation opportunities available outside the resorts. Placing areas into special management is critical to preserve the areas that provide exceptional wilderness recreation opportunities and protect them from development. I think the key non motorized urban and mountain trail connections are a great idea, especially a complete BST that runs along the foothills through Parley's canyon, and the trails connecting the entirety of Millcreek, BCC, and LCC to the city all the way through to I-15. Better connectivity from the city to the mountains, especially through non-motorized trails or public transit, is a good thing. However this scenario seems to indicate the creation of a year-round public transit route from Park City to LCC. The upper part of LCC is a great place to backcountry ski and, in low snow years like the past three years, high elevation north, east, and west facing terrain is often the only place to find good snow conditions. Much of this high elevation north-facing terrain, in particular is already occupied by ski resorts, and I do not think it is a good idea to develop any portion of upper LCC, even for transportation. ENVIRONMENT I fully support the proposal to ensure no net increase in greenhouse gas emissions, and I think it should be taken a step farther to seek a net decrease in greenhouse gas emissions. Climate change is expected to result in more precipitation falling as rain, not snow, and higher snowlines overall, which is very bad news for Utah's ski resorts. As such, the ski resorts should be committing to reduce their own carbon footprints, and we should all work together to find strategies to help reduce carbon emissions resulting from lodging and transportation related to the ski resorts. Investments in green energy are not specifically addressed in any of these scenarios, and investments in green energy offer a great opportunity for the resorts and resort-related businesses to simultaneously reduce their usage of fossil fuels and attract new visitors by advertising their green actions. ECONOMY I think it is a great idea to create highly developed nodes in Salt Lake City, paired with good transportation from these nodes to the resort. Salt Lake City can handle the development and increased density, and when combined with public transportation that offers easy access to the canyons, new development will be very attractive as visitors will be able to fly in, choose from a variety of lodging accommodations, and ski at world class ski resorts, all without having to rent a car. Over the snow connections between the resorts might attract new visitors, especially where ski resorts closely abut each other and connections would be natural and easy, however I think the idea of connecting all 7 resorts is mostly a marketing ploy that would not actually attract new visitors. Each resort alone offers excellent skiing and enough terrain to keep a family busy for a whole day. The existing linkages largely make sense, because the resorts share boundaries. New linkages allow the ski resorts to market vast amounts of interconnected terrain, but actually skiing all 7 resorts in one day would not be appealing to most people as the best skiing can not be found traversing from resort to resort via contrived linkages. The idea of interconnecting the ski resorts, beyond existing connections, is entirely designed to appeal to visitors and doesn't consider the needs of local residents and skiers. As previously stated, I don't believe there is space to create a transit corridor in upper LCC without negatively impacting the limited amount of undeveloped space that is available. TRANSPORTATION I support Concepts A and B, which involve no new mountain connection, but increases bus service to the canyons (especially bus service from Salt Lake to Park City, which is currently lacking as public buses only run a few times a day). I am intrigued by the idea of a train up LCC, because this canyon often suffers from severe traffic jams when it is snowing, but if there is to be a connection from the wasatch front to the wasatch back, I think it makes much more sense to connect BCC to Park City. There is already an existing road in the summer (Guardsman), so it would be possible to either maintain and plow the road in the winter, or build a new transit connection in an area that is already impacted by roads and development. Thank you again for the opportunity to provide public comment on these scenarios and for your work to carefully consider the future of the Wasatch mountains.</p>
Ann and John O'Connell	Salt Lake City	<p>This is a very difficult format. I had to take notes in order to make comments. That, that in itself, is intimidating and will discourage many. Transportation. I prefer Concept C, at least in general terms. Environment. It appears to be positive; however, I would like an emphasis on buying out private holdings when possible and certainly support greater protection in the federal lands indicated on the map. Economy. No further development. I am adamantly opposed to the Big and Little Cottonwood transit interconnect, the over the snow connections, or any further ski area expansion. Generally the ski areas have already become unsightly degraded terrain. Recreation. I am emphatically opposed to #4 and #5 but did not write down why and since it is so awkward to get back to that site, I will skip the details</p>
Tim Bennion	Salt Lake City	<p>I'll be quick. No rail up the canyons. Not a fan.</p>

John Knoblock	Salt Lake City	<p>Okay, I've probably given more input than some want to hear. And I know we're looking from the big overview plans. But I believe that we may not have taken full opportunity of the great collaborative effort to grab some of the low hanging fruit that can make significant shorter term improvements. We may be able to make short term improvements by making a 'hit list' of problems to solve that can be attributed to the Mountain Accord. Examples are- reduce canyon motorcycle noise by figuring out how to ensure mufflers meet the existing unenforced noise ordinance requirements; reduce canyon air pollution by enacting a 1 am to 5 pm campfire ban; protect wetlands by identifying and rerouting all trails that run through wetlands; establish a process to ensure that as many existing restrooms in the canyons are open, clean and functional as possible at all times. There are probably a few more others can think of that can give us early progress.</p>
John Knoblock	Salt Lake City	<p>One more short term 'low hanging fruit' item to consider is common sense improvements to the ski bus system. The existing buses on infrequent schedule, limited seating, and horrible ski rack make it so that few even consider it to be a viable transportation option.</p>
John Knoblock	Salt Lake City	<p>I want to comment on the Transportation group proposals, as I feel that they haven't included some reasonable options. 1) Make a light rail system that just loops through Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. This involves just one tunnel and resolves the BCC LCC traffic problems as well as emergency egress issues in the event of a giant landslide or avalanche. 2) Improve the existing ski bus system by having smaller more frequent shuttle busses with external ski racks. They could service many community park and rides rather than just a few large P&amp;R's at the canyon bases. Give the busses priority access by closing off downhill traffic from 7:30-9:30 am making the left lane bus only.</p>
Eric Bend	Salt lake City	<p>To the Mountain Accord Committee. I am a Salt Lake City resident, a frequent recreational user of the Wasatch Mountains, and an unapologetic advocate for prioritizing environmental protection and preservation of the Wasatch. Economy and the Environment: How can the Wasatch Range best support our lively local economy? I argue that an unchanged Wasatch is far more valuable than one with expanded transportation and recreational infrastructure. I am acutely aware of the money generated by local recreationalists and tourists. Why is the recreational economy so strong now, and how can we maintain that? Many cities have good skiing, or a strong metropolitan centers, or an international airport etc. Very few have it all. Zero cities of our size have access to genuine wilderness within 45 min. We must protect what we have. It works. Wilderness will continue to be valuable as it fosters clean air and water. It will increase in value as the supply is sacrificed and traded around the world. Lets not make these sacrifices and trades in the Wasatch. Much of the pressure for changing the Wasatch is coming from the big skiing industry (nearly all of it?) The earth is getting warmer. An investment in the ski industry is a bad economic choice for the long term. Transportation: Traffic and congestion is like friction, and a small amount of friction is a good thing. Our relatively small mountain range can only accommodate so many people. Travel times are still low. Please limit transportation expansion, especially in remote and roadless areas. Recreation: I ski, cycle, fish, backpack and more. I love these activities and value our current infrastructure. However, expanding trails, ski lifts etc. will sacrifice the small amount of wildness left in our Wasatch. Please protect this un-renewable resource and limit recreational expansion. Thank you Eric Bend, PhD</p>

Dennis Borup	Salt lake City	<p>Human greed is overwhelming Mother Nature in Big Cottonwood Canyon! One Utah and the ski resorts want to expand their boundaries and increase the use of this precious and fragile canyon! Human and corporate greed are the culprits. They are trying to persuade the public citizenry and elected officials that it's okay to increase even more their footprint in the Canyon. As a Salt Lake and Canyon resident for the past 70+ years, I make a serious declaration that Big Cottonwood Canyon is being overwhelmed by it's capacity to provide recreation and scenic pleasure to the ever growing population of the Wasatch Front. Visitation of the Canyon has dramatically increased in the past 5 years. Unless steps are taken, our precious treasure will be lost forever! The Canyon is already saturated by the bikers, skiers, hikers, climbers, Sunday drivers, ATVers, motorcyclists, brunches, marathoners, rock and water gatherers, picnics, mountaineers, joggers, photographers, hunters and etc. Once the expansion and development of the ski resorts is agreed to and implemented, the trees, rocks and dirt will be lost forever. As forecast, by the year 2075 and global warming, the ski resorts will lose 2/3'rds of their ski terrain and all that misguided development will stare us in the face instead of all those wonderful trees! Please don't forget about the most precious resource...WATER. Increased use and development of the Canyon can only lead to degradation of our water supply through increased erosion, runoff, pollution, and shrinking availability. At Brighton, I have personally witnessed the decrease in size of Silver Lake and the increase in moss and willow beds as the snow fields and precipitation decrease, I have also noticed an increase in moss in Big Cottonwood Creek which can be attributed to increased human activity, such as fertilizers, detergents, human and domestic animal waste. Solutions: I recommend we...Increase bus service (NOT tram or train or tracs) up/down the canyon Increased parking at base of canyon (park and ride) Implement Canyon entrance fee (as does Millcreek Canyon) to all users except canyon residents and those taking public transportation. Fees collected can be used for habitat/trail/picnic improvements (introduction of beavers was brilliant idea...preventing flooding from spring runoff, the moose love the willows, and the photographers love the moose) Do not allow further expansion into Forest Service property Do not allow a ski lift canyon interlink Do not allow Guardsman Pass to be plowed in the winter Do not allow a tunnel to be expanded to connect Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons Do not allow ANY further commercial development Do not allow any further private bridges constructed over Big Cottonwood Creek Do not allow Tavaci or others like it Consider other ways to rationalize NOT going along with these development plans outlined above. Create other ways to produce jobs and income to the State of Utah, which always seems to be in the headlights of developers and most legislators ( who seem to be mostly real estate agents and/or receive "benefits" from those wanting to further their cause). Consider Ted Wilson and Jake Garn. In conclusion, I think we are facing great pressure and will feel even greater pressure from the ski industry now that Talisker, Deer Valley/Solitude alliance, and Vail are in the game. I would very seriously caution Ski Utah, Utah Visitors Bureau, elected officials, and Chambers of Commerce to not cave in to these proposals outlined above.</p> <p>We cannot become economic prostitutes pandering to human and corporate greed by giving away our precious land.</p> <p>Dennis Borup 2867 Hillsden Drive Salt Lake City, Utah 84117 801-232-7276</p>
Jon Pearson	Salt Lake City	<p>Clearly there is a vast amount of goodwill and forethought going into this project. Thank you. I do wish to provide a broad comment. When considering many voices (with different opinions), it is important to hear all of them. It is NOT appropriate to automatically give them equal weight. I could say that I think it's important to have a landing strip for aliens, but you shouldn't give that much leverage, right? Economic powers tend to demand an "equal voice" at the table. I think they usually have an outsized impact in discussions such as this. In the words of the Lorax "Who will speak for the trees?". Please be sure to put ample weight on the voices of the many general public users, backcountry enthusiasts, and nature herself (animals, plants, WATER). What if each person and each tree got a vote? How would that look compared to 1000 developers looking for opportunities?</p>

Sylvia Wilcox	Salt Lake City	Thank you for providing this forum for study and comment. I reviewed the maps. I am adamantly and unalterably opposed to an aerial tram ANYWHERE. How distressing to canyon visitors who go there to enjoy beauty and serenity, to have the ridge lines and panoramas marred by a manmade structure! It is not necessary to economic growth. Skiers wanting to travel between resorts on the tram would simply spend most of the day on the tram. The view looking down would be great, but it's not worth it. Please don't let Ski Utah and other developers get their way on this! It will ruin that part of the mountain range. I appreciate very much the concern and proposals for restoration and protection of key areas where invasive exist or where degradation has occurred. I also applaud increased trail connections and increased bus service into the canyons. I oppose any more building in the canyons; they are already way too crowded around the ski resorts especially. There should be a moratorium on new construction and monies and energies focused on restoration and sustainable use which could include more presence of rangers or stewards to educate and police human behavior.
Brian Walsh	Salt Lake City	The report you guys put together was fantastic. It's always great to zoom out and look at each stakeholder's perspective and even analyze their extreme wants and needs. At the end of the day, people live in Utah because of the access to the outdoors. Most people I meet in the outdoor community are not from Utah originally. The only thing keeping them here is the surrounding natural beauty. As we start to enclose on that space and we see and feel the pressure of a growing population with growing wants and needs, the beauty and what makes this place special starts to fade. I can safely safe that if the One Wasatch proposal goes through, and if we can't clean up our SMOG issues, people will move out of Utah. The economy will suffer, quality of life will suffer, education will suffer, food quality will suffer just as the environment is already suffering. Think long term. Think Big Picture.
John Rich	Salt Lake City	My comment relates specifically to the Transportation Concept B. I assume it's B for bad idea. Any concept that includes the need to purchase a lift ticket at one resort to go visit another is not going to provide the kind of people movement the plans are trying to achieve. I have been a season ticket holder at Solitude for years. The only people I see on the SolBright trail that I have talked to got lost and didn't know where they were going. When I ski Alta or Snowbird I rarely see anyone pass through the gates from Baldy Express. Except as a novelty I would never spend the ski time necessary to ride lifts from Park City to get to Snowbird.
Nellie Morgan	Salt Lake City	Top three Environment actions: Preserve private land with conservation values while respecting private property rights; Preserve conservation values on Federal lands through more protective administrative rules and/or legislation; Pursue funding for land conservation and ongoing land stewardship. Top three Transportation actions: Mountain connection between Salt Lake, Little Cottonwood, Big Cottonwood and Park City; Big Cottonwood Canyon; Other (Parking along road). Top three Recreation actions: Place areas into special management to protect against future development and preserve natural landscapes; Provide year-round public transit service to connect users with recreation destinations; Other (help with dispersed recreation. Top three Economy actions: Protect the aesthetic and natural environment of the Wasatch from degradation; Other (preserve our watershed areas).

Danielle Paterson	Salt Lake City	<p>Transportation is obviously becoming more and more of a problem in the Cottonwood Canyons. On any given snow storm day or weekend, lines up and down both Little Cottonwood Canyon(LCC) and Big Cottonwood Canyons(BCC)are becoming more and more atrocious. In face of our burgeoning population and increased tourism, our canyons face enormous pressure. I am a native Salt Laker and an avid backcountry skier. I utilize both private and public transportation for skiing. I for one, think we have totally under utilized transportation systems up and down our canyons. I have used the bus systems up both BCC and LCC and feel that management of those systems have been poorly run. In my dream transportation scenario for the Wasatch; I believe not in constructing billion dollar railway systems, tunnels trams or interconnects, but rather refining a combination of different busing options with limiting visitor use and limiting access much like some of our National Parks do. By determining the carrying capacity of the resorts and in better serving different user types. I think we could offer a myriad of transportation options like employee vans that could shuttle so many workers and skiers up the canyon with different needs. For example, have options for smaller limited 15 passenger vans equipped with ski holders that customize the kind of use or need. One van could host back country skiers, while another could host employees to the resorts. While I see big buses still playing a huge and vital role in transporting people to specific resorts. A fleet of different colored public transformation vans and small buses could provide much better service. An orange van could take only backcountry skiers and could have more distinct stops. While a green van could get folks to work at Brighton early before public buses depart. Now, the public buses have only limited stops in the canyons and force backcountry skiers into using their vehicles a majority of the time. We try when we can to use public transportation, but it is out of complete convenience that most folks use their own cars. Maybe a toll or limiting the number of folks who access the areas for pristine features and a pristine experience of snow. Make our canyons unlike any of the high use, high inventory resorts and promote our small is beautiful resource; this is the reality of the Wasatch. Let's face it, the area is fragile and still contains many wild aspects. We should build our transportation systems to match our environment. Believe me as a skier if we preserve the amenity of un-tracked snow and limited human use--we would make our destination skiing the best on earth. Our resorts will become the most sought out. It is a funny thing, how we think bigger is better; NO, absolutely not, it just ruins the richness of the experience! Throwing more money at the problem by building damaging transportation systems only ruins our water quality and the landscape we love so much. Ask anyone who has been inter lodged, the powder is premium and there are fewer people. We are not in Switzerland with the Alps in their enormity and their trains, tunnels, trams and interconnects. We should take pride in this little jewel we call the Wasatch. Treat her with all her history of unique little resorts. All of whom have provided unique autonomy and a spirit all of their own. Brighton and Alta have been in my life since I was 3. Please do not recommend slicing and dicing up their individual characters and keep all the transportation specific to each resort. This is a vital plea for what is precious about the experience of skiing in these canyons. Recap-(1) limited use based on carrying capacity and quality capacity. (2) A fleet of different types of small vans and buses, better targeting user groups. (3)valuing the amenity instead of destroying the very thing you aim to preserve(a train system is a good example) Thanks for this opportunity to comment. I beg you as a native Utahan, preserve our small place with a sense of place and understanding of our fragile riparian environments and the stunning mountains known to the world wide as "the best snow on earth!</p>
Richard Middleton	Salt Lake City	<p>The vision seems to focus on developing a resort complex comparable to those in Europe. This is a totally false analogy (speaking as a European). Those in Europe are not adjacent to a metropolitan area which will experience tremendous population growth in the coming decades, and whose inhabitants will need the Wasatch for recreation without paying resort prices (but of course they're not yet here to vote or contribute to campaigns). Also the area of the Alps is massive compared to the Wasatch, and so they can accommodate giant resorts while still easily preserving public access. Encouraging economic development in the canyons and opening Guardsman pass will simply worsen traffic problems. If better transit interconnects really are needed for commuters (not millionaire visitors from out of state who like to live in Park City but would prefer to recreate on the Wasatch), use Parleys, not the Cottonwoods.</p>



Magali Lequient	Salt Lake City	We need to preserve the future of the wasatch, the mountains and access to them is the most important resource Salt Lake City has to offer to its population and to visitors, it is also very fragile. We need to expand the Wilderness protected areas, and cannot allow ski areas to expand further, they area have a large footprint and very good terrain to offer to clients. And connecting the ski areas will not benefit skiers and anyone else than the wealthy developers and will undoubtedly impair everyone else's experience. We need to restore damaged environments and not allow any further development that once again only serves the financial interests of a handful of individuals while limiting the access and impairing the wilderness experience of the general population for whom the mountains represents a lifestyle, a reason to live in or to visit the Wasatch area. We need to improve public transit in the canyons, and also take multiple measures to prevent single car occupants. Connecting canyons and park city side does not help transit and pollution. And the rail system in the cottonwoods will have too much impact on wildlife and access to the trails, cliffs and backcountry. Rail in Parleys is a good idea for commuters.
Chris Balun	Salt Lake City	I strongly support the one Wasatch concept. opening guardsman pass for year round car transportation. A gondola from the base of LCC to the base of Snowbird. Enhanced bus service to both canyons. expanded parking areas at all major train heads and park and rides.(especially White pine and the base of LCC.
Kate Bowman	Salt Lake City	
Shane Kemp	Salt Lake City	I think by working on the ideal goals of the environment, recreation and transportation groups, we can achieve what we need to in the economic area. I am not sympathetic to land owners - especially those that might have their claims based on extremely old mineral rights. They did nothing for the land, and want to profit from their position. ( Thinking about issues in cardiff fork for example - not other "real" land owners like cabin owners and others that bought their land recently ) The resorts are plenty big and we do not need to expand them - there is precious other room in the Wasatch as it is- it should be left undisturbed, although I'm not a big fan of wilderness declaration either ( due to the arbitrary exclusion of mtn bikes and undue preference for horse travel - been to the Uintas? horse pack groups have a HUGE non wild impact! )
Nathan Kota	Salt Lake City	Rather than focusing on inter-canyon connection, the primary objective of the transportation initiative should be to first provide robust, efficient, and effective intra-canyon transportation, along with increased connection of the urban areas to those transportation corridors. Roads into each of the tri-canyons and Parley's already exist, but are insufficient for the volume of traffic during peak recreation times, particularly in the tri-canyon area. Buses are slow, small, and too difficult to plan for (especially for families of any size), with limited parking and scheduling. Alternatively, trains up-and-down each canyon, that connect among the base of the canyons, and into the Salt Lake Valley could be extremely beneficial for reducing vehicle emissions, while providing swift transport to resort areas, and other popular recreation stops along the way. Imagine a truly connected system where residents and visitors alike would either not have to use a car at all, or very little, to get from the airport, a hotel, or even their home, to a recreation area, and then among various recreation areas; and could do it relatively quickly. Forget about drilling holes through the mountains or expanding resort footprints and lifts, thereby reducing recreational availability to non-resort users, and heavily impacting watershed, ecosystem, and wildlife habitat health and integrity. The central Wasatch is compact and heavily-used by humans and must, therefore, be preserved, conserved and maintained in a way that ensures the longevity of a properly functioning wild-land, mountainous zone. Littering the mountains with expanded human development will only hasten the fragmentation of the mountains, its uses, and users. Using existing transport corridors, but increasing their scope and effectiveness, could help to reduce negative impacts.
Kenton Peters	Salt Lake City	I agree with the environment and recreation System Group's recommendations. I prefer the transportation group's Concept D but think that Concept B is more achievable in the short run and can be used as a first step to achieve the goals of Concept D. I disagree with the Economy Group's 'over snow' connection concept. While it could have tourist marketing value it doesn't serve as a viable transportation solution and because it would be tantamount to ski resort expansion it would be contrary to the goals of the environment and recreation groups goals.

Scott Martin	Salt Lake City	I commend the entire Mountain Accord process and its participants on their hard work and efforts at consensus building. A few things: 1) Ski Resort Ski Terrain Expansion in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon cannot and shall not occur. Such an expansion represents an irretrievable commitment of public resources that frankly is not tolerable on many fronts - backcountry recreation and watershed are the most pronounced. Retirement of private development rights in favor of ski resort base density increase is seemingly fine, but expansion of skiing terrain is a non-starter. 2) Watershed health and preservation should be paramount of all decision making. The Wasatch Front grows at exponential pace and the Canyons are certainly not producing more water - less in fact given climate change. That said, quality is every bit as important as quantity. I'm at a complete loss to understand how or why watershed protection is evaluated on an equal plane as lift-served ski terrain expansion. Preserve the local resource for all. It should not be degraded in the name of ski resort marketing, profits, and the enjoyment of lifts by a select few - many of whom are from out of state. 3) Backcountry skiing is growing rapidly. Why destroy the best and most accessible terrain. Please please find some foresight here. 4) The "representatives of private property" in the Canyons (i.e. Robinson, Johnson, etc) should be revealed as frauds. They should have NO legitimacy. Thank you.
Parker Chapple	Salt Lake City	I reject the ski link/One Wasatch approach. To favor of the monetary benefits will have devastating environmental impact and mar our unique and aesthetic backcountry places. Maintaining a pristine outdoor recreation zones benefits all, not just the few. I am in favor of increased bus usage with stops at trailheads and resorts.
Steve Gourley	Salt Lake City	I would like to see all car traffic banned from big and little cottonwood canyons. Create a bus system that runs on a 5-30 minute schedule depending on the time of day. This is much less invasive than a rail line and will reduce car traffic. If the schedule is good people will not mind the change. I do not like the idea of transportation linking to park city as it tarnishes the landscape and environment. The same going for trams. There is not a lot of land and it would be unnecessary with a good bus system. A rail up i80 seems like a crazy idea since there wouldn't be enough demand from skiers to warrant the costs. Therefore I think I like Concept A the most. I do not like the idea of ski area expansion either. The greed of the ski resorts is so great that contentedness will never be found. I know it is fueled by tourism, but we are already well known for skiing for environmental reasons more so than ski resort size. Backcountry skiing and other activities are becoming more popular with the crowds at ski resorts and the ski technology so the land around ski resorts should be considered valuable.
Paul Diegel	Salt Lake City	I just wanted to point out that the economic model used by the Economy Systems group was done by a consultant working for the Utah resorts. The growth numbers used are far from the numbers reported by the NSAA and Ski Utah and there is no mention of uncertainty related to data quality and source, climate change and seasonal snow variability, competitive response to Utah action, or the impact of recent resort ownership consolidation. That study probably grossly overstates the future economic impact of winter resort activity.
Carlo Ciriello	Salt Lake City	The ski industry has always been behind the times, playing catch up to the trends. This is no different. Guess what...people do not want bigger resorts. People want open spaces that are specifically NOT resorts. This is what is fueling the booming backcountry ski touring segment. When the ski industry figures this out, they will realize that the Wasatch provides some of the best terrain and easiest access, making it a jewel that attracts people from around the world. Bigger is not better. In fact, the opposite is true. Utah should not allow growth of ski resorts and begin catering to the backcountry touring market and realize the economic benefit derived from backcountry skiers and boarders.
Erick Balken	Salt Lake City	Preserve what little backcountry is still left in the Wasatch and don't build an interconnect!
Frank Ryburn	Salt Lake City	
Andrew Spencer	Salt Lake City	I want to comment and express support for public transportation including trains in LCC and Parleys, as well as possible fee stations to generate revenue for reclamation in canyons such as BCC. I do not support a big parking lot for WMSP so close to Brighton Estates in Wasatch County. I do support making the Guardsman Pass road year-round, however. I strongly DO NOT support expansion of the current ski resorts, especially the One Wasatch proposal, which would significantly degrade the summer hiking and backcountry skiing experience in the Wasatch. The ski resorts already take up a huge portion of our canyons.

Daniel Johnson	Salt Lake City	I appreciate what you are doing trying to get the stakeholders together to solve this important problem. I grew up in SLC and have returned after leaving for various educational pursuits mainly due to the amazing combination of the mountains and a city with economic opportunities. I am a life long downhill skier and have been skiing in the backcountry for about 10 years. I couldn't feel more strongly that we have plenty of lift-serviced terrain in Salt Lake. There are about 5 crowded days per year. We do not need more lifts. Most of the north facing terrain in our canyons has already been claimed by our resorts. I am very opposed to any expansion over ridgelines. The Wasatch is a resource unlike any other in the country and we can't fix this once it has been ruined. I skied the famous Haute Route from Chamonix to Zermatt last season and have seen first hand the "Euro Style" gondolas and buildings that One Utah touts. First of all, the Alps are massive. They stretch for literally hundreds of miles. The real peaks of the Wasatch are about 20 miles long. The Wasatch is not the Alps. We can't reproduce their system and, frankly, we shouldn't try. The Europeans have overdeveloped their resources, building roads and gondolas to their best peaks. It's "cultured" but tragic. I think it would be reasonable to link the Canyons with Park City and Deer Valley. It's basically been done already. Solitude and Brighton are linked and Alta and Snowbird are already linked. No real skier thinks for a second that they could have fun skiing the canyons, pop over to Brighton then Snowbird then come back in one day. It would be nothing but lift lines and sitting on windy lifts. Let's get real. People come to Utah for the beautiful mountains. If we blow this by building too many lifts to make it accessible to the least common denominator tourist, the skiers will go somewhere else. On the transportation side, I am a fan of any solution that will decrease pollution and our effect on the mountains. The most important next step in the valley in my opinion is bike lanes on the east bench, including from 6200 South/Wasatch drive to the U. Trax paralleling 215 on the east bench would also be helpful. Trains up Parleys, BCC, and LCC should be explored but I think frequent busing would likely be more flexible and less damaging to the environment. Building tunnels through the mountains is invasive, expensive, and irrational. Put on your shoes or skis and hike. If you prefer the car, or getting shuttled around, go to the zoo. Please don't let short term business interests ruin our 20 mile mountain oasis. Ski resorts will come and go. Once we carve up the Wasatch, it will never be the same.
Jeff Munger	Salt Lake City	I ski and snowshoe in the backcountry all along the Wasatch front. I do not support further expansion of any ski area in Utah as it would reduce the amount of open unspoiled terrain. The joining of ski areas via additional trams or lifts going over the mountains is also something I strongly oppose as it ruins one of the things I go there to enjoy, the view. I would support an expanded mass transit system to carry people up and down the canyons provided it ran early and late enough in the day to give us time to recreate. This would help the ski areas and the backcountry users while reducing the environmental impact. There would need to be stops in the canyons and not just at the ski areas. Best of luck making everyone happy. I have a tough job. Thank you, for listening. Jeff Munger
Stefanie Naden	Salt Lake City	Improved bus systems should be the FIRST step before building a train or additional lifts are even considered. We are under utilizing such a simple and effective mode of transportation. The current bus system does not accommodate locals who are the primary drivers and cause of congestion in BCC and LCC. There is extremely limited midday service in the canyon which makes using public transportation to go skiing for a 1/2 day before or after work very difficult. They also don't run very long past the lifts closing, which makes staying for food and drinks impossible. There should be bus service every 15 minutes throughout the day in each canyon. Then there should also be an express bus from Park City to the mouth of BCC and LCC for tourists to transfer to the canyon bus. This solution could be quickly implemented. The parking issues at the mouth of each Canyon will also need to be addressed, but extending midday and after hours service would be an easy first step. Currently many people are hitchhiking up and down the canyon because the bus service is so limited.
Drew Hardesty	Salt Lake City	I support light rail up Mill Creek and both Cottonwood Canyons. as well as from SLC to PC. I only support lift connections between Alta and Brighton through the Catherine's area and Brighton/Park City via the Guardsman Pass area. I do support tunnels and sheds up the Cottonwoods for avalanche protection.

Robert Duncan	Salt Lake City	<p>I am a climber and a skier. I moved to SLC in 2008 to ski, and have rapidly immersed myself in the climbing world here in the Wasatch. I have seen the growth of the Wasatch Basin in the 7 years I have been here and I agree that growth of our population base and hence growth of the user groups who are accessing the Wasatch is undeniable and inevitable. I am a member of the SLCA and agree with the positions the SLCA has taken with regards to Mountain Accord. Notably: Federal Land Preservation Actions are insufficient to protect climbing areas and access. There are a great many climbing areas throughout the Wasatch, some roadside, some miles from roads. It is imperative that any plan going forward incorporates our long tradition of climbing in the Wasatch and allows fixed anchors to be installed and maintained. Consequently, the SLCA opposes new wilderness area designation that would prohibit necessary maintenance activities for fixed anchors, new trails, and trail maintenance. To properly address this concern, the SLCA suggests evaluating land management designations that ensure the existing preservation of climbing in these areas while affording the necessary flexibility to allow for required maintenance. Transportation Solutions: I think a rail system would be a valuable asset to ensure that the character of the Wasatch is maintained in the coming decades. By having a rail system going up to the top of LCC, coupled with a parking pass system for backcountry skiers and climbers to access various random spots along Little Cottonwood Canyon Road, we can limit the emissions of cars (engine exhaust and brake pad exhaust) while providing low impact transportation to a variety of spots in LCC. For example: Train stops at the Gate Buttress parking area, Tanners flat, White Pine, and Snowbird/Alta. This would concentrate users in these areas and still allow the intervening spaces to maintain a 'wilderness character' even though there is a train and road at the bottom of the canyon. Coupling such a train system with a 'parking permit' that citizens can buy annually would go far to allow heavy users to access LCC and the gross majority of users to have easy and cheap access to the main user hot-spots in LCC. I think this process is very valuable for all of the Wasatch to determine how our backyard is developed in the coming decades. I feel that any solution that addresses these problems will necessarily involve considerable development but we must ensure that the character of our lands is maintained as 'wilderness' and that climbing and backcountry skiing is not adversely affected by any Mountain Accord plan that is adopted. thanks! Rob Duncan</p>
Jim Harris	Salt Lake City	<p>Thanks Mountain Accord for soliciting comments. I just wanted to chime in to say that I DO NOT support ski area expansion in the Wasatch. I am an enthusiastic customer at Alta, and occasionally the other LLC and BCC resorts as well, but the preservation of terrain non-commercial recreation is very important to me. I agree with the USFS plan that LCC and BCC resorts should not be permitted to expand beyond their current boundaries. I would love to see a better transportation plan implemented for traveling up, down and between canyons, but chairlifts are not that solution.</p>
Ned White	Salt Lake City	<p>As a person new to the area, I do not portend to fully grasp the subtleties of the arguments for and against infrastructure expansion. Here's what I do know: • Natural watersheds close to major urban areas are the most precious commodities in the world. Think San Francisco, Vancouver, Portland, Seattle. • Once infrastructure is built it is NEVER removed. • No one talks about there being a lack of lift served terrain or too many long lift lines in Utah. It is not a conversation people have. • Hiking and back country skiing serves the local population and businesses. Infrastructure expansion serves multi-national corporations.</p>

Scott Reichard	Salt Lake City	<p>I came from Chicago to go to school at the U of U here in 1974 and graduated in 1979. I got married, raised a family, had a good professional career and have given back to the community. The biggest reason I settled here is because of the ease of access to recreate and play here locally and regionally. I love the lifestyle. So does my family. I ski 55ish days a year. Mostly at Alta and Snowbird and 50% in the back country. While I have thoroughly enjoyed the new terrain the ski resorts have expanded into, I believe there is currently just the right balance between ski resort boundaries and backcountry. The ROI for ski resort expansion, other than within their current boundaries, is not worth the loss of additional back country and associated issues. We need the resorts to succeed. Ski resort skier density is a fraction of that in CO, CA and back east. They have the ability to be competitive and grow significantly within their current boundaries. They eventually have to compete without expanding boundaries so become industry leaders by developing those strategies and tactics now. Utilize commerce and base camp transportation hubs in the surrounding valley's. Improve marketing. We have significant advantages over the rest of the country that most skiers don't fully understand. Improve perceptions about Utah's quirky liquor laws and ability to have après ski fun. The biggest challenge is how do you maintain quality access to the CWM ski resorts with projected population increases while maintaining the current pristine nature of the mountains. I strongly suggest economic and feasibility studies to be conducted to determine ROI for various transportation solutions. Then compare ROI's.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. First, maximize rapid transit up LC/BC canyons and between PC/SLC. Add a rapid transit lane. Charge an access fee, or yearly permit fee to use LC/BC canyons for personal cars and business travel so people are incentivized to use public transportation up the canyons. Have free parking available at major transportation hubs. Charge for parking at resorts. Resorts will subsidize rapid transit fees for people who go to resorts. Build additional day use lockers at resorts (and even heavy visit places like White Pine) since people need to be able to stash gear when talking public transportation. What is ROI for this scenario?</li> <li>2. Next, what is ROI for a train system up Parleys to one of the junctions. Add rapid transit to support various PC and resort locations.</li> <li>3. Last options should be trains and tunnels up LC/BC with connection to somewhere in/near PC with supporting rapid transit.</li> <li>4. MOST IMPORTANTLY – take the \$\$ investment plus, maintenance, environmental impacts, risks and estimated ROI for LC/BC and Parleys options and compare to improving corridor from Provo to Ogden. There are far greater numbers of people and businesses that can be positively impacted by improving the ability to commute along the front. That corridor is bumper to bumper 5 days a week for 52 weeks a year vs. snow day challenges in LC/BC. The air pollution alone from commuting in the valley dwarfs the pollution from LC/BC canyon use.</li> <li>5. Once you have total estimated ROI's from the 3-4 scenarios, share it with the CWM populace. Then you will be able to garner better educated input from interested constituents. If the studies are done without political influences superior results can be obtained for our future.</li> </ol>
Noah Swanson	Salt Lake City	<p>Despite the pressures of an expanding population base, with few environmental treasures left, I think that we need to do whatever is possible to maintain the Wasatch. I think that expansion of ski resorts should not occur and that we need to be very careful to balance access with the environment. If left to me, the entire Tri Canyons area would be protected. Ski areas would be capped for any future growth outside existing boundaries.</p>
Laura Gray	Salt Lake City	<p>I am in favor of enhanced transportation, and defer to the views of Save Our Canyons. I am strongly against connecting the resorts between Park City and Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. There is no need to do that and the downside in terms of affecting the unique character of the Wasatch is significant. I am in favor of protecting more federal lands. Our reort-based economy will continue to flourish without an interconnect of resorts which I see only as a marketing ploy that is not even guaranteed to work. This is NOT Europe where there is development everywhere in the Alps.</p>
David Whittaker	Salt Lake City	<p>I'm going to "Dream Big" and share MY ideal system (hopefully it would be sustainable).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No ski resort expansion of any kind.</li> <li>2. No selling of public land in the canyons to private parties.</li> <li>3. No private motorized vehicles in the canyons. Only travel by bus which would have stops every ~1/2 mile (like Zion's National Park, for example).</li> <li>4. Continue preservation of watershed areas, with no pets allowed.</li> </ol> <p>Designate Big &amp; Little Cottonwood Canyons as wilderness areas or parks of some kind to protect them further from development/misuse. Economical point: Tourists that love the Wasatch Front come from all over the world (but mainly from the East, and also from Europe) and do not want to see a shopping mall at the base of Solitude, or a giant hotel on top of Hidden Peak. It is the rugged wilderness that our tourists want and we cannot lose the wild feel of the canyons. This may seem to be a stringent approach to preserving our "Wonder of the World", but please consider the long-term impact on the canyons and our watershed if more private development continues to encroach on this gem of the Rockies. Thank you!</p>
Mark Billie	Salt Lake City	<p>Please STOP One Wasatch! There do not need to be any more lifts in an already over-developed area. A joined season pass would be more than adequate.</p>

Colby Stetson	Salt Lake City	Ideal scenario for the Wasatch: -NO MORE SKI AREA EXPANSION (new lifts etc.) -Encourage ski areas to offer backcountry access, since that is currently the only growing part of the ski industry. NO MORE OFFERING UP PUBLIC LAND FOR PRIVATE BENEFIT! -No motorized (snow machine) access in the Cottonwoods or Mill creek -Dogs are bad but sleds are OK??.Questionable -NEW Cottonwood Canyons Rail system: -Train runs both ways on a loop over Catherine's Pass and is protected from avalanches (runs often and 24 hrs) -Parking is heavily discouraged in upper canyons -Increase in usable public transportation in the mean time
Beth Allen	Salt Lake City	Good afternoon, I thought I had completed the survey sometime ago but don't remember having reviewed the Idealized Systems materials. Can I resubmit the survey at this point and if so, how do I access it? This process, unfortunately, is very complicated and would be very difficult for the general public to understand and complete without post high school education.
Sean Quill	Salt Lake City	Of all scenarios listed, A, in my opinion is the best option for leaving the Wasatch in a better state in 2040. This diamond doesn't need to be polished anymore and selling the "European Vacation" will not help Utah.
Nick Schlegel	Salt Lake City	I oppose the One Wasatch project from 2 angles. First, I think additional development in areas such as guardsman pass and Grizzley gulch/Twin lakes pass is a poor decision because those zones should be kept available for backcountry touring and other winter recreational opportunities, not lift accessed. The touring market is one of the only growing segments of an ski industry that is stagnating or even decreasing. The wasatch is known as a prime backcountry zone, and developing key
Danielle Poirier	Salt Lake City	Dear Mountain Accord, As a SLC resident, I want a say in the future of Wasatch skiing. The implications behind this article extend far beyond skiing. These mountains serve as recreation for families and mountain thrill-seekers whether they be skiing, hiking, camping, fishing, or relaxing. They're also our vital watershed. When adversaries discuss the future of the Wasatch Mountains, I ask they keep the people and environment in mind, not just the money. I oppose the ONE Wasatch plan. I have skied since I could walk, and value my capability to ski all Utah's resorts and backcountry. Perhaps, I can understand why one may want ski lift-connected mountain systems: easier access to unclaimed terrain. But I ask that they consider the environmental and social implications. I cringe at the thought of a man-made interconnected Wasatch; clear cutting paths through ambient nature, towering more metal poles above the trees, posting more no trespassing signs, and further disrupting our watershed. I am unspeakably grateful for the relationship I have had with the Wasatch Mountains. As the opposing groups meet, please recognize the importance of a wild Wasatch so future generations may enjoy the same treasures I have. May the odds be ever in Wasatch's favor, Danielle Poirier
Carolyn Clark	Salt Lake City	I strongly support an Ideal Environment scenario. We need to protect and preserve as much of our Wasatch as possible, for several reasons: Water quality! We rely on the mountains for pure water. Prevent overuse to keep our water supply safe! Air quality: Reduce traffic. I agree with the transportation nodes. Wildlife: Viewing wildlife, including large animals such as moose, is one of the special treats to be gained from hiking in the Wasatch. Please preserve quiet retreats and corridors for these animals. Quality of life for locals: people migrate to the Wasatch in order to enjoy the close-at-hand wilderness. That's why I live here. Many of my friends say the same. If the mountains become over-used, they lose that magical quality of providing a respite from noise and hubbub. We need this retreat. There will be so much population growth in the future that we need to stand stronger than ever to protect this beautiful resource. Please prioritize the needs of local citizens. Quality of recreation: If ski resorts become too big and bustling, they lose the charm that brings visitors here in the first place. Small is beautiful. Charge higher prices and bring in fewer people. Do not link ski resorts. There's enough territory to keep a skier entertained at any resort in any one day. Use multi-resort passes with fee transportation, so a skier can take a bus the next day to a different resort. Instead of interconnecting ski resorts, let's interconnect all the wilderness areas, to create a large unified wilderness. Transportation: Yes use transportation nodes. Allow only travel by bus in the canyons, with the possible exception of those who own cabins in the canyons. Increase the ease of public transportation from downtown hotels to these nodes. A train or additional express bus service to Park City would be good. Please do not create any interconnects across different canyons. An important part of preserving the scenic beauty and quietness of the canyons is to have each one remain as a separate entity. Please preserve the integrity of our separate canyons. This special place offers tremendous value for its serenity. People move here for this serenity. The quietness of the Wasatch is unique, as a place of tranquility so close to an ever-expanding urban area. Don't give away this great prize, just to create yet another motorized playground. Instead of interconnecting ski resorts, let's interconnect all the wilderness areas.
Douglas Brockmeyer	Salt Lake City	Ski area expansion and the One Wasatch concept are unacceptable alternatives for the Wasatch, a small geographic area that supports considerable competition for our most valuable resources: beauty, solitude, and world-class recreational opportunities. These must be preserved at all costs, not sold to the highest bidder.

Beth Allen	Salt Lake City	I've reviewed the idealized systems and there are some great ideas. Because of air quality and water quality and quantity issues, I feel this must always be given priority over everything else. Without maintaining this quality, the Wasatch will no longer be a place where people will choose to go. I do not support further degradation of the Wasatch than has already occurred over the years. Connecting the canyons or other areas of the Wasatch that are currently roadless would be a huge mistake. On the other hand, putting rail service to areas that already have roads (i.e. LCC) to minimize driving vehicles up the canyon makes sense. Putting rail service or lift service connecting LCC, BCC and Park City would mean the destruction of more precious wilderness. We already have better access to 7 major ski areas than anywhere in the U.S. I am a downhill skier and cannot see a positive side to connecting the canyons. It definitely makes sense to have efficient rail service to Park City and Parley's probably makes the most sense. There's already a road, so it would not involve destruction of wilderness areas. SLC's greatest attraction and asset is its unique access to wilderness areas. Without this, it would be "Any City USA" and frankly, I would not have considered moving here if it weren't for the undeveloped areas of the Wasatch. Many people go into the canyons for lots of things besides downhill skiing on a year round basis. There are hikers, bikers, walkers, runners, rock climbers and sightseers. Their needs must be considered as much as the skiers. I look forward to this continuing dialogue.
Alex Obbard	Salt Lake City	I support either Transportation scenarios A or C. I am against any rail or tram connecting Alta with Park City. I am against any expansion of existing ski resorts. I am in favor of completing Bonneville Shoreline trail segments; over past 15 years we've had huge increase in Shoreline trail usage, with virtually no trail expansion North of Draper.
Andrew Stone	Salt Lake City	1) Resorts should stay within existing boundaries. Interconnect or "one wasatch" is a useless gimmick, and has been since it was proposed decades ago. We need closure on this subject--it keep coming up again and again. Put a stake through its heart. 2) summer shuttle bus in Millcreek. It's needed now. Consider the same for Big and Little Cottonwood. 3) encourage bus use for skiers in big and little cottonwood with steep discounts on lift tickets for transit users, and closing canyons to private cars after daily limit is reached. also consider some way of allowing buses to pass the long line that forms at the mouth of Little cottonwood--once people see the bus passing them regularly, they'll want to use it. 4) There is no need to open Guardsman's pass year round. No real attempt has been made to provide a realistic shuttle between Park city and the cottonwoods using existing roads. Prove the demand exists before proposing devastating environmental consequences. If people aren't willing to use bus service, there's no compelling reason to make it easy for them to get to alta/ snowbird. 5) Preserving wild areas should be paramount, year-round. Development and commercialization have to end at some point, and that point is now.
Joel Trachtenberg	Salt Lake City	Right now the Central Wasatch has a unique balance of developed ski resorts, backcountry, and wilderness. There is really no economic or recreational rationale to expand the resorts or develop One Wasatch. The proposed expansion of development will encroach on the aesthetics of the mountains without providing new, unique experiences for the skier/hiker/biker. As well, with the ruggedness and size of the individual resorts, there will not be meaningful use of a One Wasatch system. Europeans are jealous of our backcountry, and more and more visitors come to the Wasatch specifically for its backcountry skiing potential. There is no need to develop a "European style" system to "enhance" our ski experience. Celebrate the system that we currently have.
Mason Diedrich	Salt Lake City	Please encourage all parties to consider the importance of preserving and protecting the Wasatch from ski resort expansion. The proximity of our city to the Wasatch is something unique, but it will be less unique if we open it up for more development. As a backcountry skier, I want to have the option to ski in a resort OR in the backcountry, not be restricted to just skiing in a resort.
Philip Blevins	Salt Lake City	I am against expansion of the area resorts. I am for coming up with a plan for a train up Little Cottonwood Canyon or expanding the road of Little Cottonwood canyon. I believe we need to keep the back country of the Cottonwood Canyons for recreational use and not develop it. I am against setting up a gondola system between Park City to the Cottonwood Canyons as it would also allow access which would likely lead to development.
Michael Brehm	Salt Lake City	TRANSPORTATION and RECREATION systems and solutions must NOT expand the footprint in either BCC or LCC, because our ECONOMY absolutely depends on preserving or improving the Environmental qualities of the wild Wasatch. This does not require analysis or debate. It is an established truth. We must squeeze more efficiency and sustainability out of what we currently have developed.

Peter Woodruff	Salt Lake City	As an avid backcountry skier and advocate of the Wasatch wilderness experience, I feel that the idealized recreation system group has not adequately recognized the irreparable damage that ski resort connections may cause. There is not specific language regarding boundaries on resort expansion, which is concerning. The resort industry's insatiable appetite for growth jeopardizes the already shrinking and vulnerable backcountry terrain resource. With backcountry skier numbers increasing and a limited amount of backcountry terrain that's accessible without very long hikes to access, we're looking at a collision of interests. Backcountry skiers cost the environment and economy nothing, in fact we support the many salt lake valley-based ski shops and gear companies. And if public transportation options become more friendly to the backcountry hiking/skiing community - our travel up and down the canyons will have a smaller affect. Whereas expansion of the ski resorts will only have dubious improvement for the economy, while definitely have substantial negative affects on the environment, transportation congestion, and not significantly improve the already amazing ski terrain available to our resorts. Please consider that the existing footprint for our ski resorts is adequate and the efforts to connect them via trams, lifts, or any other overland methods will have unimaginable consequences on the currently outstanding natural character of the Wasatch. Respectfully yours, Peter Woodruff
Angela York	Salt Lake City	I'd like to throw my two cents in from the voice of a human powered recreationalist. Ideal proposal would be to see the ski resorts to stay within their current boundaries; they've made enough of an imprint on the land and have more than enough to cater to their operation/profit need. This said, we need to leave the "backcountry" to those who have the drive and skill enough to hike/skin/snowshoe up there themselves and are avalanche prepared. The criteria to venture in the backcountry has it's own "weeding out" process that keeps numbers low and environment impact to a minimum. By interconnecting all the resorts, access to this areas will increase for skiers who do now have the proper skill preparedness and will warrant high liability. Also, most resorts who have combined have not seen tremendous benefit from connecting. Implementing large construction projects like trains to ease transportation has not shown to ease up traffic to other ski areas either. I propose we move slowly implementing the least environmental impact projects first and give proper trial time to test them. I know the ski buses have helped with some traffic alleviation but from personal experience, they do not run often enough to be conducive for complete cessation of using a car to get to up the canyon or the main park n ride lots where they would be conducive are overrun. Expanding the lots down canyon, and increasing the amount of buses would make them much more attractive for use to the resorts. As a working student, this would be most conducive to catering to a busy schedule when we want to get some turns in before/after shift; a lot of people with season passes heading up the canyon aren't spending the entire day skiing and are going up for quick jaunts, that's why they feel they need to drive their vehicle up. That being said, the buses only run to the resorts--maybe we could explore a bus route that ran when avalanche conditions are good that makes stops at certain backcountry/hiking areas. I feel the cars from backcountry users/hikers is much less than those of the resorts though.
Jeffrey Brown	Salt lake City	We need dramatically enhanced bus service in the canyons. This is the easiest and quickest change that can be made with the least permanent consequences in case the consequences are bad. I've spent a lot of time on empty ski buses that run once every hour or two, and as much time on packed buses with people standing. Run them frequently throughout the day from lots of places in the valley and downtown and it will cut down on traffic in the canyon. Market the new bus system long before the ski season starts so people will be aware of it and plan accordingly.
Tony Church	Salt lake City	I support increasing public transit, whether rail or bus, to improve air quality and decrease automobile traffic. I do not support any ski resort expansion or "interconnect" plans because they would significantly degrade human powered backcountry user experiences and further make our National Forest property (in many cases) only accessible to those who can afford expensive lift tickets. All the major resorts in the northern central Wasatch are large enough, in my opinion, as they are. I constantly hear the refrain of "we have to compete with Colorado, Europe, etc." but on what terms? Only on maximum number of skier-days per acre or some other solely economic metric? Instead, I say let's out-compete them on pristine beauty and preserved spaces. Let us protect our mountains for our kids to hike in and enjoy without being completely overrun by ski lifts, cafeterias and the like.
Rob Trauscht	Salt lake City	Please do no allow any further expansion of the ski area boundaries. The resorts have effectively taken up the majority of the prime recreation terrain(Steep, north facing) and it is unfair to other users including backcountry skiers, snowshoers, and hikers to further limit the terrain available to them. I also think only mass transit based solutions should be added to any of the canyons. No road expansions, and new train/tram/bus infrastructure should be accompanied by attempts to reduce personal transport(cars) in the canyon.



Ronald Sawdey	Salt Lake City	I would like to express my concern that gondolas and tramways are NOT adequate components of a transportation system between the various mountain resorts. I view such proposals as more resort marketing than a transportation "solution". As both a resort skier and a back country skier, I know well the fantastic terrain that exists within and without the developed mountain resorts. I believe that there is more than adequate terrain and uphill capacity at our collective Wasatch resorts. I also believe that if we are serious about addressing transportation between the resorts we need to reconsider the current surface routes up both BCC and LCC as well as how people move up Parleys Canyon. I am in favor of limiting private vehicle access up BCC and LCC and replacing those car trips with a much improved transit system. I would also argue that the same can be done to move people from the Salt Lake Valley to the Park City area. Simply expanding our roadways is not a sufficient solution.
Heidi Goedhart	Salt Lake City	Canyon access via transportation has to be improved. I wouldn't be opposed to required transit access if more frequent and quality transit were available (light rail). Less vehicles up the canyon would lead to reduced negative impacts on our watershed and would provide better recreation possibilities for runners, cyclists and people recreating in the canyons.
Polly Hart	Salt Lake City	I prefer to exercise in the mountain wilderness with my dogs. I have a six and a half year old Siberian Husky, and even at middle age, he can not get the workout he needs when on leash. It is no fun for either of us to be attached by a tether. I would like to be able to take him to non-wilderness areas off leash while I ride my bike. There is virtually nowhere in the Wasatch that anyone can go with a bike and off-leash dog on the same day (odd-even day rules generally separate the two). There are a lot of people who need more off-leash open space in general, no matter what mode of exercise we are getting. We are banned from most of the canyons along the Wasatch Front because of culinary water issues, and we are heavily restricted in the rest. I pay my share of taxes, and I expect my share of user space. On the matter of motorized, developed recreation, I am adamantly opposed to allowing ski resorts to merge together. I'm sorry for them that they are not maximizing their potential revenue, but that is not the government's fault or responsibility. I have not maximized my personal potential into billionaire status, and I don't think there is anyone in government who feels that they owe it to me to gratuitously give me opportunities that will make me so. Public land belongs not only to every citizen, but the wild life who were there long before us. I am a hiker, climber, biker, back country skier, and the experience is so much greater when I get myself up the mountain on my own power. Around winter 1999-2000 or 2000-01, I skied up Porter Fork in Millcreek Canyon. When I hit the base of Gobblers Knob, I rested with my dog next to a tree. It was stunningly beautiful- blue skies and two feet of new snow. Out of nowhere, I heard a loud noise and watched a Powderbirds helicopter land on top of Gobbler's. After dropping off a half dozen people on top (which was heart breaking enough for me), the copter flew down into the wilderness area and buzzed a group of trees to drop the snow off them, just for kicks. In an instant, I was buried up to my chest, and my dog was more than two feet under. I will never forget that experience. The day started with everything that is right with the Wasatch. Before I headed up the last stretch of the mountain, I experienced what is wrong with the management of our resources. I know that helicopter pilot broke the law, but if they hadn't been allowed in the area to begin with, this never would have happened. I would like to see expanded wilderness designations to prevent this from ever happening again.
Jim Byrne	Salt Lake City	The Recreation Report is a good start on the process, and the Transportation Report calls for actions to limit or reduce the traffic in the canyons, but at some point in the process there should be a goal for full 5 foot (at least) bike lanes up AND down each of the canyons.
Annie Studer	Salt Lake City	I do not support ski resort expansion. The backcountry provides our valley water, public playgrounds, pristine areas, and the benefits of expansion will not outweigh the costs to these crucial mountains. I support expanding public transportation to the canyons, expanding protected development areas, and sustainable development of structures that meet LEEDS certification. Recreation and tourism provide millions to the state of Utah, especially to the Greater Salt Lake area. Harming our mountain resources is a financial loss, especially long-term. Furthermore, short-term economic gains are unclear for the invested ski areas of One Wasatch; connecting resorts does not translate into greater profit.

Colin Gregersen	Salt Lake City	<p>To the Mountain Accord, I wanted to write you because I am deeply concerned with the Mountain Accord (MA) process and the direction I believe it is heading. I am a resort skier, backcountry skier, mountain biker, hiker, and trail runner. I was born in SLC and have a deep appreciation for the gem we have at our city's doorstep, the Central Wasatch (CW). I've been exploring these mountains for over 25 years and love them as much as a family member. I have observed the ever-increasing number of people in our mountains and so I was excited about the idea of the Mountain Accord when introduced. I was hopeful that the MA process would lead to a long-term plan to protect the treasure we have at our doorstep by balancing the needs of its users with a strategy to protect the open space and water quality. Unfortunately, after seeing the latest output from the MA, the "Idealized Systems" maps, I am very concerned that the MA structure does not lend itself to solutions that will protect and preserve what we love about the CW mountains. The CW mountains are not a city; however, it appears to me the MA process is treating them as such. The MA structure has assigned 4 buckets to compartmentalize the 'needs' of the CW mountains, then tasked the Systems Groups to MAXIMIZE (i.e. 'dream big') transportation, recreation, environment, and economy to come up with 'Idealized Systems'. I would ask to you please consider this: does maximizing these 4 systems result in the best outcome for a natural resource? I don't believe that it does. Maximizing the systems of transportation, economy, and recreation inherently forces the Systems Group members to propose development solutions rather than protection ones. Their outputs support my argument, where Transportation proposed trains and tunnels everywhere, Economy proposed expanded ski areas and a 'commerce connection' between PC and SLC, and Recreation proposed more trails, more parking, and expansion of high-use areas. (Of course the maximum for Environment was proposing wilderness area expansion, which is also an extreme). What is concerning about this approach is that the writing is on the wall for the next step in this process: combining outputs. Since the groups ideal systems carry equal weight, the combined scenarios will be a 'majority-rule' result. The 'Idealized Systems Maps' will be consulted for commonality between them. When I look at the commonalities between the Systems Groups, I'm frightened. I'm frightened because the commonalities all involve development of the CW. For example, the transport, rec, and economy groups have proposed interconnecting LCC, BCC, and PC; therefore, the majority-rule would support this interconnection. Ski area expansion is another obvious majority-rule result. Environment will get out-voted on every issue. I wanted to inform you that, as a frequent user of the CW, I cannot support the Mountain Accord process. This structure is not in alignment with planning for a natural resource. At this point, I do not see this process resulting in a balanced approach to managing the Central Wasatch's future. Regards, Colin Gregersen 2647 Filmore St. Salt Lake City, UT 84106 801-554-5739 csgregersen@yahoo.com</p>
Beatrice Lufkin	Salt Lake City	<p>I feel that we need more off-leash hiking areas for city dogs and their owners to be in the outdoors. Every year more and more areas are excluded from use with dogs.</p>

Daniel Barrell	Salt Lake City	<p>Dear Mountain Accord, Thank you so much for letting the public provide input in this very important process. I am writing to voice my strong opposition to One Wasatch concept proposed by the ski resorts and advocate for greater preservation of the Central Wasatch. In the 1970's San Francisco and the Bay area took practical and sensible steps to preserve their coastal mountain ranges, while Los Angeles pursued sprawling development. In the year 2014, it is clearly evident which strategy was the more viable as the Bay Area is a beautiful and attractive place to live and Los Angeles is a sprawling mess! The Bay Area has preserved forever vast swaths of mountains, coastline and forests, part of what makes it such an amazing place to live. Now I would like to focus on the Wasatch and the Wasatch Front....a very unique places in the world to have a large metropolitan area butting up against 11,000 ft mountains. The mountains provide respite, clean water and an environmental habitat for much wildlife. I want to encourage the board to pursue a strategy of greater preservation. I take particular issue with the One Wasatch proposal. The One Wasatch Proposal is being pursued by the Utah ski Industry as a advertising platform, to advertise to those people that demand bigger and better....at the expense of the local Utah residents. How much potential ROI would these lifts provide? As a CPA I am highly doubtful about past claims made about the economic benefit of Ski Link. I would tell Ski Utah that the presence of Goldman Sachs in Utah has done WAY MORE for the Utah economy than a 1-2% increase in skier days (or rather a 25% increase in skier days). To be able to continue to attract business to the state we need to preserve what makes this place such a great place to live. Also as an avid backcountry skier, I love getting a wilderness experience. Back in the 1980's the resort lines were supposedly permanent - after several expansions they want to do it again. They have already swallowed up most of the best backcountry skiing and now the want to further stake their claims. The resorts commoditize the mountains and charge over \$80 per head for enjoyment. How many average Americans can afford this? Their business model caters to the rich and to a great extent relies on selling mountain real estate and lodging. How much more pristine mountain wilderness will the resorts continue to swallow up in the name of economic development? Has anyone seen what the Park City resorts have done to the Wasatch back? It is the wilderness equivalent of Chernobyl, plowing roads deep into pristine forests, to sell off plots to out of state multi millionaires. I do not see the Park City resorts as allies for wilderness preservation and would like to permanently shut them out of the Cottonwood Canyons. To a large extent, Utah citizens and politicians fail to see the permanent damage that can happen when business interests are considered over conservation. If One Wasatch goes through, I have no doubt that future generations will harshly judge Ski Utah, the 7 Wasatch resorts and Utah Politicians for making profit motivated decisions which significantly degrade the greatest asset of Salt Lake...the Wasatch. I would kindly ask for your support for additional wilderness preservation and PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE, don't let the ski resorts make a permanent and sinister change to the place we all love. Thank you again for hearing my comment, Dan Barrell</p>
Susan Loffler	Salt Lake City	<p>Please consider the following issues: Snowpack by 2040 due to conservative global warming projections may only exist above 9,000 feet, placing greater demand on the needs for more snowmaking to compensate for this while population demand for the same water supplies increases as well. Transportation solutions across the Wasatch back, either by rail, gondola or roadway may leave many area users stranded either at the Park City end or the Cottonwood end without ability to return in a timely fashion to their original point of departure. This easily happens in such similar spread out areas in Alpine resorts such as Courchevel where if a skier doesn't return to their original destination on time via a sometimes time consuming series of lifts and rails he/she will be confronted by either a costly taxi ride or overnight hotel stay at an unintended place. This is also why I favor keeping the Deer Vally/PCMR/Canyons area as a doable recreational/transportation unit and the Brighton/Solitude/Alta/Snowbird treated the same way. Improve public transportation to these areas without involving interconnection over the back. It is a physical impossibility to ski/ride/bike etc. these areas in one day if joined via the back country, so the only logical solution to this is 1)pick either the Summit County group or the Cottonwood Canyons Group for the day or 2) build a Euro style series of back country hutte systems for overnight stays. Consider also the difficulty/cost of providing the kind of patrolling safety and rescue systems to which most US visitors to recreation areas have become accustomed to (You are very much on your own in such widely spread out areas in Europe) and also consider the difficulties of accessing rescue, servicing and maintenance of transportation facilities through such spread out areas which also include private lands. How about adding to the already astronomical cost of US lift ticket prices by requiring individuals to purchase rescue insurance each time a facility is used to guarantee the cost of safety and rescue operations. Good luck. Susan Loffler 940 S Donner Way #590 Salt Lake City, UT 84108.</p>

Howie Garber	Salt Lake City	<p>My comments below encompass Transportation, recreation, environment, and economy. Regarding transportation: I feel that it is a mistake to connect Big and Little Cottonwood with a train, tunnel, or aerial device. How would a train in LCC serve resort and dispersed recreation users ? Given the difficulty of getting folks out of their autos, adding a train would ruin the aesthetic experience of LCC. It would also put too many people in LCC. Each canyon has its own character and a connection between canyons makes the Wasatch a smaller place. Transportation in LCC is currently limited because of avalanche control. Safety can be accomplished with snow sheds or avalanche sheds.</p> <p>We can do so much with improving mass transportation in BCC and LCC. A reasonable goal would be for example 50 minutes to Alta or Snowbird or Brighton / Solitude via bus from Sandy or Sugarhouse. Much can be done to discourage solo auto trips. Lift tickets should be discounted for those driving to resorts with 3 or more in vehicle. Improving mass transit and discouraging auto use would help S.L County comply with EPA air quality standards. A train from Park City to SLC airport would have huge air quality benefits. Air quality improvements can best be achieved by improving mass transit in the valley and mass transit to the resorts. This is a much better use of tax payer money than trains or tunnels in the canyons. Speeding fines should double in the Canyons in the same way that they double in school and construction zones. Recreation- I am vehemently opposed to ski resort expansion and One Wasatch . ( I have skied at all 7 of the central Wasatch resorts.) They are world class resorts that already have a huge imprint on the Wasatch.I have talked with many expert skiers who have stated that it is possible to ski two resorts in a day. (Not 3 or 4) It is possible now to ski Alta/ snowbird. It will soon be possible to ski Canyons and PCMR. Tourism could be increased by some form of packaged pricing. For example an agreement that someone skiing several different resorts would get a discount. Connecting multiple ski resorts via lifts is analogous to building an amusement park in the mts. This might attract a few unwary tourist for a few years. There are many other ways to increase tourism- for example changing liquor laws . The Epic pass at the Canyons brought many more tourists and locals there. Given the certainty of climate change and the fact that only 6-8% of SL County residents ski or snowboard, resort expansion makes no sense. We need to preserve as much open space as possible for wildlife, watershed protection, and for the growing number of dispersed recreation users. A lift up Grizzly Gulch or Flagstaff Mt. would cut the heart out of the Central Wasatch. Either lift would take away about 30% of the best backcountry skiing and snowboarding. The opportunity to ski and snowboard untracked powder away from ski resorts should be considered a dwindling resource.Using calls and page views to the Utah Avalanche Forecast center as a gross estimate of backcountry winter use, this use has doubled in last 10 years. It is really impossible to measure quality of life benefits to locals. It is much easier to measure increased tourist revenue for the relative few. Given the huge population growth expected along the Wasatch, how much more tourism do we need? Why don't we ask locals how they feel about this?</p> <p>Thanks for all of your hard work!! Howie Garber</p>
--------------	----------------	--

Parker Reed	Salt Lake City	<p>Hi. I am an avid skier and what brought me to move to SLC and recreate here is the balance of WILDERNESS and developed ski areas in the wasatch mountains. The balance of these two is very important to me. I am all for further development of the ski areas and connecting them better - as long as it doesn't affect the wilderness areas that connect them. Building lifts as an excuse for developing condos will significantly degrade the character of our beautiful natural resource that has already had significant degradation from our mining history. I think that improving the public transit options for getting to (and between) all of our world class resorts, rather than developing over the snow connections should be the biggest priority. As we are already in the winter inversion season - it is very frustrating for me to not have a viable public transit option to get from my house in sugarhouse to the mountains on weekends. Furthermore - on storm days the number of cars in little cottonwood canyon can be absurd (and dangerous). Please devise a viable way (1h) to get from the population centers of the valley to the ski resorts and work on increased frequency and the ability to stop at the other recreational trailheads in the canyons as well. I read through the idealized systems and I think that Utah would benefit significantly from a robust transit network connecting the resorts. A bus rapid transit system up little cottonwood with express busses from TRAX or Downtown would be a very good start, however the train up little cottonwood and connecting the PC resorts and then linking to downtown would be an amazing boom for tourists. Ski resorts are designed to be accessed from their bases. Each resort is big enough to spend a full day exploring as a visitor. Allowing tourists to stay anywhere (including downtown) and visit whatever resort they choose without having to drive would be a huge draw. The ski link proposal would not have actually allowed people to access more terrain because it would have taken 4+ hours of "commuting" to get from the base of canyons over to big cottonwood. In the summer - a train would link SLC with the world class (IMBA GOLD) mountain biking trails and increase summer tourism as well. One Wasatch and the Ski Link proposal want to compare the Wasatch to Europe in terms of their connectedness. The best way I can think to do this is to have them accessible by a fast, clean, environmentally friendly mountain train nothing is more european and modern than that. thanks -Parker Reed</p>
Andrew McNeil	Salt Lake City	<p>One Wasatch . . . is simply a bad idea. Little Cottonwood Canyon with all the available parking being utilized during the peak season period is proof of that. Constructing overhead trams or chairs or building tunnels to access this area will greatly diminish the skiing and boarding experience in the Crown Jewel of our State. Also creating more access into LLC and expansion of resort areas will infringe on the rights of the backcountry skiers. As LLC naturally becomes more populated Front Range skiers/riders will more and more gravitate into Big Cottonwood Canyon making the carrying capacity of these two areas more in balance. Infusing Park City tourists and residents into this mix seems absurd to me. One Wasatch favors the wealth center of Summit County giving these local and tourist winter recreationists access to the Central Wasatch's most pristine and beautiful terrain, best snow and ski terrain while diminishing Front Range water quality, skiing and riding experience and access to back country skiing. Clearly this proposed development favors economic growth over environmental conservation in Salt Lake County once again. Much like the allowed expansion of Kennecott Copper in the valley for economic reasons while county residents are left with the negative externalities of poor respiratory health and other medical conditions in the name of economic expansion, number one State for business, best run County in the nation....LLC could have better bus service and work on a transportation plan of its own with the help of the government leaders in Salt Lake County and Sandy but bringing Summit County into the Front Range by overhead or underground cable and rail is an assault to the residents of Salt Lake County.</p> <p>Andrew McNeil  The Bringham Group Real Estate  c 801.209.3818  o 801.485.7653  <a href="http://www.emigrationrealestate.com">www.emigrationrealestate.com</a></p>

Naomi Franklin	Salt Lake City	To Mountain Accord, I am unable to open your website, nor your Comment site. So I'll just give my generalized opinion, without knowing whether you have posed specific questions. I put the highest value on the natural features of the Wasatch mountains. Their proximity to populations of both the Wasatch Front and the Snyderville Basin is of remarkable value. Access from both sides by public transit up the canyons would be advantageous. I would NOT wish to have the interior compromised by any internal cross-link. Better to protect the core with more extensive wilderness designation. As a watershed for both adjacent populations, the Wasatch Mountains are of highest value. Internal development should be minimal-ized, and held to strict standards against any wastes/drainage. All streams should be carefully preserved----unless some waters might be guided to cache opportunities for storage. Wild-life should be treasured, left undisturbed. Our natural surroundings are the product of eons. They can be trampled by humans, but not created. Please tread lightly! Naomi Franklin 1411 Utah St #4, SLC, UT 84104
Ashley Patterson	Salt Lake City	No train up Little Cottonwood Canyon. Put the train up Parley's where there are six lanes of traffic and commuters both ways every day. Parking garages at the mouths of the canyons and free buses. No driving. No ski area expansion. Skier resort customers are flat. Backcountry users are up. Allot terrain based on user preferences. No inter-canyon connectivity beyond what exists is needed. Plow Guardsman if need be. LCC and BCC do not need to be connected. Keep the watershed protections in mind with all decision making.
Corey Kopischke	Salt Lake City	I am interested in seeing a better transportation program for the Cottonwoods to help with offsetting the bad air of Utah. The Winters see the most vehicle travel and the Bus system is just not a great system when trying to get up the hill to ski. Encouraging drivers to pick up another person when driving up the canyon would be a great start especially if you were charged a fee for an empty vehicle? I don't have the answers but I do have the concern. Thank you.
Ethan Haggard	Salt Lake City	I am a little concerned to see that some of your maps/proposals look as if they were drafted by the folks behind One Wasatch. It is far from clear to me that ski area expansion is a solution to traffic/transport issues.
Megan Southwick	Salt Lake City	I would like to see a train put in up Parley's Canyon to facilitate recreation, business and commuter transportation to and from Park City. I would like to see transportation limited to travel by bus in little and big cottonwood canyons. However I feel that this would need to be both frequent and provide service around the clock. I feel strongly that ski area boundaries are not allowed to expand. Backcountry use is growing exponentially and ski resort user days are down. I do not think this is due to a lack of amenities or terrain. I think this is just a shifting of interest in the outdoors community. Please preserve the terrain that remains accessible by backcountry users. I would also like to see iconic trails like the Wasatch Crest Trail protected through permanent easements or land acquisitions. Thank you for working hard to find a consensus on these matters.
Andrew Southwick	Salt Lake City	I would like to see trains connecting Park City to Salt Lake City. I think a train tunnel connecting Park City and the cottonwood canyons would help with traffic congestion and increase access. I would like to see buses only up the cotton wood canyons with a park and ride area centrally located in Cotton Wood Heights or Sandy. The trains and buses need to have around the clock schedules for resort employees and tourists. Watershed protection is critical and therefore, ski area boundaries should not expand. Ridge top development should not be allowed due to sight line and view impacts. Segmenting public lands restricting access should not be allowed. Please preserve backcountry terrain and access as this is a growing sport and industry. Thank you for requesting and accepting comments.
Erik Kisch-Trier	Salt Lake City	Dear Mountain Accord - I am a Salt Lake area resident and professional in the field of biomedical science. I originally came to Salt Lake to complete my training at the U, during which time I feel in love with the area. The amazing access to alpine wilderness here is unmatched in the continental US, permitting those of us who live here fantastic work/life balance. Many of my colleagues and myriad businesses in the region have chosen to locate themselves here because of this. Any further ski area development would damage our already scant open spaces in the Cottonwoods. There is plenty of resort skiing and it is not logistically feasible to ski multiple canyons in one day. While there is a transportation issue, ski area expansion would not solve it. We should use Transportation Concept A. Rail would damage sensitive areas and is overkill. All we need is flexible transport like express buses. Please, please do not green light ski area expansion. While we can always develop, it is virtually impossible to revert to open space. I know it is hard to quantify the economic impact of dispersed users such as myself, but we make up a large part of the local businesses that make the region so productive. Thank you for your time.

Rebecca Burrage	Salt Lake City	The transportation corridors that are proposed between ski resorts are worrisome. The potential disruption to the environment is terrible to imagine. I no longer ski, but do enjoy hiking and snowshoeing in areas other than ski resorts. It becomes more and more difficult to get away from noise and high action sports. I hope the call for greater economic returns won't be the primary consideration. I saw in the proposal that you predict no increased impact on global warming, but with recent study results forecasting lessening amounts of snow in Park City, what measures are being taken to ensure that the risk does not increase along with more traffic and building?
Alexandra Moody	Sandy	I live in Wasatch resort and I am concerned about the plans for a train to be built going up Little Cottonwood Canyon. I love where I live and I love that my house is somewhat secluded and there are not crowds of strangers. I also love outdoor activities and just being in nature. I rock climb and hike in the area, and I believe that putting a train up there will ruin the peaceful atmosphere, and disturb not only the residents in the canyon, but also the outdoorsmen who spend time there to get away from the city. I fit under both categories, so I have double the reasons to be against this train.
Robert Moody	Sandy	How can anyone be really serious about this! Putting a noisy, ugly oil leaking train up and across this amazing canyon is a crime of nature to profit a few greedy resort owners. Have the Snowbird employees ride a bus with a mandatory bus pass that is provided by Snowbird. Don't waist taxpayer money destroying this canyon! Why destroy this world renowned pristine canyon for only 19 days of traffic. The hikers and mountain bikers will loose their trail. The canyon will fill with pollution. The wildlife will retreat back into the mountains. Please stop this nightmare! On top of that who is paying the billion dollars this will cost? Who will pay the legal fees? When all nature loving people fight every step of this?
Stacey Moody	Sandy	As a child that grew up in California, we used to fly to Utah, just to visit Little Cottonwood Canyon. The amazing granite cliffs and small intimate canyon was something my family found unique enough to visit frequently! As an adult I am fortunate enough to life here in this canyon. The narrow trail, pristine water, and gigantic cliffs are unique only to Little Cottonwood Canyon. Please don't ruin it by sticking a train right through the middle of it! Can't we find a less destructive way to spend taxpayer money?!!!!
Matt Tobey	Sandy	We just moved into the Little Cottonwood Canyon area and are curious as to how a rail line might effect our neighborhood - from noise and litter, to convenience and crime. From the limited knowledge available, my family is not in favor of any option involving a rail addition to little cottonwood canyon.
Zosh Kuball	Sandy	Please, please do not connect the West/East side of the Wasatch/Uinta range. There is a very special appeal and draw to the West Side (BCC and LCC) that you lose in Park City. The East Side (PC) is full of tourism, commercialism, and traffic. Many, many people come specifically to BCC/LCC to ski in peace. By connecting the BCC/LCC canyons and by connecting the West/East sides of the mountains you will absolutely kill that attraction and lose a formidable customer base.
Aimee McComb	Sandy	I think that Transportation Plan C is best to preserve the important resources of Utah while improving the transportation. I think that the outlined preservation of wilderness areas is good
Matt Heim Mueller	Sandy	I support One Wasatch.
Jenifer Johnson	Sandy	Dear people in charge-- Please don't ruin the hiking trails up little Cottonwood in exchange for a rail system to benefit the ski resorts. Please let people use the buses that are available. Adding more frequent bus routes up both canyons is far more economical and far more environmentally friendly for our canyons! Save the peace and tranquillity that outdoor enthusiasts who use their own body power to hike or bike up the canyons enjoy by using trails such as the Temple Quarry Trail that continues up past Wasatch Resort up to the deserted mill. Thanks for keeping our Canyons Green and train free!! Jenifer Johnson 801-746-9446 jbaxjohnson@gmail.com
Jon Reese	Sandy	Time to bite the bullet on UTA. We have a huge capital investment and few riders. Lets cut fairs for Seniors, Youth, any Utah citizen to 50 cents on any one ride. This will include express bus to ski resorts on a 15 minute max wait. This will cost some, but will also pay lots of benefits as we limit cars in the canyons and make riding the Trax to downtown cost effective for many. If this triples the ridership this could pay the same for the fixed operating costs as today. We need to insist UTA operate at least 50% capacity of no bonuses or salary increase for all UTA mgmt. At the same time parking at ski resort should be pay parking which should also go to UTA operating budget.
Louella Ash	Sandy	I want our mountains (which I love) to stay as natural as possible. Keep transportation to a minimum. Make private ownership locked at its present level. Keep public access for all people open. I feel all people must have the right to enjoy the fresh air and beauty of our mountains. They are refreshment for the soul.

Daren Cottle	Sandy	As an frequent user (multiple days per week year round) of the natural wonders of the central Wasatch, I have been following the Mountain Accord project with interest. I applaud the project and I'm hopeful it will be successful in bringing about consensus and action. I agree with the direction in most of the Ideal 2040 scenarios presented by Mountain Accord. However, there a few items that concern me very much. 1. Expansion of ski areas via "One Wasatch" or other interconnect proposals. Ski areas already dominate the central Wasatch and once they expand more, there's no reversing the impact. I've seen no solid reasoning for interconnect or resort expansion other than a marketing ploy. However, it seems dubious that there is a financial payoff for such a system and no payoff considering the damage it will do. Of particular concern is any connection through Grizzly Gulch operated by Alta. The Grizzly Gulch and Flagstaff area is the single most popular starting point for backcountry skiing, ridge line hiking and backcountry bowhunting. With Alta's track record of excluding up hill traffic and snowboards, it's hard to imagine access to the BCC/LCC ridge line allowed without a lift ticket in the winter. This would fundamentally change the balance between ski area and non-ski area usage, which is already heavily tilted to ski areas. This applies to both summer and winter. 2. Any transportation system with permanent roads or rail lines that connect LCC and BCC pose the same problems I outlined in #1 above. However, in this case, the damage to the environment would be even worse. On the positive side, the idea of the better connected trail systems and more protection from development are very welcome. Also, better mass transit up and down the canyons and from SLC to PC are much needed. Again, I'm not opposed to commercially developed usage and multiple use. In fact, I enjoy resort skiing, MTB riding on developed trails and other commercial recreation. I'm just very concerned with the prospects of expansion of these activities beyond their current boarders. The central Wasatch will not get any bigger and we much fight to keep development contained. Thanks for the opportunity to comment. Daren Cottle
David R. Smith	Sandy	The current balance among high density and dispersed recreation should be maintained! Ski areas should be restricted to their existing permit areas. They already have most of the best ski terrain in the range. In the words of Ed Abbey--"Leave it as it was"!
David R. Smith	Sandy	Salt Lake and Park City should be connected with expanded bus service (or perhaps by rail). Bus service should be expanded in the Cottonwood Canyons. Private automobiles should be banned in the Cottonwood Canyons (perhaps between 8-11 a.m. and again between 2--5 p.m.). Backcountry users would be able to use their private autos by getting an early start. I don't believe a rail interconnect including Big & Little Cottonwood Canyons and Park City can be done without significant adverse environmental impact.
David R. Smith	Sandy	The Wasatch is not the Alps--it is an extremely small range! Each of the seven ski areas is unique. "One Wasatch" will result in increased costs and will do nothing for the local skier. We should not sacrifice anymore of what makes the Wasatch unique to provide a supposed marketing advantage for the ski industry! We need to maintain the balance between high density and backcountry snowsports that we currently enjoy.
David R. Smith	Sandy	As you are aware, the Wasatch Range is unique in offering an very accessible natural environment so close to a major population center. Balance of use is perhaps the key to maintaining its benefits in the future. Given the coming population growth, no one use can be expanded with out impacting the other uses (users). Watershed protection must remain as the highest use. Given this priority, all other uses must remain subordinate--maintaining a balance of uses should be our goal!
Thom Filgo	Sandy	I moved here in the early 80's because of the skiing and the incredible natural beauty of the Wasatch. I have also experienced what I would call a degradation of the spiritual experience that brought me here due to overdevelopment, overcrowding, and basically overuse. While I acknowledge that we live in a more urban Wasatch, future planning is critical for this gem that makes SLC the most unique place on earth. I applaud the Mountain Accord for addressing the long term issues that will detrimine the future canyon experience. We do need a transit system in the canyons that encourages fewer cars. We cannot continue to keep expanding in the canyons for the benefit of a few at the expense of the many. Make no mistake, "One Wasatch" is no more than a Carl Rove type marketing scheme that benefits developers and businesses while converting public land into private profit for a few well politically connected individuals. This vision of the future of the Wasatch looks more like Colorado, complete with wall to wall trophy homes, ski lifts marring every vista, and high rise hotels stuffed into every nook that developers can eke out of "OUR" public lands. I would like to see the Mountain Accord take a more long term, conservation minded approach to managing the Wasatch. One that puts a premium on preserving public lands, creating additional protections to prevent development creep and come up with a transportation solution that addresses rush hour like grid lock traffic. I believe this vision will best address a quality experience for all who recreate in the Wasatch in the future. Thank you Thom Filgo Sandy Utah
Brad Fullmer	Sandy	I welcome any approach that reduces the number of vehicles on the road. Public transportation/mass transit is the future for Utah. Future generations will benefit greatly from such a system.



Steve Hunt	Sandy	I feel strongly that the resorts are big enough! Further expansion is not needed. We have plenty of Alpine terrain accessed by lifts. The One Wasatch idea is simply a marketing ploy and NOT needed. This would be used by a small handful of people and at a huge expense to the backcountry. I am in favor of a canyon transport system similar to Zion NP in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. It is working there for much larger numbers than we will ever see. Please preserve our undeveloped Wasatch Mts. We need clean water, untouched wilderness, peace and quite.
Ronald Hardy	Sandy	as an avid skier with over 50 years of skiing and over 30 years skiing the wasatch it would be my dream to see an inter-connected wasatch. a well developed hut system that went from logan to nephi is my dream!!!
Byron Harvison	Sandy	When my family and I chose to move here 15 months ago, the "wildness" and accessibility of the Wasatch was a significant factor. Please keep the resorts in their current footprint and keep the backcountry free
Alex Anderson	Sandy	I think if there will be a change in the transportation system up Little Cottonwood Canyon it should be as follows. Do not spend money putting in a new system that will possibly not change anything. Instead, make a rule where only the busses and the locals and employees are allowed to go up on fresh powder days. Then after the typical snow day rush is over allow the rest of the traffic up there. This would stop all of the over populated traffic from happening. There would also be less carbon dioxide from the vehicles going into the atmosphere. That helps the Transportation and the Environment section of the Mountain Accord focus groups. This would also help prevent those who want to have a recreational activity up the canyon, because they would not be hindered by too many people trying to get to the ski resorts all at once. Also this would prevent a lot of money from being consumed into a plan that has a strong possibility of being fruitless and overburdening, The tax payers of the surrounding cities do not need to pay for a new transportation system. Just slightly change the already existing system and see what happens in ten years. Create a schedule that decides when certain traffic is allowed up the canyon and then collect data for ten years and decide after the results from the collected data if there is a real need for a new form of transportation.

Megan Anderson	Sandy	<p>To better the public transportation up the canyon there needs to be more busses, and they need to be more affordable. There needs to be parking down in Sandy City. Some of the parking was sold for no apparent reason, and this has caused the situation to worsen. There was no sign for this parking, but once the city put one up it started to fill. Busses are the cheapest fix to the transportation issue, and we know they work. If there is an avalanche the damage will also be less. With greater advertisement of the bus system and more parking, there would be more revenue and prices could be lowered. I do not want to see a monorail up the canyon I love so dearly. A monorail would cut into the Wasatch National Forest if it were placed on the bike trail, or the side of the road. If it were placed on the bike trail, it would severely limit recreational use of the canyon. The most popular bike trail would be eliminated if it were placed on the trail, and the side of the road the road bikers use would be taken out. It would also cross over the watershed. There have been many avalanches on the road and the bike trail, just because it has been a long time does not mean that they will not come back. In Colorado, they put a monorail up the canyon and the excess people began to devastate the place. The canyon could not support the flow of people, and they eventually had to run the monorail less than it was valued to run and charge for people to enter the canyon. Enough people drive up, and will continue driving up with all of their athletic gear and friends. A monorail will not limit the amount of drivers, it will simply increase the total number of people. The plants and wildlife will not benefit from more people up the canyon. I love the trees, bushes, streams, deer, mountain goats, and other wildlife which frequent these hills. Please do not destroy their home. The monorail would be a danger to hikers, rock climbers, cyclists, and other forms of recreation. I highly disagree with the idea of making tax payers pay over 2.5 billion for the ski resorts to profit. That number would be a gamble to invest. It has been estimated that the monorail would take over a century to pay for itself. As far as economy goes we should be looking to advertise the canyon as a place for climbing, biking, and hiking. Snowbird and Alta exceed their legal limits of use of water every year making snow, and I do not know for how long this will be allowed to continue. It would be unwise to throw everything we have into the ski industry. The monorail, if it went over the trail, would cover and destroy historical mining tracks. I would like to preserve the history of our canyon. A monorail would destroy or do severe harm to the following; the environment, wildlife, the watershed, recreation, economy, and those who benefit from the transportation would mainly be foreigners. Let us preserve the canyon for our children, and not exploit it for the casual visitor. Another point I would like to make is residential. I believe that should be a factor in this decision of what happens to our canyon. I do not want a train through my neighborhood, yard, or home. I do not want a train on the side of the road either. The canyon has been called a precious gem. One does not send a little toy through something of such great worth. I am aware that the traffic can be taxing in the canyon. However, a monorail is not the solution. If the busses were cheaper, more people would ride them. A monorail would have to be more expensive to cover its cost. My suggestion would be to limit the times public vehicles can go up the canyon. If an avid skier must be on a bus to catch the first power, they will be on that bus. I do feel that the canyon should be available to people, but by doing little things like that it would limit the traffic. I would also suggest that Snowbird and Alta cut back on the employees who drive to work. If those employees would take the bus, there would be many a car eliminated.</p>
Megan Sieverts	Sandy	<p>More availability and affordability of busses would benefit the transportation up the canyon. Busses are the cheapest solution, and the least amount of risk. A monorail is ostentatious. It is an absurd notion to build something that would cost over 2.5 billion dollars of tax payers money to benefit an elite wealthy few. This group of elite being wealthy travelers and the owners of the ski resorts. A monorail would limit other forms of recreation, damage the watershed, cause harm to wildlife, and be a great risk of public money. Not to mention the fact that a monorail would do harm to the history of the canyon if it tread over the historic mining tracks. The canyon is a home to wildlife and people. The residents do not want to see a train up their canyon. The car flow is inevitable unless stopped with a limit or a fee. A limit on the time period private vehicles were allowed up the canyon would lessen the number. If only busses were allowed up early in the morning on powder days, for instance, more people would take the bus. My plea is that the canyon be left a heritage to our children and grandchildren. Do not over commercialize it with a dangerous high-speed tram of any kind. Such a devise, as previously stated, benefits only an elite few at the expense of the general population. Let the local cyclists, hikers, and climbers have their canyon.</p>
William Albertson	Sandy	<p>All of the people I have talked to on the Little Cottonwood Trail have never heard of Mountain Accord. They are all extremely upset that any discussion is taking place, that involves taking the Trail from them. This is a very popular Trail. This Train is not needed. If Snowbird &amp; Alta require their employees to ride the bus.</p>
John Hill	Saratoga Springs	<p>Unfortunately, the look at recreation does not focus on balanced recreation that includes motorized traffic. Where is the development of atv/motorcycle trails? Is hiking the recreation? This sort of shortsightedness gives this movement no credibility. It needs to be more inclusive of a diverse cross section of recreation. Your ideal recreation is to say the least much less than ideal</p>

Kelly Lether	Silver Fork	Top three Environment actions: Other(Restrooms); Top three Transportation corridors: North-south corridor along the eastern portion of Salt Lake Valley (i.e. Foothill/Wasatch Blvd.); Big Cottonwood Canyon; Other (Restrooms); Top three Recreation actions: Design and manage key recreation areas for increased use while maintaining existing character and recreation opportunities; Provide year-round public transit service to connect users with recreation destinations; Other (Restrooms); Top three Economy actions: Consider the connection of mountain resort areas with ski lifts to handle growing tourism; Develop effective tools and approaches for resolving land-use and property-rights conflicts; Other (Restrooms).
Daniel Rich	South Jordan	I want cycling access to be a priority throughout the area. I regularly ride most of the local canyons here(little cottonwood, emigration, big cottonwood) and these are an amazing resource that must be preserved. In the ideal world I would have a protected divided bike line all the way to the top in these canyons on the traveling uphill side of the road. On the down side I think mixing bikes and traffic is the safest since bikes move at roughly car speed(~40 mph) going down these steep canyons. So on the down side regular side posting to be aware of bikes would be sufficient. As well regular sweepings of these roads since the gravel accumulation can make descending by bike more dangerous.
Garth Tino	South Jordan	I love my canyons. I climb, hike, bike, ski, and do all sorts of things in them. They are where we play. I don't like policies that make it difficult or impossible to do this. Transportation- I don't like B or D as options. I don't feel that putting more stress on the region is good. I don't like the train idea, as it will take up even more space, be loud, and make it harder for us to get around. Putting in trains will cut off valuable lands to use, and make it difficult or impossible to get around and access the climbing and skiing. How can I get to the climbing in the canyon- will I be allowed to go over the train tracks? If it moves to just trains- will they drop me off mid canyon at 4am to climb into White Pine? Tunnels under the mountains will do the same. I think bringing trains to the mouths of the canyons is nice. Economy: I also don't like the lifts everywhere. We, at some point, need to decrease the amount of expansion in that area, and look to expand into other areas. Development of the Oquirrh Mountains will spread out the stress on the Wasatch. What about developing more in other areas- East Canyon, Parleys, Davis and Weber counties. We can't make 7 resorts big enough for all of us and all of the tourists too. Spread out the impact. Stansbury peaks could use a resort.
Daniel Rich	South Jordan	We have in our back-yard world famous and world class rock climbing. This is a treasure that we need to preserve and make available to the public. I think improved and city guided trail building to help reduce erosion would be awesome. City contribution to bolting and re-bolting efforts for safety.
Andy McKay	South Jordan	I come up the Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons with my kids for hiking all Spring/Summer/Fall. These wonderful trails are such an asset to local residents, though so many of the parking areas are way overcrowded. I'd like to see more parking near hiking and climbing areas as roads are improved and possibly widened. I also think that more family friendly hikes should be developed (friendly to beginner hikers - like donut falls) to help our rising generation of stewards over this great area of wilderness have more experiences out in the woods. I would not like to see any megadevelopment up the canyons without fixing the current transportation problems in a way that's sensitive to environmental impacts on watershed, etc. Andy McKay
John Evans	South Jordan	The Environment portion of the Mountain Accord Draft is the most sensitive and must be protected the most. There should be no tram/chairlift from Wasatch Front to Wasatch Back, nor a rail line. This is an totally artificial need created by the ski industry. The environment must be preserved, and in doing so we preserve opportunities for human powered recreation in these areas, instead of degrading those opportunities. There are plenty of ski resorts, resorts that are already expanding and pushing outwards. Connecting them is a horrible idea that shuts down lower impact, healthier forms of recreation.
Pam Hepworth	South Jordan	I think transportation is the key group that will facilitate accomplishment of the other three systems' goals. Without economical and environmentally-conscious transportation options to our mountains and around the Wasatch front, we are stuck with individual drivers entering our canyons one vehicle at a time. That's a high impact and an unnecessary one if low impact transportation options are available to visitors and residents alike. I visited Switzerland years ago without a car. I was able to access the highest mountaintops without the use of a car. We can do the same here. It's possible.

Michele Evans	South Jordan	I find some of the proposed options completely inappropriate! I don't feel there is any need to connect our canyons by roads, rails or trams. Please keep them individual!!! I do support greater parking at the mouth of BCC & LCC with good bus access up those two canyons. Putting a rail up the already huge Parley's containing I-80 is very appropriate and very inappropriate for LCC where it would destroy the unique feel of wilderness. So plan A or C for transportation I would support. The economy plan seems to focus on connecting the canyons which feels like it's being driven by big business and not what is best for the future of the average local enjoying the Wasatch and maintaining the wild feel of our canyons. I agree with the increased protection in the environment plan. I feel business doesn't respect protecting our wild places and if it's not protected they have visions of development. Some of the plans were hard to make out all that was proposed. I know some of the ski resorts like Snowbird want to expand and cross the road. I've seen reports that show the number of skiers has leveled off and there really isn't a need to expand, ruining untouched areas that many enjoy. The local Wasatch community is loved by many hikers, backpackers, back country skiers, climbers that rely on commercial business being contained. The USA doesn't seem to know how to minimally impact the environment like Europe, we always seem to be over the top grandiose and big business minded. I hope you make the proper decision to limit the big business and keep the wonderful natural & wild feel of our canyons. Tourist also come here expecting that feel and we won't be very special if we aren't careful. Thank you for considering my comments, Michele Evans South Jordan UT Climber, hiker, backpacker, skier with season passes to multiple resorts
Ken Hunt	South Jordan	Why is it only 1/4 of a mile from key Mountain Accord Investments? How did 1/4 come about? Why not 1/3, 1/2 or 1 mile? For recreation/transportation strong consideration needs to be in place for shoulders placed on canyon roads for bike riders. What about a toll system just like Emigration Canyon to increase funding?
Amy Kipischke	South Salt Lake	Please establish better infrastructure to allow more efficient mass transit up the Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. I ski at Alta and have made numerous observations about the traffic up and down the canyons. Most people I talk to don't ride the bus because it is expensive, slow, and inconvenient. I know numerous people who drive to the ski area as the sole occupant of their cars 2-3 times a week. There is already so much pollution in the valley and we really need to start to protect these wonderful resources that are at such close proximity to a large population.
Joseph Neilson	Tucson	As a backcountry skier, I am opposed to the idea of connecting existing resorts because this would result in a decrease to access as well as terrain to those of us who prefer to "earn our turns." I have skied inbounds at all the "big" 7 resorts, and I see NO NEED for this kind of expansion. As it stands now, the inbound skier has it all with such great resorts. The backcountry skier, however, has a lot to LOSE with the One Wasatch plan.
Travis Bellantino	West Jordan	I think One Wasatch is bad for Utah! The Wasatch Mountains are very unique and should be left alone! I'm all for high speed bus transportation for it will be faster and more efficient than a train. I'm pretty sure I speak for a lot of people by saying One Wasatch will not benefit us locals in any way, it's not going to benefit our economy as well! PLEASE PROTECT THE WASATCH!
Analee Munsey	West Jordan	
Brady Wheeler	West Jordan	After reviewing the different ideal scenarios for each subject area, this is the balance I would seek: Environment - 70% Recreation - 20% Transportation - 5% Economy - 5%
Gary Nichols	West Jordan	I am definitely against choices B and D in the transportation segment. They have way too much impact on the environment. They shouldn't even be considered. Connecting the resorts will hurt both the recreation and the environment. Don't do anything more to damage our beautiful mountains.
Chris Erickson	West Valley	Looking at the ideal systems for recreation, it seems to me that putting machinery (lifts/trains) over the top of the passes (Grizzly gulch / Guardsman Pass) destroys recreation opportunities. In the winter, this would take areas that are open to the public to use and designate them for use by private interests. (Ski areas and those who can pay for their passes) In the summer, it would take areas where someone can go to be away from a bunch of mechanized noise and fill them up with chair lifts, service roads, etc. As far as transportation, currently, it is not a tremendous effort to travel by road (A Bus?) from the Wasatch front to the Wasatch back. It takes 45 minutes to an hour. The proposed lifts/trains would shorten this to a half an hour for those who are rich (< 5% of the population) and ruin much of this backcountry. A train to Park City seems like a good idea... There is only one Wasatch. It isn't that big. The ski areas already have most of the good terrain and have trashed it with service roads, cutting runs, and ski lifts. Lets keep what is still "wild" wild for the rest of us to enjoy.
Thomas Tischner		This just looks like more "pie in the sky" utopian rhetoric that hands more control over our lives to big government. There are way too many rules already. We don't need a giant gated community.

		I prefer Concept D. We need to limit and/or prohibit automobiles in these canyons with public transit options.
Scott House		<p>Greetings, My name is Scott House. I am a Wasatch County resident working and playing in Summit, Wasatch and Salt Lake counties. First and foremost, thank you for dedicating your time and energy to making the Wasatch a better place for us all. I believe that whatever comes of Mountain Accord will be immensely beneficial for the Wasatch and it's communities. All that said, I have one major concern: Wasatch County has been, for the most part, left out of your planning process. I have spoke with members of Mountain Accord committees, city government as well as board members regarding this. The answer I have received; Wasatch County does not want to actively be involved in the Mountain Accord process. I can't be sure this is actually the case but it shouldn't matter. Whether Wasatch County was not included or they (Wasatch County) chose not to participate is irrelevant. You are master planning for the future of the Wasatch yet you are leaving out the fastest growing county in Utah and the 5th largest per capita in the U.S. (as of the last census). Not to mention it is directly adjacent to 3 of our major resorts and a bedroom community for Park City, Salt Lake, Provo and Orem. Whatever the case may be, Wasatch County needs to be included in the Mountain Accord process. The fact that none of the transportation, economic, environmental, or recreation plans includes Wasatch County in even the slightest capacity is extremely nearsighted and naive (in my humble opinion). More and more Park City, SLC and Provo/Orem residents are moving to the Heber/Midway valley. This is on top of the ever flowing stream of people coming to Utah from outside the state to Wasatch County. Even with a good job and a dual income, Park City is rapidly becoming out of reach for the working local class, already is for the most part. As people leave these areas to find more affordable housing, better lifestyles and increased access to the mountains we (Mountain Accord) need to plan for this. Again, you have left out what is arguably one of the most crucial communities to include. I urge you to do what you can to involve Wasatch County in the Mountain Accord process. I truly believe that leaving out Wasatch County, as you have currently, will haunt Wasatch residents long into the future. Now is the time, or as you put it a "once in a generation" opportunity to change our communities for the better. Leaving out Wasatch County would be counterproductive to capitalizing on this opportunity, and in my humble opinion, a failure on the part of the leadership of Mountain Accord. Please, consider including Wasatch County in your transportation and recreation planning at the very least. Thank you for your time and any consideration. I appreciate all you are doing for the Wasatch Mountains and hope you can understand where I am coming from. I look forward to your response and the future of Mountain Accord. Be well and create a great afternoon! Scott</p>
Norm Henderson		<p>Seems like you're putting the cart before the horse. The way I see it, any change to the current land acquisition plan/process can only be developed after the mountain accord general development strategy is known. Right now the city currently has a lock hold on virtually all the water in the Wasatch canyons so most development is severely restricted. In addition, the city currently purchases private land to accomplish its own goals (not spelled out by the committee but likely similar to those of the mountain accord). I believe that any modification to the current land acquisition process by salt lake city would have to be in line with the mountain accord development plan.</p>
Anne Zeigler		<p>After taking a hike up Mill D in Big Cottonwood Canyon last Wednesday, I contemplated the result of increased resort expansion, development and what the canyons would look like without a chance to preserve the beauty of such a pristine sight. Anyone who can walk can hike Mill D. Let's save our canyons for local people who enjoy the backcountry in all seasons of the year. Ski resorts that want to expand will curtail the experience of outdoor lovers. Due to climate change and the economy they will not witness the great financial benefit they expect. I have been hearing so many people say, they don't ski anymore, it's too expensive. Only the wealthy from out of state can afford the 1-2 week vacations at high end resorts. Let's save the Wasatch Mountains for the locals who spend way more time recreating in the canyons. We need to preserve what we have - once developed, it is gone.</p>
Kirk Nichols		<p>Here is another tack you could take: The current Forest Service plan limited the acreage leased of the public lands to the ski resorts based on no expansion of the resort's acreage. Now the resorts are finding private land to build new lifts to access new acreage of public lands. The Forest Service (Steve Schied) says that the Forest Service has no say about the private land, however the Forest Service, to keep their no new ski resort acreage as designated in the Forest Plan, must consider that if suddenly available private is used to access public land, they the Forest Service will be negligent by allowing access to new acreage of public land. Example, if Alta wants to use private land in Grizzly Gulch to build a new lift that accesses public land or just increases the resort's overall acreage, the Forest Service is obligated to put back an equivalent acreage into general use and off-bounds for resort access. Alta should be required by the F.S. to remove a lift from the public land and close an equivalent acreage to lift serviced skiing. If Alta would rather service Grizzly Gulch, so be it as long as they close an equal acreage of the current resort boundaries. It is called equal compromise, adding one new acre means giving up one old acre.</p>

Jan Baker		I support the mountain accord plan and encourage land preservation for our children and grandchildren to enjoy. I believe that we need a transportation system for our canyons. I support what the people of Utah have said for many years. No further expansion of ski resorts. We are heading into decreasing snow pack as climate change begins it's toll so why build more ski lifts if there will be reduced snow available.
Joshua Quigley		Will the rail through the canyons be light rail (TRAX) commuter rail (Frontrunner) or something different like electric multiple unit (like the new commuter lines in denver)? Also will they tunnel through the mountains? Thank you!
Ken Libre		I submitted final comments at the end of the questionnaire that I just submitted, but was unable to complete my last thought due to lack of space. Perhaps you could kindly link this to my final comment of the questionnaire. 3. Any mass transit system is going to be expensive. It needs to be convenient to get people out of the peace and comfort of their cars; there also needs to be a financial incentive. A way to pay for this could be to levy a toll on all trips up any Canyon of the central Wasatch. Parley's; Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. All of them equally. Like what exists in Millcreek Canyon or any of the large transportation works on the East Coast e.g. George Washington Bridge or Lincoln Tunnel. (But use an EZ Pass-type system as opposed to the ancient toll booth in Millcreek.) If you got out of your car and into a bus you would avoid the toll. The proceeds could help pay for the cost of the mountain transit system. Obviously, this system would only work if all Canyons had the same toll system. State legislative action would most likely be required. The ski areas may balk at this, thinking that it would be a barrier to entry. A good transportation system will ultimately help them. \$5 round trip? Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this important issue. Ken Libre Alta, UT
Earlynn Sheehan		Dear mountain accord team, I do not want a train going up our beautiful canyon just for the sake of tourism. All employees should be required to park and ride the buses that go up to the resorts. If the employees were required to ride the bus to the resort, there will be no problem with traffic jams. Give all employees a free pass. That makes more sense than pushing a train up the canyon and destroying its beauty. Earlynn Sheehan, South Jordan, Utah
Diane Rollins		As a frequent hiker/runner on LC Trail, I am totally against the proposal to put a train up the cyn, possibly using the current trail from the mouth. I am in agreement to use busses for the canyon transportation. Please don't take away one of the few biking/hiking/running trails in the canyon area.
Charles Stuart		The emphasis in long term planning should be on environmental protection and light recreational use of presently undeveloped parts of the central Wasatch. Protection is paramount because once lands are developed, even minimally with ski lifts or roads, more extensive development, pollution, and crowding out of wildlife will follow. Maintaining a semi-wilderness buffer zone between western and eastern ski areas, with select single-track trails allows summer access that's still open for unimpeded back-country use during the winter. The "One Wasatch" concept would inevitable close off much open back-country use in favor of paid ski resort users. If there is a potential for error, it should be on the side of non-development.
Linda Smaligo		First of all - it's NOT just the tourists that are creating the traffic problems. Locals drive back and forth all day long on 224 and 80! The drop off and pick ups at the area schools are insane and CAR POOLING needs to be encouraged or mandatory! My daughter goes to school in Pinebrook - I drive from Willow Creek to Pinebrook 2 times per day and to the Marc daily - sometimes twice when she has tennis after school. Not to mention when ski season starts I will be to and from PCMR and Deer Valley almost daily. I feel awful with the amount that I drive - but the bus system is just too slow and inconvenient unless you live directly on a bus route. (Speaking of which it would be great to have a PC bus stop at the Willow Creek parking lot). Also, the big, noisy busses (in off peak times) could be changed out for smaller vehicles (vans?) so that the mostly empty busses are not used when not needed. On a more fun and future planning note - Make Park City unique with a high speed light rail (or monorail) from old town to kimball junction with one train being "express" and the other a "local" with stops along the way at major intersections (i.e. DV Drive, Kearns, Thaynes, Holiday Ranch loop, Meadows, the area schools and Old Ranch Road). Also - "branch" rails to veer off to more specific destinations from the local to get to the Marc, Willow Creek, Pinebrook, Jeremy Ranch. For a really cool and futuristic approach the "branch" rails could be amusement park style "pods" to smoothly transport people to the off 224 destinations. Remember - forty years from now cars may not even be part of the picture - much as horses were the standard before cars gained popularity - pods and solar powered trains may be the new normal in the future.

CJ Whittaker		<p>Mt. Accord, As a backcountry enthusiast (I get out 3-6 times per week) and a recreation-based business owner, I support a conservation oriented approach. I think that this approach would support a sustainable economic future for the areas around the Wasatch and the businesses who really on the Wasatch for recreation. My clientele come to the Wasatch from around the world to experience the backcountry and the undisturbed beauty that is so close to an urban life. More roads, lifts, trams, tunnels, and structures would threaten this consumer and the beauty of the Wasatch. That said, we do need a balanced transportation solution I think this involves improved public transportation and parking areas for backcountry trail heads. I do not want more trams, lifts, or tunnels connecting resorts. Also, I do not like the Snopark solutions in California. Those limit access and congest the backcountry making the experience less desirable and unsafe. The current Wasatch system is flexible and consumers can park almost anywhere to access the variety of trails (it also distributes/disperses people more)...although difficult, I think this is a unique and marketable feature which should be preserved. Regarding wilderness designation: Yes, we do need to protect what we have left in this small and high concentrated use mountain range. However, I think that "special management" areas (such as those proposed by Rep. Matheson) are a good idea. mountain biking and hell-skiing could be grandfathered into certain areas. Also, some areas should be reserved for total non-motorized use. Connecting the Wasatch with more backcountry trails is a good idea. Ski Utah and others have likened the Wasatch to Europe. I think this comparison is false. I have skied and recreated in the Alps and other ranges. The Wasatch is truly unique and a lot smaller than the European Alps. Because we are so small, we cannot bear to have the amount of infrastructure which Ski Utah, One Wasatch, and other development corporations are proposing. Also, with major metropolitan areas surrounding every aspect of the Wasatch, there is no need for more shopping, retail, and lodging in the mountains. I think we need to stop trying to sell a European dream and start selling the Utah ski dream: Urban life and recreation so close, you don't need a massive shopping/lodging center in the mountains. As a 5th generation Utahn, a local recreation based business owner, and most importantly a backcountry user, I support more wilderness preservation over development and economy. Thanks for your time, CJ</p>
Britt Vanderhoof		<p>Has anyone read "The No Growth Imperative - Creating Sustainable Communities under Ecological Limits to Growth" by Gabor Zovanyi? It is a wonderful, thought provoking book! You could be making a huge contribution to your/our future generations, and to others by using a few (or several) of his ideas. I highly recommend all of the people involved in the decision making process of the future goals of SLC to read it! Imagine....Salt Lake City could be a WORLD LEADER in creating a HEALTHIER planet and population, for our children, our grandchildren and future generations!!</p>
Jenifer Johnson		<p>Please don't put a train up little cottonwood canyon!! It's my solace to hike and bike the Quarry trail! The community deserves green space...let the buses transport the skiers</p>
Thomas Kleinstuber		<p>Under "Environment Systems Group" in the "goal" to "mitigate the severity of climate change and develop adaptive capacity to reduce vulnerabilities to local climate change impacts." One of the (2) "metrics" mentioned is "Net reduction of greenhouse gases." This seems problematic. Though almost all goals and metrics are good ideas and commendable, the realities are though good ideas in theory, some simply are not locally achievable. "Net reduction of greenhouse gases" is one. If a "goal" or "metric" is in-fact, not or could not be locally achievable, it should not be included in this project. If included, these lofty but unattainable goals would have a tendency to give the otherwise comprehensive and realistic project, less creditability. They would also give critics of the project subject matter for their criticisms. As a long time Salt Lake City resident and outdoor recreation enthusiast, former Big Cottonwood Canyon resident (Silverfork), and current (12 years) employee of the U.S. Dept. of Homeland Security, I see this project as a good thing and would value any further input I could provide. (This was sent on my government e-mail but I would request any response go to my personal e-mail: twkleinstuber@ Hotmail.com)</p>
		<p>I support Concept A for Transportation. NO train... that would be too costly and would damage the environment more. It would look like Disneyland instead of our beloved mountain retreat. Do not interconnect the canyons. Right now they seem large, and worthy of exploration. An interconnect would shrink them. They would lose their sense of being so awesome. Avoid tunnels, trams, trains, and interconnected ski lifts. That detracts so much from the feel we want to maintain, that we are in real mountains, not just an over-urbanized resort. Require bus service for all.... no individual cars in the canyons. Provide parking lots outside of the canyons, and increase bus service from downtown, especially from hotels. Increase the total area of wilderness to offset all the human trammeling that will be done as our SLC population explodes. We still need a quiet refuge to escape to, to maintain our sanity in this crazy, over-pressured world. Protect wildlife. Protect our precious resource, water. Keep the Wasatch as wild as possible.</p>

		<p>I strongly support an Ideal Environment scenario. We need to protect and preserve as much of our Wasatch as possible, for several reasons: · Water quality! We rely on the mountains for pure water. Prevent overuse to keep our water supply safe! · Air quality: Reduce traffic. I agree with the transportation nodes. · Wildlife: Viewing wildlife, including large animals such as moose, is one of the special treats to be gained from hiking in the Wasatch. Please preserve quiet retreats and corridors for these animals. · Quality of life for locals: people migrate to the Wasatch in order to enjoy the close-at-hand wilderness. That’s why I live here. Many of my friends say the same. If the mountains become over-used, they lose that magical quality of providing a respite from noise and hubbub. We need this retreat. There will be so much population growth in the future that we need to stand stronger than ever to protect this beautiful resource. Please prioritize the needs of local citizens. · Quality of recreation: If ski resorts become too big and bustling, they lose the charm that brings visitors here in the first place. Small is beautiful. Charge higher prices and bring in fewer people. · Do not link ski resorts. There’s enough territory to keep a skier entertained at any resort in any one day. Use multi-resort passes with fee transportation, so a skier can take a bus the next day to a different resort. Instead of interconnecting ski resorts, let’s interconnect all the wilderness areas, to create a large unified wilderness. · Transportation: Yes—use transportation nodes. Allow only travel by bus in the canyons, with the possible exception of those who own cabins in the canyons. Increase the ease of public transportation from downtown hotels to these nodes. A train or additional express bus service to Park City would be good. · Please do not create any interconnects across different canyons. An important part of preserving the scenic beauty and quietness of the canyons is to have each one remain as a separate entity. Please preserve the integrity of our separate canyons. This special place offers tremendous value for its serenity. People move here for this serenity. The quietness of the Wasatch is unique, as a place of tranquility so close to an ever-expanding urban area. Don’t give away this great prize, just to create yet another motorized playground. Instead of interconnecting ski resorts, let’s interconnect all the wilderness areas.</p>
Ian Mathias		<p>I believe we should take the most long-term view possible during this planning process. By doing so, we would protect the wild spaces that, once developed, will never be the same again. To this point, the notion of ski resort expansion and/or a rail that goes through LCC are distasteful ideas that would take away from this place the very thing people are flocking to enjoy. Our canyons are not Disneyland. Keep them wild. Exhaust all options before altering them forever, such as improving park and rides, more busses at lower rates (if not free), subsidizing those that carpool up the canyon, and please stop the ski resorts from their endless quest to turn the Wasatch into one huge resort with no character, wildness, risk or natural beauty. Over the years they have transformed from family owned businesses with the hubris to know when to leave nature alone into shareholder-driven organizations that care about profits and little else. They only look out for themselves now. In short, we are the stewards of this amazing place, not its owners. Time to act like it.</p>
Donny Roth		<p>Wild. Pristine. Quiet. Information and education resources at all trailheads and access points.</p>
Alex Lemieux		<p>I am opposed to expansion of the Central Wasatch ski resorts. I have worked for a ski resort for over 10 years and have seen first hand that they do just fine and already have the prime terrain to themselves. I believe that any more expansion will dramatically reduce my options and terrain as an avid backcountry skier and guide, squeezing all backcountry users into smaller and less desirable areas. Instead, visitors to the Wasatch should learn to move through the backcountry and connect to the various ski resorts by themselves or with guides. I value the human-powered ski experience and believe that there is already a lot of lift served terrain as it is. I do not support ski resort expansion or any further development.</p>
Mike Hales		<p>I would like to comment on the One Wasatch plan and Utah Ski Area expansion in general. I am a life-long Utah resident and skier. I currently purchase 5 season passes per year for myself and my wife and children. I also am a frequent backcountry skier. I strongly believe that the ski areas have adequate area and do not need to expand. I also believe that if there is any limiting factor for ski areas, it is parking and transportation, not area. The One Wasatch proposal will not enhance the ski experience for those who would use it, as it will involve more time on the chair and less time skiing. The loss of backcountry terrain to this project would be a terrible tragedy for the local community, as there is already very high pressure on the currently available backcountry terrain. Thank you for considering my comment. Mike</p>
Tim Ridges		<p>As a son of Utah pioneers and backcountry skier it saddens me to think that the spots I've been enjoying since the 1970's could be threatened by more ski lifts. This possible intrusion upon nature and a mountain ecosystem that does not need ONE MORE SCAR is a scary possibility. Keep it free. Keep it unblemished. Let the strong access the freedom of the wilderness.</p>



Chris Adams		<p>As you work through the various options for future use of the Wasatch, I hope that the voice of the backcountry user will be heard. Unlike most alpine snow sports, this form of winter activity shows significant growth, both in terms of people participating and dollars being spent locally. The existing boundaries of the current 7 ski areas are large enough and should not be expanded any further, whether it's OneWasatch or other expansion. OneWasatch is a silly idea that seems only to be supported by a few locals and SkiUtah as it attempts to remain relevant in the new ski economy/world of the Wasatch. Utah is not Colorado or the Alps and we need to stop attempting to come up with ways to be them. Locals and visitors alike love coming to UT for the great snow and distinct feeling at each resort. There is no data to support that there will be an economic boost by connecting them, and it will further diminish the backcountry ski areas for no real reason. I suggest that discussions of OneWasatch be held off until Canyons and Park City are connected next year and people realize how far it is from the base of Canyons to Jupiter Bowl (and how long it takes to get there). I think that will be a real eye-opener and that support for OneWasatch will decrease after that. As for transportation, there is no doubt that something has to be done about Little Cottonwood as the traffic there gets worse every year. I know that you are considering a lot of options such as increased bus service, trains or a gondola, but the reality is that most of those solutions are not going to help the immediate problem. One idea that I would like to see considered is to put more people into fewer cars, such as by forcing people to have at least 2 if not 3 people in every car that goes up the canyons. That alone would make a big difference on busy days, and while I realize it is a limited solution, it seems like it could be put in place relatively quickly and easily. Thanks for all of your effort on making the Wasatch front the best place it can be.</p>
David Kliger & Phyllis Mandel		<p>My wife and I moved to the Wasatch front from the east coast 3 years ago because the area is so unique in that one can be in the wilderness in minutes yet enjoy all the cultural benefits of living in or near a large city. We ski both at the resorts and in the backcountry and if you look at a map of the terrain you can see there is quite an imbalance between the two. The resorts have taken over a large portion of the Wasatch. We feel it is imperative to preserve what little is left for future generations. Expanding the ski areas will not necessarily increase skier numbers. And if they are increased who benefits? Surely not the residents of the area. The hiking here is also spectacular and so accessible. It would be great if there was access to more terrain. I feel the best investment would be to preserve what wilderness is left to keep this place so special.</p>
Jack Phillips		
Sheldon Smith		<p>A few questions to the people promoting One Wasatch: If I were coming to the Wasatch on a ski vacation, how will you entice me and my snowboarding family to take advantage of this all in one lift experience when 2 of the 7 areas do not allow snowboarders? Being a regular skier in both Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons, how will you entice me to use your lifts on the Park City side of the ridge? It may sound appealing that this ticket offers access to seven unique resorts, but most people gravitate towards what they like and stick with it. How do you plan to get people to branch out? Is this something people actually want and will use? Multiple resorts in a day sounds fun but how will people will feel when they realize most of their time will be spent riding lifts and traversing to get to each of these resorts? With the cost of skiing as it is today, people who like to ski want a lot of bang for their buck. How much skiing can people actually get in a day if they take advantage of this? Is this good value? Say I bought a ticket at the Canyons and made the trek all the way to Snowbird one stormy day and the lifts stopped running due to weather, mechanical failure, etc. What is the plan for getting me and others back to where we started? It is well known that the ski industry has been flat for some time now. How to you intend to fill these chairs and keep them filled? Is this project sustainable? If this plan is really for skiers and snowboarders, please convince me and the rest of the skiing/snowboarding community that this is worth it before you cut down one tree. Otherwise or it should be called One Wasatch. Ms. Sheldon Smith Salt Lake City, Utah</p>
Kevin Wittnebert		<p>I think One Wasatch is a great idea, and ski resort expansion is essential to compete on the global scale.</p>

Nic Van Dyken		<p>I would like to make a formal comment concerning the future development of the Wasatch Mountains. We recently received enough snow to get out and enjoy some skiing/snowboarding this last weekend. With such little snow the options are limited to the most upper north facing elevations holding enough snow to ride. You would think with so much national forest it would be easy to find a nice grassy slope, however this weekend the whole upper elevation north facing aspects in Little Cottonwood Canyon starting at Snowbird all the way up to the very end of the road were closed to "uphill traffic". Leaving the options for quality skiing to a few limited S/W facing, rocky dangerous slopes, while plenty of good terrain that is public land lay only a stones throw away but closed to the public. I believe this is a fair representation of the current imbalance of accessibility in the Wasatch. Current proposals for ski expansion such as the "ONE Wasatch" will only exacerbate the problem. Furthermore, I believe this notion that there is a current need for such expansion is false and similar plans in British Columbia did not generate the increased tourism as promised. This plan is often compared to "mega resorts" found in Europe however the Wasatch is comprised of only a small fraction of the square footage that makes up the European Alps. One is not comparable to the other. What should be considered is that currently the largest growth in the ski industry has been limited to backcountry skiing and snowboarding while the rest of the industry has remained stale. The greatest draw for people looking to come to Utah is the accessibility to pristine National Forest and the quality not quantity of their experience. It should be noted that part of the current "ONE Wasatch" proposal includes closing access to the most heavily visited backcountry winter area of the Wasatch "Grizzly Gulch". This area draws tourist from all over the country to snowshoe, ski, snowboard, take avalanche safety classes, and much more and would be a devastating set back for the general local Utah resident. My wife and I work hard, pay taxes, serve our community in many ways. We drink the water, breathe the air and frequently visit the mountains for play, rest and religion. We represent the voice of the a people most invested in the future of our National Forest. We believe it should be conserved and preserved for our children and other future generations. Not sold, closed and developed for the gain of only a few. We ride the resorts, visit the resorts during the summer and consistently spend money at the resorts but we don't want more resorts with higher ticket prices. It doesn't benefit the average person. Research showed that those people holding a multi-resort passes rarely if ever rode more than one resort a day. Concerning future transportation and congestibility concerns related to the main canyon roads. This problem currently is not systemic and is limited to specific holidays and weekends. Increased buses with more options and a more affordable price would be more realistic and cost effective than light rails and tunnels. Improving current infrastructure should be the main focus.</p> <p>Sincerely, Nic Van Dyken</p>
Josh Beckner		<p>To Whom it May Concern, I would like to emphatically oppose the any development by One Wasatch or any other campaign that promotes more lift service skiing in the Central Wasatch. As it is, we don't have enough undeveloped open space in the Central Wasatch. Once we develop it, there's no going back. I make part of my living by working as a ski guide in this beautiful place. It is one of the main reasons that I moved here with my family. As it is, there is too much development for my personal liking in the Trivalley area. Please don't let One Wasatch move forward with anymore development. Josh Beckner</p> <p>Founder and Director, School for International Expedition Training ExpeditionTraining.org AMGA Certified Rock Guide 760-920-3464</p>
Marisol Sullivan		<p>To Whom this may Concern, I am writing to voice my strong opposition to any development by One Wasatch or any other campaign that promotes more lift service skiing in the Central Wasatch. Undeveloped, open, wild spaces are already limited in the Central Wasatch. It is more difficult to reverse development and backtrack in order to restore an ecosystem than it is to preserve an ecosystem as it currently exists. My husband and I moved to SLC because of the accessibility of such a diverse, beautiful mountain range. My husband is a backcountry ski guide, and we are both avid backcountry skiers and ice climbers. We would like our children - and all future generations- to enjoy the precious pockets of undeveloped land that we currently spend time in and cherish. We also run a small educational non-profit that is dependent on undeveloped tracts of wilderness where we can teach snow science, avalanche awareness, backcountry skiing, mountaineering, ice climbing, and risk-management in such terrain. To be clear -I oppose One Wasatch and urge you to halt any and all development in the Central Wasatch.</p>

Rich Nydegger		<p>We have a gem here in the central wasatch. Something truly unique with a true wilderness so close to a population center. I am firmly against "one wasatch." My opinion is that one wasatch is simply a marketing tool to get out of towners to come to our great state for skiing. Now, I'm not against marketing tools, not at all!- but this marketing tool comes at a great cost to us locals who so much enjoy backcountry travel. Traveling to all 7 resorts via one wasatch means your on a lift or traversing with your skis for a large part of the day, rather than skiing. I wonder how many people would travel to all 7 ski resorts in the central wasatch via one wasatch a SECOND time? Sounds like a pretty cool thing to do, but actually doing it seems like a pretty miserable day to me! To me, this comes at far too great a cost for what we would lose with the development of one wasatch.</p>
Albert Wiebe		<p>I'm writing today to express my concern over the proposed expansion of ski areas in the Wasatch Mountains of Utah. I feel strongly that the mountains need to be kept as natural as possible, and for the access to backcountry for the public, left as open as possible. Please consider the many other parties for the future. I have enjoyed the mountains ever since I first explored them in the '70, with my family, and now I am continuing to share this experience with my own children. There is less and less open space and public access today and we need to consider this as the population expands at an ever increasing rate. This is not an easy task but I hope it is addressed in as complete a fashion as is possible. Thank you for considering the future for all of us, Albert Wiebe</p>
Zinnia Wilson		<p>Thank you to all involved in the Mountain Accord: your dedication to planning for the future of our mountains and our community will benefit everyone who lives or visits the region. I was born and raised in Salt Lake, have used the mountains extensively for hiking, climbing, backcountry skiing, picnicking and (to a lesser extent) resort skiing. General guiding principles in how I believe the wasatch should be managed: -Do not pursue options that limit local, daily quality of life in order to favor economic development and recreation/tourism aimed at the wealthy. Trails over trams!! Our mountains should not be sold to the highest bidder. - It is easier to expand human footprint than reduce it: better to err on the side of land/ecosystem protection. Specific responses to "ideal plans" -Can bus traffic up canyons replace most cars, as seen in Zion NP? -Minimizing car traffic through light rail, bus service, bike lanes, connecting city buses, etc all worth implementing. -Improving trail connections, finishing BST, and creating infrastructure for nonmotorized recreation is of paramount interest. -Link ski resorts only if this can be accomplished with minimal reduction in backcountry ski opportunities. -I value protection of ecosystem integrity even at the expense of economic growth and recreation opportunities. Thanks again for considering public comment and working towards a planned future.</p> <p>Zinnia Wilson 801 793 8201</p>

Sarah Uram		<p>Well, the last 5 minutes is when I seem to get the most done.....I have reviewed the ideal systems for each of the four groups and I am impressed with the thorough consideration that each group has given to the complex issues involved in planning the future of the Wasatch.</p> <p>Here are my comments for each of the four groups: Economy: I am in favor of bringing money into the state through tourism and ski area development. Money will enable us to develop systems that make will allow the Wasatch to continue to be a place that people want to live. But I think the kind of development that we need should carefully consider what makes the Wasatch unique and what will draw people here. The combination of resort skiing and backcountry skiing available here is unique in the world and we need to do as much as we can to preserve and promote that. Ski resorts are a high impact use of our resources and I believe that they can continue to be developed within their existing boundaries. Rather than spread this kind of high impact development to the entire Wasatch, I think it is most useful to continue to develop those areas within existing boundaries. Environment: Preserving our natural environment and addressing our air quality issues are obvious goals. If we don't address our air quality issues, people will no longer want to visit or live here. There are many examples worldwide of effective methods for dealing with these problems. Sprawling development is not a means to accomplishing these goals. Transportation: An effective transportation system has great potential for achieving the goals of addressing our air quality issues as well as promoting economic development. I believe a system of buses with good transit centers where you could park easily and get ready for skiing in a comfortable place would encourage use of buses. I also understand the desire to connect Park City with the Wasatch front. Other mountain communities have built tunnel systems that could provide a model for the Wasatch. It seems to me that the least effective transportation involves getting on a chair lift to get between these places. A tunnel could be open 24 hours and allow people to get where they want to go regardless of the weather. A chairlift and access to the terrain it would serve raises a host of safety issues as well as being inconvenient for families who might have members who are not all able to use ski lifts for transportation. Recreation: Skiing in the Wasatch is unique in many ways. Each of the seven ski resorts has a particular personality and serves distinct clientele. Combining them into one mega resort would be like going to one of those restaurants where the menu is as long as a novel. There are lots of options, and all of them are mediocre. Even though Alta and Snowbird are connected, I think most people ski one or the other on a given day. Going back and forth between resorts is a novelty, but not really a great skiing experience. Furthermore, the safety problems that are increasing as a result of more people venturing into the sidecountry should be given consideration. Utah is already becoming known as a place that is dangerous because of avalanches. Chairlifts across the terrain between the Wasatch back and front would only increase this sidecountry access and visibility and would likely increase the number of accidents. Thanks for all you are doing in carefully considering the future of the Wasatch.</p> <p>Best, Sarah Uram 801-694-2829</p>
Cindy Crass		<p>Thanks for allowing me to chime in. I love the mountains and spend a lot of time there. I would hope that the "pristine" nature could be preserved as much as possible. I also know I am not the only person to enjoy. It would be nice to have more parking for hikers/skiers at the trailheads. I don't know whether this is in your purview or not, but I would also like to see some bicycle paths.</p>
Richard Middleton		<p>This comment is specifically for Laynee Jones: We talked yesterday at the Watershed Symposium about planning for buses in the canyons. I suggested you touch base with one of the people at UTA who knows about the practical issues in routing buses. I talked to my daughter Sarah (who's a UTA driver who has been somewhat involved in route planning), and she told me that her supervisor would be the ideal person. He was a driver for many years, is now responsible for planning, and was involved in the design of the ski bus service. His name is Robert (Bob) Baty, and he can be reached at 801 287 3526 (direct), 801 860 5272 (cell), or rbaty@rideutah.com (email), I hope this helps. Richard Middleton</p>
Suzette Johnson		<p>This is something I that I strongly oppose. I am not a skier any more and never was one to ski in the backcountry. I am a hiker but a hiker who usually doesn't stray off designated trails. But having obstruction in the mountains to me is just like litter. There is no need to build in our pristine mountains. They are a place of tranquil solitude that should be left unscared. There is no need to interconnect the ski system. Who benefits from that? Only the people who make money on the deal. I have yet to come upon one person who likes the idea of building lifts to connect resorts. Leave well enough alone and let there remain a place without human interference. This is something only to make money and for people who only visit our beautiful mountains. It's Utah's mountains and we are here 365 day of the yr, not just a week vacation. I never take for granted the serenity or beauty of being in the mountains and feel so lucky. Mountains, not money.</p>

Matthew Steward		<p>1) Ski Resort Ski Terrain Expansion in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon is a terrible idea. Proposed expansion will result in an irretrievable commitment of public resources that frankly is not tolerable on many fronts - backcountry recreation and watershed are the most pronounced. Retirement of private development rights in favor of ski resort base density increase is seemingly fine, but expansion of skiing terrain is a non-starter. 2) Watershed health and preservation should be paramount of all decision making. The Wasatch Front grows at exponential pace and the Canyons are certainly not producing more water - less in fact given climate change. That said, quality is every bit as important as quantity. I'm at a complete loss to understand how or why watershed protection is evaluated on an equal plane as lift-served ski terrain expansion. Preserve the local resource for all. It should not be degraded in the name of ski resort marketing, profits, and the enjoyment of lifts by a select few - many of whom are from out of state.</p> <p>3) Non lift accessed skiing is growing rapidly. Why destroy the best and most accessible terrain. Please please find some foresight here.</p> <p>4) The "representatives of private property" in the Canyons (i.e. Robinson, Johnson, etc) should be revealed as frauds. They should have NO legitimacy.</p>
Todd Leeds		<p>My comments below encompass all four aspects of the Mountain Accord: Transportation, Recreation, Environment, and Economy. Transportation: It would be a mistake to connect Big and Little Cottonwood with a train, road, tunnel, or aerial device. Each canyon has its own character and a connection between canyons makes the Wasatch a smaller place. The carrying capacity of the canyons may not be able to support the influx of additional visitors. I support the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance Transportation Vision which I authored and is incorporated by reference into this set of comments. I have attached it to these comments as an appendix. Little Cottonwood Canyon Train:</p> <p>A train in Little Cottonwood Canyon has several inherent problems: Environmental Impacts; Viewshed impacts; Costs; Service for dispersed users. The train has a bias for resort users. I would prefer a system that works for dispersed users; The train may form a hard boundary for dispersed users; The train will have to travel through Snowbird, this will delay skiers to Alta and make it a less attractive transportation option; Up to 12 stops may be required for dispersed users; Tourists coming from the airport may require too many modal changes; The train will not eliminate use of the road; and The train will act as a "Trojan Horse" for additional development in the canyon. Tunnels:</p> <p>My tunnel comments are based on my experience as a Professional Geologist with underground mining experience. My experience includes preparation of underground mine water management plans. In my professional opinion, tunnels between the canyons have the following inherent problems; Hydrology, not enough is known. A detailed study should have been conducted prior to introducing the idea of tunnels. This would have confirmed the presence of or lack of fatal flaws. If tunnels are selected as an alternative and a fatal flaw is discovered at a later date, we are back to the drawing board, delaying the process. Water rights, the tunnels may disrupt subsurface flow regimes, this may impact water rights. This is another reason why a study should have been conducted prior to introducing the tunnel idea. Construction and operational dewatering. Treatment plants may have to be built. The tunnels may provide a large influx of visitors which may exceed the carrying capacity of the canyons. The excavation of each tunnel (LCC to BCC and BCC to PC) may require the removal of 30,000 to 70,000 truckloads of rock for each tunnel. This is based on 10 ton loads to increase the safety factor of hauling rock down a steep canyon. The current canyon infrastructure may be overwhelmed by this amount of trucking. The traffic flow at the base of the canyons and in Park City may not be able to handle this amount of truck traffic. Lift tickets should be discounted for using mass transit or driving to resorts with 3 or more in a vehicle. Improving mass transit and discouraging auto use would help S.L County comply with EPA air quality standards. A train from Park City to SLC airport would have significant air quality and economic benefits and would serve a larger segment of the population than a train up Little Cottonwood Canyon. Recreation: I do not support ski resort expansion and One Wasatch. They are unique, world-class resorts that already have a huge imprint on the Wasatch. Dispersed users have been losing ground for 40-plus years. This trend should not continue. Dispersed use has been growing steadily. Dispersed users are not asking for a reduction in ski area size. We are seeking to maintain the current balance. Given the certainty of climate change and the fact that only a minor portion of Utah residents ski or snowboard, resort expansion makes no sense. The impacts to the watershed do not justify resort expansion. A lift up Grizzly Gulch or Flagstaff Mountain will eliminate most of the only high elevation access in upper Little Cottonwood Canyon. I support realigning wilderness to accommodate the Bonneville Shoreline trail. I support buying and preserving private property. Economics: The Mountain Accord must do a full cost benefit analysis to determine the environmental, watershed and socio-economic value of land preservation. This analysis must include valuation of watershed health and quality. The Idealized Scenario appears biased towards the ski resorts. This is not the Idealized Scenario for the general public. Ski area expansion should not be included in the Idealized Scenario. The only benefit of this portion of the scenario are the ski resorts. Preserving watershed health outweighs the benefits of resort expansion. EPA has determined that ski area use is the cause of major impacts to watershed health. Environment The Mountain Accord must work to preserve the water shed and remaining natural habitat of the Central Wasatch Mountains. Additional impacts need to be assessed in a cumulative manner. Thank you for taking the time to address these comments. Please feel free to contact me at anytime if you need further information. Todd Leeds, P.G.</p>
Annie Leys		<p>I would just like to register my opinion about the proposal to link our area ski resorts. I am completely opposed to this idea as I think it threatens the backcountry experience and is totally unnecessary.</p>

Linda Johnson		<p>I worked on Mayors Corroon and McAdams "Blue Ribbon Commission" recently to make recommendations for the SLCO Foothills and Canyons masterplan. At that time, and again now, my recommendation for the Canyons' land preservation were bifurcated. First, investigate (USFS says it will do this; members of the BRC said USFS would not) making land trades with the Forest Service for remote inholdings of lands in the area of discussion. The specific objective would be to give inholdings owners value for their land by trading for properties adjacent to existing resorts. This has happened successfully in other National Forests; I am familiar with White River NF trades in the 1970's. Second, allow expansion of the existing resort areas in the Canyons on the newly traded land, again to give value to the cooperative landowner. The zoning on the newly developable land should be very strict, requiring high density development and providing trip-eliminating amenities (food, pharmacy, gasoline markets for example) for existing residents. The zoning would be similar to the TOD's being recommended in the Wasatch Front's 2040 ET+ planning, or what is known in the trade as neo-traditional zoning. Use expansions would be an implicit part of this. The result would be a guarantee of no further development of many inholdings, plus expanded uses at the resorts to accommodate less active recreation. There are many people who don't really want to recreate on mountain trails, but would actively choose to go to the expanded resorts for family outings. The real wild land, and the watershed, would be much better protected and preserved, and the real outdoors people would find less congestion.</p>
---------------	--	--