

Transportation System Group Meeting #8 Summary October 29, 2014

Vote on Final Idealized System:

I support advancing Transportation Concepts A & D to the Executive Board for consideration in the analysis of combined scenarios.

- 36% Concur
- 39% Concur with minor point of contention
- 6% Disagree with outcome but consent to move forward
- 9% Dissent
- 9% Waive/Abstain

Summary of Dissent on Idealized Systems

- Lack of data. Several representatives believe there is not enough information to make a choice, and are unclear about how the alternatives will solve problems. The context of the other idealized systems is needed to understand how to justify major investments.
- USFS Development in the designated Wilderness Area is a concern with Concept D; USFS
 would be more comfortable if that issue were more clearly addressed.

Some representatives wanted to poll on Concepts A, B, C, and D individually (rather than advance A and D only). By a show of hands, representatives expressed support for the individual Concepts:

- Concept A − 94%
- Concept B 58%
- Concept C 61%
- Concept D − 76%

Summary of Edits to Idealized Systems

Concept D will show a station at the UTA Central Station in downtown Salt Lake City.

Additional Items Discussed

- Moving skiers and others with chairlifts/ski lifts is not part of the proposed Idealized Transportation System.
 - 60% Concur
 - 27% Concur with minor point of contention
 - 7% Disagree with outcome but consent to move forward
 - 7% Dissent
 - 0% Waive/Abstain



 One Wasatch concept may not necessarily be a transportation solution in the traditional sense, but does have some transportation efficiencies that warrant inclusion into future transportation analysis.

Opening Guardsman Pass to year round automobile access is not part of the Idealized Transportation System.

- 30% Concur
- 9% Concur with minor point of contention
- 33% Disagree with outcome but consent to move forward
- 18% Dissent
- 9% Waive/Abstain
- The road is already kept maintained year-round up to Bonanza Flat; the specific section is between Jupiter Peak and Brighton.
- There was vocal support to continue evaluating role of Guardsman Pass road in the future analysis. Much of the debate centered on how the road would function and the type of travel permitted (e.g. transit, HOV, emergency access). By providing secondary access, Guardsman Pass helps achieve one project goal (emergency evacuation). Conversely, vehicle travel through the corridor would increase and potentially go against other project goals.
- UDOT recently completed a study that concluded the costs outweigh the benefits of keeping the road open year round. Physical changes to the roadway and mountain slopes are required, as well as additional staff and new equipment. It was noted that the UDOT study recommended winter closure under the context of a more narrow short-term focus.

Other Comments

- Concern about transporting too many people into the Cottonwood Canyons; noted that the canyons were eliminated as Olympic Venues in 2002 because it was felt that 25,000+ visitors were too large to handle and also a public safety concern.
- Dispersed recreation does not feel served. Not enough emphasis on getting people to the mouths of the canyons.
- These concepts tend to serve ski areas, and dispersed is harder to deal with due to seasonal and spatial variations. Keeping appropriate level of focus on ski areas is important because they consistent draw majority of canyon traffic.
- Concern about changing the character of the place. Preservation should be a key objective, rather than trying to limit SOVs. Concerned about development pressures associated with transportation investment.



- Surprised about lack of knowledge in the communities. Would like to see more effort to inform the public.
- Connectivity and continuous routes are key to get people out of their cars.
 Convenience is a big factor (e.g. cars are used as lockers).
- "Dead end canyons" and need to provide alternative access out of top of canyons.







