

Emailed and Hardcopy Comments Feb. 4 - March 16, 2015	City	Date
Comment	City	Date
<p>As a concerned resident of the Town of Alta, I would like to go on record fully and strongly supporting the Mountain Accord transportation proposal of a Mountain Light Rail system up Little Cottonwood Canyon and eventually connecting to Big Cottonwood Canyon and Park City. I am a homeowner and registered voter in the Town of Alta. I live in the Town of Alta full time year round and my Alta home is my only residence. I have been a voting resident of Alta for nearly 22 years, residing exclusively in Alta since 2002. Living in Alta exclusively gives me an informed, first hand experience with the transportation nightmare we currently face and insight into transportation alternatives that might best meet the needs of the full time residents as well as the recreational visitors to Alta. The following are some specific comments supporting my overall view that a Mountain Light Rail transportation alternative is the best alternative - A Mountain Light Rail system would be most reliable and environmentally friendly form of transportation for Little Cottonwood Canyon able to move large numbers of people up and down the canyon and dramatically reduce the reliance on automobiles. Light Rail, rather than buses is a much more appealing approach to the normal rider and would attract many more people who would be willing to shed their automobiles for a rapid transit alternative. Mountain Light Rail should be able to move residents, skiers, and visitors up and down Little Cottonwood Canyon regardless of weather conditions - totally unlike unreliability that would be expected with bus transit - this condition would be the same even if bus service were to be on a dedicated roadway. As a full-time resident of Alta for years, the frustration and danger of dealing with roads during inclement weather is extreme. - Completion of a Mountain Light Rail system up Little Cottonwood Canyon would make way to ultimately connect Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons. This rail interconnect, along with the inevitable lift interconnect, would dramatically improve the overall Utah (and Alta) skiing experience. - Since there is so little private land available for development in Alta, concerns voiced by some Alta residents about diminishing the "Alta Experience" should be minimized. Alta will remain a small town and needs the best and greatly improved access for both residents and visitors. - Fear of development has long driven Alta politics and appears to be the primary reason for some groups opposing the Mountain Light Rail alternative. Some controlled development in Alta is inevitable - a Mountain Light Rail alternative should be considered independent of development fears and should be focused on what is best to improve the transportation in the canyon for both residents and visitors. - A Mountain Light Rail System connecting the Cottonwood Canyons and Park City would benefit the Town of Alta economically in the non-ski season - a time of year when the hotels in Alta are generally closed. Rapid access to Park City and Big Cottonwood Canyon could attract summer guests and possibly allow for economically viable hotel operation in the summer. - Although costly, a Mountain Light Rail system up Little Cottonwood Canyon connecting to Big Cottonwood Canyon and Park City, in conjunction with a ski lift interconnect, would result in Utah becoming the premier winter sports destination in the country. The economic benefit to all residents of Utah, skiers or not, would be incalculable. Although my comments are limited to the transportation aspects of the Mountain Accord proposal, I strongly support the "Grand Bargain" that is currently under consideration. Thanks for considering my input.</p>	Alta	2/22/2015
<p>When I first heard of the most extreme plan for the transportation section of the Mountain Accord project, the linking of the three central Wasatch canyons by a railway running through two, miles-long tunnels, I was stunned. The proponents see a different mountain range than I do. To me the residents of the Salt Lake valley are blessed with a unique landscape. While most people in other urban and suburban areas have to travel great distances to enjoy a bit of peace and quiet, to revel in a slice of solitude, to romp, and play in a largely unspoiled natural setting, we have the Wasatch at our doorstep. On a visit to Switzerland, like most visitors I was entranced by the rugged landscape and beautiful scenery. I assumed that this was a country that celebrated their good fortune. But nearly every valley, every mountain hamlet was crisscrossed, dominated, by mechanical devices for transport: trains, trams, ski lifts, funiculars. The country began to seem like a great mountain theme park: tame, manicured, and pleasant enough but devoid of any wild feeling, any natural charm. The peaks served as picturesque backdrops for the benefit of the dominant commercial interests. I rode up the Collins chairlift this morning with two visitors staying at the Snowpine Lodge, both first-timers to Alta. The Michigan resident had been distressed to hear that the Snowpine was attempting to expand, lobbying hard to build condos. The Swedish national was even more upset that some were pushing for a railway and tunnel system up the canyon and through the mountains. "I've skied all over the world and this place is unique. There are only a few places like this left. You shouldn't spoil it. You don't know what you've got here. I can't believe I'm 39 and I'm only just now discovering this place". And these two are not alone; I've heard many such unrehearsed testimonials. There are proposals within Mountain Accord that make sense: land swaps, environmental protections, van-service up Mill Creek. As cars and parking are a big problem for Alta and Snowbird there may be smaller solutions that could help: sliding tolls based on the number of riders (single drivers pay more), expanded valley parking, dedicated bus lanes, skier-friendly buses (Park City's system is a good one). But, the grand plan, the "connectivity" proposals, the fervid call to immediate action doesn't convince. I have a concern: the comment period ends March 16th and the Mountain Accord board makes its final "preferred option" decision on April 6th; that seems a short time for each board member to read and consider the many-times-requested comments.</p>	Alta	3/5/2015
<p>My wife and I have been property owners at Blackjack in Alta for the past 20 years and preserving the uniqueness and beauty of Little Cottonwood Canyon is of utmost importance to both of us. We enjoy spending two to three months here every year, both in winter and summer and although we have seen changes in the canyon over those years, what we value most is the lack of development that has proliferated around the Park City area. We appreciate the effort that Mountain Accord is making, particularly bringing so many divergent groups together to try and plan for a reasonable, safe future for the Wasatch. We understand that as a result of that process, compromises will be necessary. We are very much in favor of the land swap that will keep the areas North of route 210, Superior, Flagstaff and Grizzly Gulch wild and free from future development. This is vital to preserving the essence of Little Cottonwood Canyon. We understand that development is inevitable, but we would vastly prefer that any increase in the number of beds in Little Cottonwood be in the form of expansion of the lodges and not replacing them with large condo projects. The transportation plan, however seems over broad and we are not convinced that it's either viable or the best solution to the traffic problems. Rail lines linking all three canyons via tunnels will be very costly and forever change the essence of the wild nature of this area. Additionally, rail may not really solve the transportation problem due to speed issues relating to the steep grade of the canyons and the inflexibility of fixed stations. It seems to us that a much more feasible alternative would be ; in addition to a disincentive for private vehicles, one or two new dedicated buses starting near the existing park and ride on Wasatch Blvd at 6500S and continuing up both Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. If at some time in the future, this solution proves inadequate, rail lines, or some other form of high speed/high volume public transportation could be built on these lanes with little additional impact on the environment and at a cost much reduced from the initial cost of starting with rail. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this process.</p>	Alta	3/8/2015
<p>Greetings, I write to you today as a full time resident of the Town of Alta. I would like to say in short that I am fully supportive of proceeding with the process and eventually implementing the proposals laid out in the Mountain Accord blueprint. It is my opinion that the proposed rail option is the best option for Little Cottonwood Canyon (LCC). This option allows for a partial solution to an overwhelming traffic problem, as well as the possibility of addressing the avalanche hazard presented by the geography of LCC. Rail and associated transportation hubs also would allow for a controlling of environmental impacts presented by the overwhelming number of users in LCC. By unloading people at a designated transportation hub we would also in effect be corralling people in a manner which may ease impacts on other portions of the upper canyon. In regards to a connection to other portions of the Wasatch, I believe that this is a key part of the plan. This connection would allow for not only a alternative transportation option connecting the Wasatch front and back but would also provide for potential increased skier visits and associated economic growth within Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons. This economic growth is certified by limited parking and access to the canyons. Thank you for your time and consideration of my comments.</p>	Alta	3/8/2015
<p>Dear All, My wife and I have been privileged to be able to live in Alta these past 19 years (albeit in 550 sq ft). We love it here for the beauty, the skiing, the hiking, the flowers, the views, and just being in the mountains. Alta is a special place; and people from both around the corner to around the world have a passionate affinity for it. Alta isn't about the shopping, or dining, or cappuccinos, or infrastructure, etc. It's about the easy access to the outdoors and the wildness of this canyon, and sharing it with people who enjoy that experience, also. It doesn't look or feel like any other major destination ski resort. And many people feel, "That's a good thing!" I understand that, with the projected population growth in the Wasatch front and Wasatch back, there will be increasing pressure on the limited resources and "wildness" in between. Mountain Accord has offered up various solutions to control the impacts of that growth to one of the most precious resources we have in Northern Utah. To that end, my thoughts on those proposals: TRANSPORTATION: Both Little and Big Cottonwood canyons are accessed by challenging serpentine roads, especially during weather events. My vote would be for improving the roads by adding dedicated bus lanes and shedding the road where avalanche dangers exist. To have this work, bus service would have to be much more robust and there would need to be incentives (\$) to get people out of their cars and onto the buses. The train option, with 2 long tunnels, would seem to me, to be a very expensive and destructive alternative. Putting in the infrastructure for a major east/west transportation corridor up a canyon as narrow and steep as Little Cottonwood would be very disruptive to the very thing we are trying to save. LAND SWAPS: Swapping private land on the ridges and in Albion Basin for Forest Service land on the valley floor seems like a good alternative to me. It would keep any potential development in the already disturbed areas in the valley and keep it off the hillsides. One problem may be that, without a tunnel, Alta may still want to connect to Big Cottonwood via a lift up Grizzly Gulch. While this may cause the back country community some heartburn, putting in miles long tunnels seems a very expensive and destructive alternative to connect ski areas. I realize that there are many concerned entities and moving parts involved in the decisions going forward. Thank you all for your time, energy and efforts. In the end, we are all trying to preserve this place that we are so fortunate to have in our lives.</p>	Alta	3/8/2015
<p>To Mountain Accord My husband and I have lived in Alta full time from 1996 until 2007 and then 6 months a year from 2007 thru today. There are very few people who live in Alta full time and I wanted to comment on what it is like to live here when the ski season is over. During the ski season the area and the roads are always busy on powder days and usually on the weekends. Mondays thru Thursdays if there is no new snow the traffic volume is low. BUT when Alta closes the last week in April, Alta is deserted. The day after closing there is not even a can of soda left in the Albion Grill. The Lodges close. All the workers head to the desert or their next season jobs. A few patrollers are left to help close down the Ski Area. If there is a snow storm between the close and the first part of July, no one rushes to plow the roads. Adventurous skiers may drive up to hike up the trails before all the snow is gone. Then finally the Summer Road is clear of snow and is opened historically for the Fourth of July. And at this time people from the valley return to Alta to begin the hiking season and to see the flowers in The Basin. My point is that for two months in the spring and again for six weeks from October until mid November very few people come to Alta. It is usually cold and gray during this period. Bus transportation could be provided, but if a train system was built as you have proposed it would not be utilized for some long periods of the year. A train seems to be overkill for the transportation problems of the canyon. Avalanche in both Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons is a problem. Snowsheds might be built to protect the roads. A designated lane for buses could be added to help ease the amount of vehicles moving up the canyons and thru Parleys. Incentives to encourage people to use the buses should be implemented. Part of salaries paid by businesses in the Ski Areas should be bus passes. People should be encouraged to car pool. Charges for parking in the ski areas should be levied. Appropriate bus schedules should be created. There should be buses in the summer and early and late buses all year; buses for hikers that finish their hikes in the evening because there is so much sunlight in the summer evenings, buses in the winter for guests that might want to have an after ski beer at the Peruvian. Bus schedules must fit the needs of the riders. More buses should be added to move guests and workers between Salt Lake and Park City. It seems that we should try to solve the transportation problem with the use of buses before we go thru the great expense of a train system. I am enthusiastic about the land swap between the Forest Service and the Ski Areas. I feel it is so important to the wilderness of the Wasatch to keep Superior, Flagstaff, the Emmas and other proposed wild areas safe from commercial development. And it seems to make a great deal of sense to have the forest service land near the base areas of The Resorts given to the Resorts for commercial development. I hope to see as much backcountry kept wild as possible. Ridgelines interrupted only by trees and rocks and not lift towers. Ski areas connected by ski runs and the desire of the skiers to make the treks themselves. Adventure comes from the excitement and the determination to make it happen. In the winter a beacon, snowshoes or skis is enough to explore the wilderness of the Wasatch. Visitors from all over the world come to ski and play in our mountains. And they have returned because of the unique style and character of our ski areas and our wonderful snow. Too much change may not be needed. As you deliberate on trying to make improvements for how the Wasatch Mountains, the Salt Lake Valley and Park City Area interact, I hope you will not lose the most important concept. And that concept is to deal with growth while protecting our PRECIOUS WILDERNESS.</p>	Alta	3/8/2015
<p>Is the tunnel necessary to fulfilling the goals of the Mountain Accord? Is it going to help people who reside year round in Utah or is it a push for an unneeded tourism "perk" that we will be paying for with our taxes? Do enough people really care that you may be able to go from Alta to Park City underground? It seems to me that the upside of a tunnel/train is minimal compared to the downsides, including that it will probably never pay for itself. The proposed station in Alta, along with the stores and hotel are an abomination to all that Alta stands for. The reason people enjoy Alta so much is for what it is not. Adding train stops, stores and hotels will turn a beautiful canyon into just another overcrowded tourist trap. Water is also, and always will be, an issue. The watershed in that area, along with all watersheds these days, should be protected. With water shortages all over the western part of the US, why would we even be thinking of adding more for an area that doesn't need or want it at this time. Also, has the disturbance from the making of the tunnel been studied enough that we know that it will not affect the flow of water in that area? I am definitely not in favor of the tunnel/train linking Park City, Brighton and Alta. I do, though, understand the need for better transportation up from the valley of Salt Lake. Too many cars crowded onto the treacherous road that winds up Little Cottonwood Canyon produce frustrating traffic jams and smog. The idea of an electric powered (or hybrid) bus with its own lane makes sense. Carving out another lane to an already used road seems to be the least detrimental prospect, both to the pocket book and the environment. The bus/train should be sheltered from avalanche where needed and could be made to be upgraded as rapid transit evolves. The extra lane could be used to bring transit up the mountain in the mornings and down in the afternoons. As the existing lane coming down in the morning is almost empty, the buses could use that lane to complete the round trip allowing more than one bus up and down the canyon at a time. Vice versa in the afternoons. With water becoming an ever more fought-for commodity, it would be a shame to give it as an incentive to expand tourism into a beautifully natural area. Once "the genie is out of the bottle" you can never put it back in. Please don't ruin a beautiful, environmentally sensitive area just for a resort!</p>	Alta	3/9/2015
<p>I have lived and recreated in Alta for the last 49 years, having arrived from NYC after college. I fell in love with Alta, and chose to make it my home. My husband arrived in Alta over 60 years ago, and was Mayor of Alta for 34 years. To quote Bill, "It is no accident that when people refer to Alta as their 'spiritual home', it is Albion Basin that is foremost in their minds. Its pristine beauty, myriad of wildflowers, lush wetlands, crystal streams, variety of mountain wildlife, and awesome mountain peaks remain familiar to the thousands of people who have visited this uniquely beautiful place. Some of the reasons why I treasure Alta are these: Alta's unique 'top of the canyon' character; open spaces and beautiful views; our quiet and less developed charm is one of Alta's economic strengths; its rich history; wildlife habitat - I could go on and on. And WE PROTECT WHAT WE FALL IN LOVE WITH. I applaud Mountain Accord's stated purpose, as a planning effort to address issues of the future. However, with regard to Little Cottonwood Canyon, I disagree with the 'solution' of a train and a tunnel. In your "Proposed Blueprint Schedule Update" of 3/11/15, under "Why Mountain Accord" you say without coordinating actions for now and the future, the qualities valued most in the Central Wasatch - clean water, open space, and the beauty of nature - will slowly disappear. You will forever change the entrance to Albion Basin by constructing a rail line to go through a tunnel to Big Cottonwood Canyon and on to Park City. The destruction of 'clean water, open space and the beauty of nature' will NOT happen 'slowly' - it will happen VERY QUICKLY, AND WITHOUT REVERSAL. Under "Economy" you say; Compact development patterns centered around transit would limit sprawl in urban and mountain areas. It would also allow economic activity - such as workforce, tourist, and resident commerce - to reduce reliance on automobiles. These are key ways to protect the character of our places and the quality of life we enjoy, and to ensure a vibrant economy. In order to 'protect the character of our places (Alta) and the quality of life we enjoy' it is my opinion that a train and a tunnel would ruin Alta's unique 'vibrant economy'. People come to Alta to get away from those things, i.e. trains &amp; tunnels. The most attractive alternative, both financially and environmentally, is the Bus Rapid Transit/BRT. Let's be practical! You also say: • Focus most future development in urban areas, as identified in Wasatch Choices 2040. • Provide the option for a car-free experience for residents, workforce, and visitors. Future development in my opinion would be better done, as YOU say, in URBAN AREAS. Alta is NOT an 'Urban area'. I am most concerned about preserving our 'community character and quality of life'. The 'transit solution' that I feel best suits our community is an enhanced Bus system, or Bus Rapid Transit/BRT.</p>	Alta	3/11/2015

<p>Hi All: Sorry for the extremely impersonal e-mail. I just discovered you have a town council meeting in about an hour and a half and wanted to get my thoughts to you - John Bird The Mountain Accord – a planning process to envision the fate of the Cottonwood Canyons and Park City is well underway. The process began over a year ago with the idea of bringing all the constituencies together to formulate a mutually acceptable blueprint for the future of the core Wasatch. Unfortunately rather than an open public process with appropriate deliberation it disappeared out of site and was presented to the public several weeks ago as completed document. My comments below pertain primarily to the proposed land swap in Little Cottonwood Canyon. The influence of lobbyists interested in development is obvious and ignores the reality of how most users interact with Little Cottonwood Canyon. I will attempt to provide bullet points of specific concerns. My understanding is that the specifics of the plan are changing almost hourly at this point but the land swap appears to be one portion of the plan that as of yet has not been changed. Unless we all speak out Alta as we have come to know and love it will likely disappear. The Mountain Accord as written includes a land swap where mountainside lands owned by the Alta Ski Lift Company, mostly in the Emma area, will be exchanged for Forest Service lands in the Alta base area. There are several significant problems with this. The swap may include all the public parking in Alta. If the deal goes through all users of the surrounding National Forest Land would be required to park on land and in lots owned by a private owner. It is not a stretch to imagine that before long this parking could either be restricted (in winter to those purchasing Alta lift tickets for example) and/or require a parking payment, summer and winter, to park and access the surrounding public lands. It is a really bad idea to limit public access to public lands which could be a consequence of the land swap as currently drafted. The swap sets the stage for the possibility that a private owner could charge a "backcountry fee" for visitors who wish to use the town of Alta as a starting point for their ski tour, hike or climb. For that matter the private owner would be in a position to charge a "viewing fee" for those who just want to be up in Alta to soak up the scenery. The exchange would open up significant parts of the Alta base for further development. The various consultants involved in the project believe that land is not useful unless it holds a town square, retail areas, food and other concessions, and even office space. They do not understand that visitors to Alta are not there to shop or for robust night life. They are there specifically because Alta is not cluttered with those things. This is evident most every weekend in the summer. The parking lots are full but the one restaurant that is open in the summers almost always has seats available. But the trails are busy. In the summer visitors to Alta are there to enjoy the wonderful outdoor environment with their friends and family. They are not there to shop and eat. The consultants and the moneyed interests pushing the vision of expanded development in the Alta base area have no idea what we value in Alta. They presume that we as users wish there were more shopping, dining and man-made recreation opportunities (one design envisioned by the consultants includes an indoor ice rink). We need to speak out loudly and often to ensure that the committees drafting this plan, and our local, state and national legislators, know that we actually like Alta the way it is: relatively undeveloped with public lands and public access for all. It is that relative wildness that makes Alta special. The Alta Lift Company, at public hearings, has insisted that we have no intention of limiting user access – that the land and access is open to all. Yet this has not been their record – ask the homeowners in Albion Basin who used to be able to access their cabins via a dedicated snow cat road at any time of day or night and now have had that access limited by the lift company to early morning and evening hours. Or ask those who enjoy snowboarding about limited access (for the record I don't snowboard). The land swap would make Alta a company town. Owned by a private owner. With orphan businesses stuck within and dependent on the private owner for access and survival. Do we really want to take a functioning municipality that has protected, preserved and enhanced this treasure for several decades and turn it into a single corporation? The Grizzly area (Twin Lakes Pass around to Emma) where the Alta runs their cat skiing operation is land owned by the ski lift company. They have made no secret of their desire to eventually develop lifts in the area. While this would be a loss to the thousands of hikers, runners and backcountry ski and snowshoos who use the area it would also have the effect of turning Silver Fork into difficult to access backcountry at best and Alta Ski Lift sidecountry at worst. The plan does not address this issue; it says the Grizzly area is still under negotiation.</p>	Alta	3/12/2015
<p>I live and work in Alta. Transportation is the biggest change we need to see. A gondola or train would be ideal, only if we can fund it. In the mean time, there are quite a few things we can do. First, we can improve the bus service in Little Cottonwood. The bus service has limited times, so a larger variety of times would help ridership. We can also have a fee for driving LCC. A reasonable solution would be a base fee, with discounts for carpools, and people working and living in the canyon. In order to make non-automobile transportation solutions viable, we need a culture shift as well. People are obsessed with their cars. If a gondola, train, or bus can offer wi-fi and comfort, I believe the longer ride times could be cancelled out. If you could get work done on your commute, that would be preferable to waiting in traffic. I would like more of a look into a gondola up LCC versus a train, bringing in the aspects of cost of construction, actual ride times, and environmental impact. As far as the gondola or train goes, terminating in Alta would be best. If there is a train (or other transportation solution) between Park City and Salt Lake City, I see no reason why Alta should have to connect to Park City. How do you put a price on the uniqueness and community of Alta, Brighton, and Park City as separate locations? Making it easier for people from the Wasatch Back to access LCC may be easier from a transportation perspective. However, it will put stress on water, recreation, and other resources. I believe the experience, qualitatively, would be diminished by making easier access to LCC. If the Wasatch Back is looking for mountain recreation opportunities, non-motorized access to the canyons should be developed, as well as less crowded destinations in the Uintas. Pertaining to water supplies, I understand the need to keep our drinking water clean. I think this is an issue that the Salt Lake Valley, Provo, and Park City needs to get involved on. The water should be used for drinking, and water waste such as watering lawns should not be allowed, especially as these past four winters have been pretty slim. It would be great to see education on water supplies in Utah and the West, and the fact that the water is not endless.</p>	Alta	3/12/2015
<p>All, Over the past fifteen years my wife and I have enjoyed Alta, so much so we now spend five month here each year. Over that period of time many chances have occurred to Alta. The increased traffic and utilization of the natural resources Alta offers has been degrading the "Alta experience" for some time. We believe the current recommendations in the Mountain Accord proposals offer the best opportunity to stem the tide of uncontrolled change (degradation) of the natural resources which occur daily. We understand your reticence to embrace the "light rail" (train) recommendations contained in the current Mountain Accord proposals. However, we believe the "light rail" transportation option is the best long term environmental solution to the continual degradation of the canyon, Salt Lake City and Utah. In addition, we do not believe a connection between Alta and Park City, in any form, makes sense. We think you should keep an open mind with respect to the Mountain Accord transportation and other recommendations until an EIS is completed. As an old Greek philosopher said, "The only thing that is permanent in life is change". How we manage that change is our future and our legacy. Alta is a very special place we all love and enjoy. We should not be afraid of either change or the future! As the population of Utah grows, the desires of current and new residents to enjoy all that Alta and the Wasatch range offers will inevitably increase. The Mountain Accord proposals make tremendous sense to protect and preserve what we all care about for the long term. Please keep an open mind and don't be "NIMBYS" during your deliberations. Thank you for the time and commitment you have all made to this process.</p>	Alta	3/13/2015
<p>I do not favor the connection of the seven resorts over the mountain ridges via chairlifts or trams. In fact, I do not favor connecting either Little Cottonwood Canyon or Big Cottonwood Canyon to Park City in any way.</p>	Alta	3/14/2015
<p>Dear Mountain Accord Comment Gatherers, I have been an employee of Alta for the past decade. Recently, I went on a 2 week ski vacation to Chamonix, France. My experience there gave me greater insight into the possibilities that exist for changing how we live in our mountain setting here in the Wasatch. Chamonix has a few things figured out that we could adopt here. Firstly, bus service: there are 17 different ski bus routes that each go to different areas along the Chamonix valley, servicing 6 separate ski resorts and several other attractions. During the morning and again around the time the lifts close, the buses visit each stop every 15 minutes. During mid-day and after the lifts have closed, they come every half-hour. They don't stop for long, with each stop lasting perhaps 30 seconds, or less. These bus lines are not to be confused with the city buses, which have even more stops and can take you anywhere you need to go in town. It was very easy to move around, and I never once wished we had a car. Because the buses ran late into the day, it was possible to enjoy yourself apres skiing without worrying over missing the last bus. Here in LCC, I have to drive if I want to do anything after work. The bus stops running so early. The frequency of bus service is too low. And there are too many stops. With several lines established, one could select a bus that, for instance, bypassed Snowbird entirely if one didn't need to stop there. And, they need to go to more park and ride locations in the valley, which would then intersect with better routes within the city. Secondly, like here in the Wasatch, the ski resorts in Chamonix are at elevations high above the valley floor. Rather than blazing roads up the mountainsides to each and every resort, instead each area is serviced by a base lift of one kind or another, either gondola or tram. The bus stops at the very base of the mountain, the people get out and buy a lift ticket, then load the lower lift to be brought up to the base facility of the resort. No roads to plow and maintain for avalanche safety up to each resort. At the end of the day you have two choices for getting back to the bus. One is to take the tram or gondola that you rode in the morning back down. The other is to ski down via a long single groomed run. I have heard that one proposal for the Wasatch involved a tram from the 94th park and ride up to White Pine. As a stand-alone idea, that sounds quite foolhardy. However, if instead the base of the tram was closer to the mouth of the canyon (like inside the "Golden Triangle") and then went all the way up to Snowbird, that would make a lot of sense. I have heard that the stop was proposed for White Pine because of the curve in the canyon. I would suggest that just like when going up to the Aguilu de Muñi, you could take two trams to get there, one tram to White Pine, land on a small plaza, then take another tram up to the top. This would allow people to go all the way up, or to stop at White Pine which is such a popular spot for recreation outside the resorts. I would see this system running year-round. From Snowbird, you could board a bus or cog train that would leave directly to Alta. The road would be reserved for emergency vehicles and deliveries. And, like in Chamonix, there could be a single groomed run that went at least back to the base of Snowbird to re-load the upper tram. A third mode of transportation in the Chamonix valley is the Montevensers cog train, which winds its way up to the Mer de Glace glacier. It could work as well as a tram system here in the Wasatch to convey people up to the resorts. Ironically, it would be a return to the first route of mechanized transportation in LCC. Just as the miners utilized cog train technology to their benefit, we could have a nice train route up the canyon that made stops at sidings, to allow other trains to pass. Just as you could have a variety of bus lines, you could also have a variety of train lines, some bypassing Snowbird, others stopping everywhere. The train lines in France do cross available to the public. They have concrete snow-sheds that are open on the leeward side that seem to do the trick just fine. In sum, the main lesson I learned from visiting Chamonix is that using cars to get around as we do here in the Wasatch is a really dumb thing to do. It's polluting, it's more dangerous, it's inconvenient to park, it's expensive to maintain, and with all the avalanches and restricted driving days we have in LCC, it's just so ineffective all around. Looking at a place like Chamonix could provide a baseline for what is possible. It's a system that works. It's also a system that works in one of the world's premier ski destinations. And, last I checked Salt Lake City and the surrounding area is trying to be just that. Besides, just imagine what we could do with all the parking lot space up at Alta if we didn't need it for cars! The town could build it's town center in the Albion lot instead of the proposed location that happens to be in a wetland. We could have a picnic plaza that is below the summer road or just restore the land back to viable habitat. ☺</p>	Alta	3/15/2015
<p>After reading the Wasatch Mountain Accord, we agree that action must be taken to reduce traffic in Little Cottonwood Canyon, improve our guest experiences when they visit, take care of our natural resources and support land use goals to reduce concentrated development.  We've heard that LCC averages 5,000 cars daily in the winter, that congestion coupled with heavy snow makes for very dangerous road conditions for the people that visit.  We think either the Bus Rapid Transit or the Light Rail Transit is viable in their conception. We do need to make visiting LCC a more enjoyable experience to all our guests and we believe that the Light Rail Transit would provide a more unique experience for the winter or summer traveler to LCC. We think this would, with proper snow shedding or constructing on a less dangerous route, be the best alternative for LCC.  Tunneling between canyons would also improve on traffic egress during storms and improve public safety during natural disasters. If we had egress through both top and bottom of our canyon, the infamous 'Red Snake' would be a thing of the past.  The forest service could also think of implementing a small 'token' charge that would go towards road maintenance. Something on the order that Millcreek Canyon does.  One thing that some guests to LCC mention is that we have no shopping or nightlife. If we had a LRT system in place they would be able to stay in Alta and do their shopping or dine out for the evening in Park City or Salt Lake Valley. We would also enjoy having more people having easier access to Alta to experience the mountain. This would allow the town of Alta to increase it's revenue.  The 'frenzy' of either 'skiing Alta' in the winter or 'hiking Alta' in the summer will not go away! We definitely need to improve our transit system in the Cottonwood Canyons and through to Park City.  We am very much in favor of the Light Rail Transit option that the Mountain Accord has in its visions and goals.</p>	Alta	3/15/2015
<p>Hello, I have lived in Alta full time since 1998. I am generally in favor of the proposed blueprint. It is essential that the ski areas be allowed to grow, within reasonable parameters. In the face not only of rising operating costs, but dramatically rising lift prices their continued economic sustainability depends on more skier visits. The impact of this growth on canyon residents, the people of Salt Lake, as well as the visitor experience needs to be carefully weighed, as you are all clearly doing. For me the transportation plan is paramount. I am in favor of the train and think several of the alignments through Alta make good sense. I think it should be electric, and if we really had it together it would be "charged" by hydro power or any other commercially viable renewable source. In Zermatt they have a large hydro project which powers everything from the trains to the hotels, and all of the other business within the valley. I doubt Hydro on Little Cottonwood Creek has quite that much potential, but it certainly has enough potential to power a canyon train. To me bifurcating the issue of mode of transportation system and the tunnel to Park City makes sense. They are really two different things. I would rank the tunnel as a low priority. I don't see very much about the ski areas or the public committing to more parking? This should be a very high priority regardless of weather or not a bigger mass transportation system is built. We are way behind the curve now with respect to parking. There are some in the community that would prefer not to see this plan adopted. I disagree. Now is the time to address the future of the canyons. The people will continue to come in ever increasing numbers regardless of what we do. By planning now for the future we can make a huge difference in the quality of experience for residents and visitors alike, for generations to come. Best of luck to you all</p>	Alta	3/16/2015
<p>I agree "If we do not take action today, one of Utah's most important resources could be lost." (Mtn Accord, Blueprint, page 4, response to Why question.) In addition, "[g]rowing population[s] and visitation[s]... development[s] and congestion as well as [ ] climate [change] are [adding] increase[d] pressure on sensitive mountain environments and our quality of life." (Id.) These concerns are not mitigated by MORE visitors, ensuring greater access, nor a "world-class transit system to connect the Wasatch Front's ... economy to the specialized economies of Park City, Summit, and Wasatch Counties..." through Little Cottonwood Canyon. Protecting watershed and water resources is critical for the natural environment and the people, plants and animals that depend on water. The US Forest Service has been a steward of the "forests," Wasatch-Cache-Uinta National Forest. Already in place are restrictions on uses and users: travel for summer and winter is restricted. Fees are charged for campsites and reservations are required as the resource is limited. Recreational snowmobiling is not allowed, but mechanized and non-mechanized skiing opportunities are monitored and controlled in both area and numbers. Parking restrictions have limited the users and result in a quality experience for those users. Water and sewage have been allocated for those uses and numbers. Allowing ever increasing access and more visitations, with the goal of limiting congestion in transit, does not ensure quality of life, environmental protection, clean water, and the beauty of nature. "Open space" becomes quickly engulfed and overwhelmed when access is open to all. While limited or no development may be present in the "open space," no "backcountry" experience will be experienced when trails are inundated by an un-restricted number of people. Congestion is moved into the canyons and the "transit-oriented development/recreation hubs." From those points, people will move outward. Disneyland changes into Nightmare on 13th. Transporting people from the Valley into the canyons and the Wasatch Back, simply moves the congestion. Will personnel need to be present at the transportation hubs to direct those unfamiliar; will travel usage still cluster around the peak times creating rush hours, requiring people to leave their beds earlier and earlier to secure a seat, or stay late for the same reason; will there be adequate water for all the visitors to drink and sanitation to remove the increased sewage; will there be sufficient municipal services to haul the additional trash out of the canyons,</p>	Alta	3/7/2015

<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>Here are some of my thoughts about the train and rail-line proposal from the Blueprint and the "Proposed Cottonwood Canyons Land Package."</p> <p>An oral tale describes an intruder taking advantage of "natural" offerings when happening to come across a cabin in the woods. "Goldilocks and the Three Bears," as it was later called, first published in 1837 by Robert Southey, shows the trespasser finding matters just to her liking, going inside the cabin, eating the porridge, sitting in the chair, and finally, falling asleep in a bed; all because they were "just right." The story evolved from the intruder being an old, ugly woman into a pretty, but thoughtless child, the three bachelor bears into an anthropomorphic family of father, mother and baby bear, while the ending, changing from the intruder running away into the woods, being nearly eaten by the bears, to being impaled on St. Paul's Cathedral steeple.</p> <p>The nursery rhyme teaches young children to be wandering in the woods, and to respect the property of others. Are these lessons for us as we consider the Central Wasatch and how to plan for the future? Are these mountains ours to use and consume, or do they belong to us in trust for future generations? The future forecast in the Mountain Accord, and elsewhere assumes ever increasing local population growth, increased needs and demands for outdoor recreation, increased demands for culinary water, increases in tourist visits for the "Greatest Snow on Earth," winter inversions and the resulting poor air quality in the Salt Lake Valley along the Wasatch Front. Either obliquely or "covered elsewhere," is the inexorable decline in the snowpack in the Western Region due to global climate warming trends. All 17 state-of-the-art climate models used by Columbia University's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory forecast deeper and longer U.S. droughts. Comparing these models with tree ring data from a 1000-year drought history record, suggests with an 80% likelihood, that "at least one decade-long megadrought will hit the region between 2050 and 2100." (Emily Underwood, "Models predict longer, deeper U.S. droughts," Science, 13 February 2015, vol. 347, issue 6223, page 707.)</p> <p>Mountain Accord's stated planning time frame is to 2040. Assumptions include ever increasing influx of both Salt Lake City residents and tourist, prevalent snow, abundant recreational opportunities for all comers, as well as adequate water for all users and uses.</p> <p>Mountain Accord purports to address problems identified as the lack of the ability to quickly access the Wasatch, inadequate parking, the economic need for expansion of ski resorts, the need for more beds for guests in Little Cottonwood Canyon, the need to transport people from Park City to and from the Cottonwood Canyons to ski during the day and sleep where they started at night.</p> <p>First, the Blueprint horizon is "near-term," and consequently foreshadows land acquisition, even when the parties are willing, takes years. (E.g., Alta is being deeded acreage from the U.S. Forest Service on which its Town buildings sit. All parties are willing, yet that process from negotiation onward, is taking years.) After, or even simultaneously with that process, studies and even NEPA impacts would need to be studied of potential alternatives to the proposed rail line, tunneling, etc. That process, and any follow-up legal actions would likely further delay implementation of the plan. Once a plan were approved, request for proposals for the construction would likely take many months if not a year or more. Once the contract is let, the construction timeframe for a rail line and tunneling is certainly unknown, but likely lengthy. Even Seattle's "Big Bertha" tunneled itself into a position that was not anticipated. After only 4 months drilling, it got stuck and has remained stuck for 14 months at only 1000 feet into her 1.7 mile tunnel. Story from December 2014: <a href="http://www.popularmechanics.com/technology/infrastructure/a11678/bertha-seattle-tunnel-boring-machine-still-stuck-17517311/">http://www.popularmechanics.com/technology/infrastructure/a11678/bertha-seattle-tunnel-boring-machine-still-stuck-17517311/</a>; story updated February 2015: <a href="http://dailywu.com/archive/2015/02/01/opinion/big-bertha-testing-seattles-limits.VOpsEMQ78o">http://dailywu.com/archive/2015/02/01/opinion/big-bertha-testing-seattles-limits.VOpsEMQ78o</a>. And the State of Washington has already spent \$1 billion of the \$1.4 billion budgeted for the entire contract. (Id.)</p> <p>Second, the Blueprint is touted as focusing on and "addressing" projected increases in population. This may well be the forecast for the stated timeframe.</p>	<p>Alta</p> <p>2/25/2015</p>
<p>References are to Proposed Cottonwood Canyons Land Package—For Public Consideration The Cottonwood Canyon Task Force has proposed a very significant land swap in Little Cottonwood Canyon that cedes to Alta Ski Lifts currently public land that could then be used for development. I have termed this "the plan to end Alta as we know it," I strenuously object to this plan. Purported advantages of this plan are [page 2]:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Station stops on a mountain-rail system which would provide reliable, fast, unique, and marketable transit to the resorts and to major dispersed recreation access points. The canyon road would still be open to vehicular traffic. 2. Approximately 288 acres for base-area management and future development (with new culinary water for up to 108 units at Alta) to support activity at transit stops. 3. Additional water for snowmaking. I reject advantage #1 because I feel a mountain-rail system is a poor idea: it is unnecessary, under-utilized, very intrusive, far more expensive than other alternatives, and disruptive to the region. My detailed argument will be contained in a separate comment. With regard to professed advantages #2 and #3, Alta has traditionally been characterized by low density construction with commercial development limited to a few lodges, necessary ski area facilities, and the rest of the area around the lift bases open. That is a quality that very few recreation areas enjoy and is one of Alta's most attractive features, to both residents and visitors. Moving a significant amount of land, on relatively flat terrain, from public to private hands, opens the door to build-up and threatens the character of the Town. This is made worse by allocation of additional culinary water to facilitate development, which in turn opens the door to water allocation to private lands elsewhere in Alta, particularly the Albion Basin further degrading the pastoral nature of Alta. Changing the water allocation in Alta from that which has been in place since 1976 will lead to destruction of much of the quality that makes this place unique. Further, moving currently private land on the north side of the canyon (Superior through Grizzly Gulch) into Forest Service ownership opens the door to ski area expansion because the Forest Service could then expand Alta Ski Lifts' special use permit to include those lands. Currently that area is protected by Town of Alta zoning, namely FR40. Should these parcels move to public ownership, they would be no longer be subject to Town zoning hence exempt from local control. particularly additional lift served skiing, in reality it does just the opposite. While the current federal administration may not be in favor of such expansion, a future administration might. An example is the BLM opening land tracts for oil and gas development under the Bush administration, lands that were reserved under previous administrations. Once the land has been converted from open to developed, there is no turning back. I fear that that the forces of business, briefly stated "more is better" will overcome the common good and create something whose public value is far less than it is today. Alta is a treasure that is increasingly rare in this country. Let's not destroy it. My fervent hope is that the Mountain Accord exercise will serve as a wake up call for this region. <p>Shall we take the path toward more crowding, more pollution, more environmental damage, more degradation of the Central Wasatch with marginal stops to lessen the damage, or shall we</p> </li></ol>	<p>Alta</p> <p>2/13/2015</p>
<p>All page references are to Existing Conditions &amp; Future Trendlines of the Economy System. The most distressing element of the Mountain Accord undertaking starts right in the beginning:</p> <p>Current conditions and future trends, namely the huge increase in population. Population in the project area counties has doubled in the 30 years between 1970 and 2000. [ Fig. 2, p 6] And this trend continues: "Utah's population has experienced consistently high growth, which has outpaced national growth rates continuously for several decades. According to the U.S. Census and Utah Governor's Office of Management and Budget, between now and 2040, population is anticipated to grow about 58 percent statewide, from approximately 2.90 million to 4.57 million. In Salt Lake County, the anticipated growth will be slightly slower because developable land is scarcer. Summit and Wasatch counties, on the other hand, are anticipated to have steeper population growth rates than Utah as a whole:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Salt Lake County: 3.08 million to 3.51 million (an increase of 42 percent)</li> <li>• Summit County: 38,000 to 71,000 (an increase of 86 percent)</li> <li>• Wasatch County: 26,000 to 59,000 (an increase of 123 percent)" [p. 26] The Utah legislature's projection is even more dramatic. Starting from just over 1 million people in 1970, their estimate is that the state will reach 3 million people this year and 7 million by 2060, a seven-fold increase in 90 years. [OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH AND GENERAL COUNSEL, Utah's Population, February 2014, <a href="http://le.utah.gov/lrgc/briefings/PopulationBriefing2014.pdf">http://le.utah.gov/lrgc/briefings/PopulationBriefing2014.pdf</a>]</li> </ul> <p>The impact of this staggering population growth is acknowledged, for example, "Even so, it is considered possible that crowding, user conflicts, traffic and parking congestion, or degraded recreation infrastructure conditions are placing some resources near capacity, and perhaps causing lower-quality experiences. This may be supported by the 2010 Wasatch Canyons Tomorrow survey, which found that 62.5% of respondents believe the Wasatch Canyons are already overused (Evison Utah 2010)." [p. 31]</p> <p>At the same time, it appears that the authors embrace this growth as in, "Long-term, steady growth of a population, total employment, and real personal income usually indicate a prosperous economy." [p.6] Somehow the enormity of the problem seems to be lost. Indeed the whole rest of the report</p>	<p>Alta</p> <p>2/13/2015</p>
<p>Very disappointing that the Alta Community was not treated to a question &amp; answer session. I also feel that specifics of the proposals are not well-spelled out enough for the public to make an informed decision about each aspect of the Blueprint. I'd like to thank everyone involved in their efforts so far but would appreciate specifics, especially with alignments and methods of connecting the</p>	<p>Alta</p> <p>2/23/2015</p>
<p>References are to Transportation Corridor Purposes and Alternatives. Mountain Accord's preferred transportation alternative is a rail line up Little Cottonwood Canyon then tunneling to Brighton and Park City. It is purportedly responsive to a set of purposes repeated below. Unfortunately there is not a side-by-side comparison of another alternative. For purposes of discussion, let us term the rail alternative Plan T. And let us consider another alternative, Plan B, that widens some of the road up LCC to the tree lanes, with the third lane dedicated to bus service during periods of high traffic. From an Alta perspective, presented here are the ability of Plans T and B to meet each of the objectives identified by Mountain Accord: Objective 1. Protect watershed health, water supply, and water quality. Plan T: Does far more damage to the watershed because it builds a new, separate right of way that scars the land, potentially unearths toxic minerals and disrupts the current hydrological system. Plan B: Much less disruptive to the watershed. Approximately 25% of the LCC road is currently 3 lanes so the additional construction is far less than a new rail line. Objective 2. Provide competitive transit service in the corridor. Plan T: Presumably in this context, "competitive" means cost competitive. Plan T cannot possibly meet this goal. It is by far the most expensive alternative. Fares could never cover the operating cost, let alone recover the capital. Plan B is surely much less expensive. Objective 3. Reduce avalanche-related risks and delay in Little Cottonwood Canyon. Plan T: This presumes that a rail line can be better protected from avalanche risks than a road, presumably by snowsheds. Plan B: Similar protection could be applied to the road instead for similar investment. Objective 4. Provide new evacuation options from both Cottonwood Canyons Plan T: A tunnel does this. But what is the magnitude of the problem that one is protecting against? In the last 20 years, there has been one night in which all who wanted to were not able to exit LCC and were forced to overnight there. That is 1 day out of the last 7000+ days. All the rest of the time, the system in place was able to handle the situation, admittedly with considerable delay on about a dozen days each year. It is impossible to justify a tunnel to the east on the grounds that it provides and evacuation route. In this regard, Plan T is a solution looking for a problem. Plan B: Plan B does not meet this unnecessary objective. Objective 5. Reduce auto use and congestion in Little Cottonwood Canyon. Plan T: might do that if people will move out of their cars and on to a train. Plan T assumes that will happen without evidence that it will. Plan B: Under the same assumptions so would Plan B for far less money. Objective 6. Reduce vehicle emissions in the Cottonwood Canyons to improve air quality. Plan T: Given the assumption above, Plan T would indeed reduce vehicle emissions in LCC, but presumably a train is electric which means there is a generator somewhere and that generator is generally fossil fueled which produces emissions at the generation site. So the effect is to move the emissions out of LCC and put them elsewhere—locally good but globally no gain. Plan B would also reduce vehicle emissions since buses are cleaner per passenger mile Plan B would do this. Objective 9. Create unique, attractive "traveler experience" to increase tourist and resident visitation. It is true the riding a train would probably be more attractive to tourists than riding a bus, but is it worth the cost? But "increasing visitation" is counter to objectives 1, 13 and 14. Objective 10. Improve access and connections for pedestrians and bicyclists. Plan T: A rail line, once built is an immovable object. Pedestrians who are not near it are unlikely to use it. Plan B: Buses are more flexible than trains as routes can be easily changed to meet demand. Bikes can be carried on buses as well as trains. Objective 11. Improve travel reliability in inclement weather. Plan T: This presumes a more robust avalanche protection and snow clearing program for a train than for a road. If tracks are covered with snow, a train can't go around the blockage, whereas a road, with even one lane open, provides some flow. There is no evidence that a train up LCC is more reliable than a road given comparable snow protection measures. Objective 12. Provide competitive transit service to a range of recreation destinations and economic nodes. Again "competitive" implies cost competitive. This can't be true for Plan T. Plan B can provide cost competitive transit service. Objective 13. Protect or enhance the natural and scenic resources of the Cottonwood Canyons. Plan T it will do nothing of the sort. Adding a rail line with concomitant infrastructure such as snowsheds is the antithesis of "protecting and enhancing the natural and scenic resources." Plan B does less damage than Plan T. Objective 14. Protect and enhance community character.</p>	

<p>Plan T: As to community character, turning Alta into a rail stop is just the opposite of "protecting and enhancing community character." One of the most attractive feature of Alta is that it has little development, with large natural open spaces—that is its unique and irreplaceable character. Plan B: Plan B meets this objective better than Plan T. And who benefits from this rail system? Day skiers coming to LCC from the Wasatch Front might use it, but because of their inflexibility rail transit systems built in urban environments have been notoriously unsuccessful in attracting ridership, even when used every day. Imagine a day skier that starts his journey from the valley to LCC from more than an easy walk to a rail stop, say more than one block. Is this person going to load his equipment in the car, drive to a train station parking lot, unload, wait for a train, get on board with his equipment, then unload at the top end, only to go through this inconvenience in reverse on the return? Of course not. That person will load up his car and drive to as close to his destination as he can. The proportion of skiers using the current buses vs private cars today illustrates that reality. Would this rail system bring more customers to the LCC ski areas? Perhaps, but at great expense. Although not explicitly stated, this rail system will be built with taxpayer funds primarily to enhance the economic welfare of the businesses in the canyon. Do the taxpayers of Utah really gain? Only a small fraction of the Utah populace ski as noted by Carl Fisher in City Weekly, February 11, 2015. "Concealed beneath all of the lofty plans is a truth that Fisher has a hard time ignoring: Only 7 percent of Utahns ski, and Fisher says if this number is headed in any direction, it is going down. Ski resorts, with daily lift ticket prices at some places cresting the \$100 mark, long ago priced out middle-class Utahns, he says, leaving the primary areas of growth for that market in the backcountry, a trend that can be witnessed on almost any winter day in Grizzly Gulch.</p> <p>And so schemes to connect the resorts, expand terrain and perhaps even build a train, Fisher says, are more about marketing Utah's snow to tourists than they are about doing what's right for the Wasatch and those who call Utah home." In short, this is a plan to transfer the wealth from many (i.e., Utah taxpayers) to few (i.e., businesses in the Canyons.)</p> <p>Must we always despoil the precious things we have, namely the beauty of our natural surroundings, simply to raise the income of a few? Or might we recognize that what we have does not result in making the situation better than today, rather it is an attempt to make things less bad than they would be if nothing were done. So what is the alternative? The first is to recognize that notwithstanding the economic advantages of population growth as cited above, the overall result is diminished quality of life for all in the region. This stems from more crowding, worse air quality, more noise, more demands on diminishing water, less open space, more congestion, more strip malls—all the conditions that Utahans have spoken so disparagingly about when referring to other regions. By default, it seems like our State's unspoken policy is to promote, or at least accept, population growth until the environment is just as bad as it is elsewhere, as long as there is concomitant economic growth. I think that is a bad plan. Could we do anything different? Clearly, exponential growth can not go on forever, no matter the the organism; eventually it must come to a stop, either by strangling itself, or by externally imposed We could shift the emphasis from growing population to stabilizing population. Is this even feasible? It can be if we recognize that the real limit on human occupancy in this part of the world is not open land—we have plenty of that—but water. Remarkably, the in the last 25 years, the tiny town of Alta has had a nearly constant population, despite it's very attractive surroundings. This was achieved by limiting new water hook ups. Elsewhere, for example Deer Valley where similar water limits have not been imposed, suburban sprawl has devastated the land. My fervent hope is that the Mountain Accord exercise will serve as a wake up call for this region.</p> <p>Shall we take the path toward more crowding, more pollution, more environmental damage, more degradation of the Central Wasatch with marginal stops to lessen the damage, or shall we recognize the underlying cause and attack the problem at its source?</p>	
<p>My comments on Transportation Alternatives Proposed by Mountain Accord: I am a registered voter in the Town of Alta. I live in the Town of Alta full time year round. I am a homeowner. My home is my only residence built in 1998; before that, I owned in the Village of Sugar Plum. I am a long time resident of the Canyon. I have no financial interests - I own no commercial properties or enterprises or businesses. I have firsthand experience with the transportation nightmare in the Canyon be it in the winter with 2 - 4 hour backups in the Canyon, the summer Wild Flower Festival traffic or mudslide closures. I believe these qualifications should be considered as a very weighted opinion in making a decision about the alternative suggested. The following are some specific comments supporting my overall view that a Mountain Light Rail transportation alternative is the best alternative: 1. As demonstrated in Salt Lake City, people will use Light Rail. Currently, visitors to the Canyon do not abandon their cars and use buses now. What makes us think they will abandon cars for buses in the future? 2. Light Rail would move more people up the canyon efficiently and eliminate cars and backups. Additionally, Light Rail would provide a way to quickly evacuate the canyon when necessary. 3. Buses just add pollution to the canyon. As demonstrated earlier this year, they also have rollover accidents in the canyon due to weather or driver error. Light rail would move visitors up and down the canyon regardless of weather and it would move them safely. 4. A rail interconnect can only help both Park City and Alta. Both of which offer different types of experiences for skiers and summer hikers. 5. Will it change the population density of Alta? Probably not much since there is so little private land available for development. A full interconnect just improves access to Alta and Park City for development and non-resident self-interests are difficult to overcome, but not all who want the best for Alta and Utah subscribe to these fears and self-interests. I am one of those. 7. The economic benefits for both communities and Utah in the long term are considerable. The marketing benefit of attracting and keeping market share of skiers in the future will keep the canyon economically viable. The potential opportunity to utilize hotels and restaurants in the off season helps Alta stay economically viable as well. 8. Is it costly? Yes, I am one of those who see the cost as something that is necessary in order to reap the benefits that will outweigh those costs. I cannot measure the hidden additional revenue to both areas and the State that will inevitably happen but I am confident that it will be considerable. 9. I look to the future. I also support the ski lift interconnect in conjunction with Light Rail to make this the premier recreational area in and outside the country. I go on record as supporting Light Rail and the ski lift interconnect, and sincerely hope this is the path taken.</p> <p>To Mountain Accord: My husband and I have lived in Alta full time from 1996 until 2007 and then 6 months a year from 2007 thru today. There are very few people who live in Alta full time and I wanted to comment on what it is like to live here when the ski season is over. During the ski season the area and the roads are always busy on powder days and usually on the weekends. Mondays thru Thursdays there is no new snow the traffic volume is low. BUT when Alta closes the last week in April, Alta is deserted. The day after closing there is not even a can of soda left in the Albion Grill. The Lodges close. All the workers head to the desert or their next season jobs. A few patrolers are left to help close down the Ski Area. If there is a snow storm between the close and the first part of July, no one rushes to plow the roads. Adventurous skiers may drive up to hike u the trails before all the snow is gone. Then finally the Summer Road is clear of snow and is opened historically for the Fourth of July, and at this time people from the valley return to Alta to begin the hiking season and to see the flowers in The Basin. My point is that for two months in the spring and again for six weeks from October until mid November very few people come to Alta. It is usually cold and gray during this period. Bus transportation could be provided, but if a train system was built as you have proposed it would not be utilized for some long periods of the year. A train seem to be overkill for the transportation problems of the canyon. Avalanche in both Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons is a problem. Snowsheds might be built to protect the roads. A designated lane for buses could be added to help ease the amount of vehicles moving up the canyons and thru Parleys. Incentives to encourage people to use the buses should be implemented. Part of salaries paid by businesses in the Ski Areas should be bus passes. People should be encouraged to car pool. Charges for parking in the ski areas should be levied. Appropriate bus schedules should be created. There should be buses in the summer and early and late buses all year; buses for hikers that finish their hikes in the evening because there is so much sunlight in the summer evenings, buses in the winter for guests that might want to have an after ski beer at the Peruvian. Bus schedules must fit the needs of the riders. More buses should be added to move guests and workers between Salt Lake and Park City. It seems that we should try to solve the transportation problem with the use of buses before we go thru the great expense of a train system. I am enthusiastic about the bid and swap between the Forest Service and the Ski Areas. I feel it is so important to the wilderness of the Wasatch to keep Superior, Flagstaff, the Emmas and other proposed wild areas safe from commercial development. And it seems to make a great deal of sense to have the forest service land near the base areas of the Resorts given to the Resorts or commercial development. I hope to see as much backcountry kept wild as possible. ridgelines interrupted only by trees and rocks and not lift towers. Ski areas connected by ski runs and the desire of the skiers to make the treks themselves. Adventure comes from the excitement and the determination to make it happen. In the winter a beacon, snowshoes or skis is enough to explore the wilderness of the Wasatch. Visitors from all over the world come to ski and play in our mountains. And they have returned because of the unique style and character of our ski areas and our wonderful snow. Too much magic may not be needed. As you deliberate on trying to make improvements for how the Wasatch Mountains, the Salt Lake Valley and Park City Area interact, I hope you will not lose the most important concept. And that concept is to deal with growth while protecting our PRECIOUS WILDERNESS.</p>	Alta
<p>Thanks for asking our opinion regarding your proposed plans!</p> <p>We understand economically why you would want to attract global visitors to your area to have a European experience by being able to ski/ride between resorts. You certainly would attract "high end" customers.</p> <p>We are aware that with One Wasatch that you would no longer be able to pay to ski/ride at a particular resort – but would be required to pay a higher price to have the option to ski/ride at all resorts. My husband would tell you there are areas he never gets to eat year, so how could you ski several resorts in one day. We have enjoyed the availability of booking early with a participating hotel (before December 15th) to get the buy 3 get one free superpass discount. We like to visit both Alta and Brighton and have used the reloadable cards to save \$\$, coupon books, and ski free/\$10 after 3pm. All these mentioned have made skiing affordable for us.</p> <p>We are from North Carolina, and have spent our vacation dollars in Utah the last 5 years. We fear that the changes you propose will put you out of our vacation budget range. We anticipate that the 2015/2016 season may be our last to your area – unless the project should be completed by then. We have begun to look at options in other areas of Utah and other states that will remain affordable to us. Sad to us as we have truly enjoyed our visits to Utah – but we do not have an unlimited vacation budget.</p> <p>Again we appreciate that you have asked our opinion, no change would be our vote – but we don't live in Utah.</p>	Asheboro, NC
<p>Thank you for attempting to address this issue.</p> <p>I just bought a house at the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon. Last week, I drove up Snowbird around 11 am. It was bumper to bumper going 20 miles an hour. When I arrive at Snowbird all parking was taken with more cars coming. That means some people drove the hour long route to turn around and go home.</p> <p>Free parking is the root of all transportation problems. In my current home of Austin, the city has implemented paid parking in more areas to reduce congestion. In the Canyons policing parking would be troublesome. I like the implementation in Mill Creek Canyon will a toll at the mouth.</p> <p>It is probably a little late to make suggestions, but here is mine: Toll the entrance to Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. For Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons, there should be a bus pass lane for rapid bus movement. Use the toll funds to make bus commutes free up the Canyon. Many people that ride the bus have resort passes and get a free ride anyway. This would create a need for more buses trips with less time between buses. Some people do not ride the bus, because they do not want to wait for the next bus.</p> <p>For the city of Salt Lake City, I recommend a similar approach as Austin and add more paid parking or increase the parking fees where it is.</p> <p>What percentage of the transit system is funded through fares? Long ago, I thought that cities should make bus fares \$20 per month for unlimited use and sold as a passenger boards the bus for easy access. Many more people would use the bus system if they knew it was paid for already. People could get a discount to \$10 unlimited if they were on a monthly debit with a 3 month minimum. Or maybe, it is on the property tax bill, like add \$100 per year for unlimited bus access. These amounts could be moved higher or lower to boost volume. The main point is to remove psychological barriers of paying each use. If the monthly fee was low enough, advertising campaigns could communicate community support rather than riding. Many people would pay a small amount monthly just to have the use of buses for free occasionally, like to and from lunch everyday.</p>	Austin/LCC
<p>Thank you for listening!</p> <p>I really enjoyed visits the last 2 winters to Utah for skiing. One thing I would like to see is expansion of UTA bus service to the resorts around Park City. I really liked the UTA bus and ski combination tickets to the Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon resorts. Making those services even more reliable would be great. I really wished there was comparable service to the Park City resorts. I see in your plan, it includes express service from the SLC airport to Park City. How about having a stop at a large park and ride station so SLC residents and guests can take advantage of the express transportation too? Alternatively, I would like UTA ski and ride routes to the Park City ski areas. Most of the resorts have plenty of trails to keep my interest. I don't think I would take advantage of interconnecting tunnels or chair lifts. They seem more of a marketing gimmick. One thing that I really missed at some resorts were safety bars on all the chairs. That is an upgrade that should be made at all resorts. I have no interest in returning to resorts with old chairs lacking safety bars.</p>	Ballston Spa, NY
<p>What do you think about resort connectivity?</p> <p>I think most Utah resorts are big enough. There is plenty to do at each of the resorts. I personally wouldn't bother to ski multiple resorts in a day. I didn't bother to ski Alta and Snowbird on the same day. I skied each a day. Not worth paying extra.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would you like to see improved, year-round public transportation?</li> </ul> <p>Improved public transportation is almost always a good thing. Last trip to Utah I used the UTA bus and ski discounted combination. It was great.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved bus services?</li> </ul> <p>I would like to see improved bus services. I wish there were comparable bus options to the Park City area resorts from Salt Lake like there are to the Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon resorts. Maybe the Ogden area resorts too?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mountain rail?</li> </ul> <p>Rail service would be good. Not sure where it would run? I heard a proposal to run rail from the airport to Park City? I would suggest a stop with a park and ride parking lot so residents can ride but don't need to go all the way to the airport and won't have to pay airport parking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No improvements at all?</li> </ul> <p>Improvements are appreciated as long as it does not run up customer costs. I just skied at a couple EPIC resorts. The ticket window prices were up to \$125 for a lift ticket! On top of that, I ended up paying \$8 for a locker (no brown bag lunch room with hooks and cubbies). I paid \$5 for a bottle of water. The total expense of a day of skiing is outrageous. Anything possible to lower costs would be the best improvement that can be done.</p>	Ballston Spa, NY

<p>It appears much effort has gone into your proposed Blueprint, and presented mostly in broad general terms. I am wondering what the specific proposed route of the tunnel system from Alta through Brighton to Park City is. Where will it exit the mountain in Brighton and where will it re-enter the mountain to proceed to Park City and what is its route from those two points? I should think that after this much study a proposed specific route would be on the table as well as reasonable estimates of the cost to construct such a tunnel. As a secondary question...how are you proposing this endeavor be paid for?</p> <p>Thank you, Property Owner, Big Cottonwood Canyon</p>	BCC	3/14/2015
<p>Hi Laynee, Attached is the Big Cottonwood Scenic Bikeway Study. We hope the Mountain Accord Committee will include it as part of the public input for an EIS study. Would you be able to email a copy to your committee? We also hope to collaborate with Millcreek and Little Cottonwood in the public outreach effort to make cycling and running a little safer in the canyons. All the best...and Thanks!</p>	BCC	3/11/2015
<p>I am undecided on all of the above topics because it is very difficult to understand (from this web page) exactly what the proposed blueprint is! I see several options listed under "proposed blueprint" and it is not clear which is the most likely. It is obvious to me that the best option is the light rail train from SLC airport/downtown, south along the Wasatch Front, up LCC with stops in Alta and Snowbird, through a tunnel stopping in Brighton parking lot, and through another tunnel stopping in PC - and back again.</p> <p>I agree that the major concerns are environmental, economic and recreation. I believe the BCC's secluded reality, while part of its appeal, also make it difficult for homeowners to rent their properties in the winter.</p> <p>I have spent a lot of time skiing in France, Switzerland, Austria and Italy and it seems obvious to me that we need to follow their lead. While I lived in Zurich and Geneva I was able to take a train (with one or two easy changes) from both of these major city centers or the airports to the ski lift in Zermatt or Chamonix. No cars, no traffic and an incredible skiing experience. I would also say that with these train systems the European countries did a very good job preserving their environments in these mountains.</p> <p>In BCC or LCC, if you had a train system connecting to Park City residents and renters could take an evening ride over the mountain into Park City for dinner or after ski. This would be a huge boost for all three of these economies! It would discourage driving in the evening.</p> <p>Your proposal, while better than anything else I've seen, still excludes the possibility that BCC residents and renters will have evening access to the bars and restaurants in Park City. The very obvious option to me (and I believe one of your blueprints) would be to a light rail connect from SLC airport/downtown, south along the Wasatch front, up Little Cottonwood with stops in SB and Alta, through a tunnel into Brighton parking lot and a stop there, and through another tunnel into Park City. For me, it seems very important that this train line will continue (perhaps less frequently) late into the evening so Park City could gain the Economic benefit of more BCC and LCC homeowners and renters using their restaurants.</p> <p>At the same time, with so many houses and cabins in BCC, an evening connection will provide an additional economic injection to Park City which should certainly be welcome!</p> <p>So with this necessary evening connection in mind, the light rail with the above connection (which done in the European manner could be minimal impact to the environment) is the obvious best option.</p> <p>If you consider the economic interests (and I believe you have) of all the interested parties, not just the ski resorts - Park City business owners (tax payers), BCC house/cabin owners (tax payers), ski resorts (large business and tax payers), the SLC and PC local governments (tax spenders), - why not look at this project as a public/private cooperation expanding the possibilities to include the light rail train system. This is absolutely the best option. ☺</p>	BCC (Silver Fork)	3/16/2015
<p>Dear Mountain Accord, I own a house in Big Cottonwood Canyon / Silverfork I am undecided on all of the above topics because it is very difficult to understand (from this web page) exactly what the proposed blueprint is! I see several options listed under "proposed blueprint" and it is not clear which is the most likely. It is obvious to me that the best option is the light rail train from SLC airport/downtown, south along the Wasatch Front, up LCC with stops in Alta and Snowbird, through a tunnel stopping in Brighton parking lot, and through another tunnel stopping in PC - and back again.</p> <p>I agree that the major concerns are environmental, economic and recreation. I believe the BCC's secluded reality, while part of its appeal, also make it difficult for homeowners to rent their properties in the winter.</p> <p>I have spent a lot of time skiing in France, Switzerland, Austria and Italy and it seems obvious to me that we need to follow their lead. While I lived in Zurich and Geneva I was able to take a train (with one or two easy changes) from both of these major city centers or the airports to the ski lift in Zermatt or Chamonix, or many other ski options. No cars, no traffic and an incredible skiing experience. I would also say that with these train systems the European countries did a very good job preserving their environments in these mountains.</p> <p>In BCC or LCC, if you had a train system connecting to Park City residents and renters could not only use the connection for skiing, but could take an evening ride over the mountain into Park City for dinner or after ski. This would be a huge boost for all three of these economies! It would discourage driving in the evening, and by using tunnels it would not be of significant impact to the environment.</p> <p>Your proposal, while better than anything else I've seen, still excludes the possibility that BCC residents and renters will have evening access to the bars and restaurants in Park City. The very obvious option to me (and I believe one of your blueprints) would be to a light rail connect from SLC airport/downtown, south along the Wasatch front, up Little Cottonwood with stops in SB and Alta, through a tunnel into Brighton parking lot and a stop there, and through another tunnel into Park City. For me, it seems very important that this train line will continue (perhaps less frequently) late into the evening so Park City could gain the Economic benefit of more BCC and LCC homeowners and renters using their restaurants.</p> <p>At the same time, with so many houses and cabins in BCC, an evening connection will provide an additional economic injection to Park City which should certainly be welcome!</p> <p>So with this necessary evening connection in mind, the light rail with the above connection (which done in the European manner could be minimal impact to the environment) is the obvious best option.</p> <p>If you consider the economic interests (and I believe you have) of all the interested parties, not just the ski resorts - Park City business owners (tax payers), BCC house/cabin owners (tax payers), ski resorts (large business and tax payers), the SLC and PC local governments (tax spenders), - why not look at this project as a public/private cooperation expanding the possibilities to include the light rail train system. This is absolutely the best option.</p> <p>I've attached a picture of a Swiss train which takes skiers to the chairlift in Andermatt resort. The train has minimum impact on the environment as it does not stop along the way to let skiers off. ☺</p>	BCC (Silver Fork)	3/16/2015
<p>Dear Committee I feel that connectivity of the ski areas is not a viable option. It seems only elite members of society would benefit this, and regular customers need better funding to accomplish utilization of connecting through the back country. The area in between the large resorts needs to be left as pristine as possible and accessed by back country participants knowledgeable in this type of activity. I also feel that being able to use the areas designated for winter recreation would be better served if the access was improved during times when driving to the bases is impossible due to poor road conditions. Whether it be rail or tunnel or improved buses, it needs to be addressed. Year round activities will continue to increase your tourist numbers in traditional off seasons. This of course would say that possible rail service might be the best option for year round access to these great areas. Thank you</p>	Bethel, VT	2/26/2015
<p>Dear Mountain Accord, I represent lower Big Cottonwood Canyon (up to the Turn) on the Big Cottonwood Canyon Council. Having heard comments by Laney Jones and John Yeates at our last BCCC meeting on February 9, I have one concern for the trails committee. Between the Storm Mountain Quartzite sign (above Storm Mountain picnic and amphitheater) and Maxfield Drive is a very dangerous turn in the road between two rock cliffs. There have been a few head-on auto collisions there and the old-timers used to even honk their horns as they rounded the turn. This is becoming an even greater safety hazard with the increase of biking and hiking/running on Big Cottonwood Canyon Road. There currently exists a kind of rough trail up and over the quartzite that hikers can take. This could be improved so that all foot and mountain bike traffic used it. Another option is to ask people to cross the road down below and build a trail around the other side by the reservoir, but I think SLC City Water would object. A third possibility would be to blast the rock cliffs and widen the road to make an adequate bike/walking path, but it would be incredibly expensive. Anyway, this is a problem that needs your attention. Thanks for all you are doing to help improve the canyon.</p>	Big Cottonwood Canyon	2/23/2015
<p>Hello, I grew up in Salt Lake and I grew up loving to ski. I skied at Solitude and Alta mostly in high school, then got a job working at Snowbird the year after high school and worked up there on and off for 12 years. I love the resorts we have here and feel spoiled to have such great access to such great terrain. But it wasn't until about 6 years ago that I went into the backcountry. I went up Grizzly Gulch with some friends and I think we did a lap or two back in East Bowl. I was not hooked. It was so much work for just a couple runs! However, after going a few times the next couple years and getting better equipment, taking an Avey 1 Class, finding more friends to do it with, I am hooked! I still get a pass at either Alta or Snowbird, but I spend my time equally between the backcountry and the resorts and it's a great balance. The resorts are a great place to go when the avalanche danger is high or you don't want to put in all the work. But the backcountry is great to get away from the crowds, get a work out and hopefully find my own little pocket of snow. My point is, I love having both. The resorts are great, but they do not need to expand. More and more people are going into the backcountry and to take away the terrain and access to those areas would be a real shame. Grizzly Gulch was a great starting point for me and should be protected to be a safe(er), easy introductory point for others. I've only toured once out of Brighton, so I can't really speak to the side country of BCC but for both LCC and BCC to put in more lifts and expand the resorts' area and ease of side-country access would take away areas for beginners to learn and expand their skills and love of the backcountry. Please leave Grizzly Gulch undeveloped! The whole Emma's ridge to Superior is the next step up to learn on. Those skin tracks and a little tougher but provide great access to a lot of really good skiing terrain and I'm grateful to hear that Snowbird is willing to cede so much terrain to permanent protection! The traffic in LCC is really a problem and with so many single rider cars, it is something that needs to be looked at. When Zion National Park implemented their bus / shuttle system, I was really annoyed and thought it would really be a pain. But once I used it a couple times I realized it was great. Frequent buses, lots of quick stops in places people needed to get off on. In LCC when I have tried to look into taking the bus up the canyon I am often frustrated by their infrequency. I think it would take residence some time to get used to taking a bus up the canyon, but if there was more room for parking at the mouth and a separate lane for the bus, I feel like that would be incentive. Spending so much money for a train that seems less flexible and more disruptive to the watershed seems to be a waste of resources. Resources that could be used to put in a bus system and develop multi-use trails in the canyon that would benefit the canyon year round. There is so much potential for mountain bike trails and hiking trails in the canyon! I now live at the mouth of BCC and love these canyons. I know more and more people are loving them too and wanting to take advantage. These are little mountains, compared to Europe, and we don't need to be them. We have great resorts in their own rights, and don't need to become one giant overtake of the Wasatch Mountains. Please consider the backcountry user's need for a good places to learn and areas for the ever-increasing population of us to spread out and get the solitude we're out there looking for! ☺</p>	Big Cottonwood Canyon	2/28/2015
<p>I am opposed to one Wasatch. I don't want to see any more development - the Wasatch is beautiful as it is - rugged and majestic - I hate the idea of trees being cut and lifts and infrastructure criss-crossing this spectacular landscape. I also think it is a really dumb idea. Skiers will be spending more time on lifts than skiing, and what if you end up in LCC at the end of the day, but are staying in PC. Creates unnecessary complexity and confusion. I say NO WAY! Frequent visitor to Utah</p>	Boston, MA	2/28/2015
<p>Good leaders, greetings. I visit the Wasatch often but hail from Boston. I think of Boston often as I follow the bends, turns, and passions surfacing as the Mountain Accord debate gets very serious. Back in the late 1950s, in the name of progress and the ever-pressing economic compulsion to rev up the engine faster, we killed a quaint neighborhood (the West End) in the name of urban renewal. It took a half-century (yes, I am an elder), but you would be hard pressed to find anyone here today who believes the decision was a good one. The character of that neighborhood, so much a part of this city, and all the revenue it would bring us today in tourism and real estate, is gone forever. And then there was the lesson learned. In the late-1960s we were teetering on the edge of slicing through the city with an inner belt highway. The late Gov. Frank Sergeant was a strong advocate - and then saw the reality of how the interstate would change forever the urban character. He had the courage to back down and admit he had "seen the light." This is how he is remembered today. Lovingly. Please tread gently in the precious Wasatch. To my eye, bus rapid transit makes so much sense in Little Cottonwood. And think deeply about how you define progress as we try to rev the engine ever faster. You are stewards for one of the nation's dwindling treasures.</p>	Boston, MA	3/4/2015
<p>My wife and I travel to ski destinations both domestic and abroad extensively. Utah is by far our favorite destination and we have been coming here to ski for many years. We are very concerned about the air particulate pollution in the Salt Lake City area. Over the years it has become a black mark on an otherwise beautiful destination, and is the primary reason we have decide not to purchase a vacation home in the area. The time is at hand to clean this up as have other cities in the U.S.</p>	Boston, MA	3/13/2015
<p>You have sent me an email asking the following questions. The only one that impacts me is resort connectivity as I do not take buses or a train. • What do you think about resort connectivity? • Would you like to see improved, year-round public transportation? • Improved bus services? • Mountain rail? • No improvements at all?</p> <p>With respect to connectivity, the key question is the cost and time to get from one resort to another. I am not at the resorts for sightseeing so if I cannot ski from one resort to another, it is a waste of time and I will not do it. Even currently there is a substantial disconnect between Alta and Snowbird. The lift ticket costs \$30 more and I need to go to Mineral Basin to Little Cottonwood and then over the top. This is a waste of time. Very few actually go over the top and generally it is just one day of a several day stay. With that, think about the logistics of getting to Solitude from Snowbird. Sounds ridiculous. I am supposed to go over the top and then ski down, take a rope tow and then take a long chairlift to the other side of the canyon. This is a big waste of time and then ski at lesser mountains (sorry for being honest) of Solitude and Brighton.</p> <p>A superior way to spend the money would be to expand the resort boundaries and make them more attractive. Snowbird is the top resort and competes with Vail, Jackson and Big Sky. How does it become more interesting. Perhaps more restaurants as well at the bottom as it is thin picking.</p> <p><u>Boston, MA but coming to Utah for 40 years to ski</u> I'm generally supportive of the resort connectivity. However, as a snowboarder, I'd be concerned if Alta and Deer Valley are included in the plan if they don't open their slopes to people like me. At the very least, the pass for snowboarders should be priced to reflect the fact that they are excluded from over 20% of the terrain. As a resort that operates on public land, Alta should be pressured if not forced to accept snowboarders in exchange for interconnection. Likewise, Deer Valley, although it operates on private land, should have to accept snowboarders in order to realize the benefits conveyed by the interconnect. Thanks.</p>	Boston, MA	3/14/2015
<p>Boston, MA but coming to Utah for 40 years to ski I'm generally supportive of the resort connectivity. However, as a snowboarder, I'd be concerned if Alta and Deer Valley are included in the plan if they don't open their slopes to people like me. At the very least, the pass for snowboarders should be priced to reflect the fact that they are excluded from over 20% of the terrain. As a resort that operates on public land, Alta should be pressured if not forced to accept snowboarders in exchange for interconnection. Likewise, Deer Valley, although it operates on private land, should have to accept snowboarders in order to realize the benefits conveyed by the interconnect. Thanks.</p>	Brigham City	2/27/2015

<p>Mountain Accord:          In my personal opinion, the proposed blue print is a well balanced approach that takes into account the interests of all of the stakeholders.          Quite an accomplishment, considering the disparate interests among the various stakeholders          Thank you</p>	Brighton	3/7/2015
<p>Dear Mountain Accord,          In my opinion, the Mountain Accord proposal does not serve the interests of the public and the environment the way that it should.          I believe that, in planning for the future, our priorities should be: 1) Protection of the unique ecosystem of our precious Wasatch; 2) Protection of our watershed; 3) Providing a variety of recreational opportunities for the people of Utah. The interests of ski resort corporations and real estate developers should be far FAR down the list of priorities. It is not our job as taxpayers and as stewards of our environment to enhance the profits of these business interests.          Based on those priorities:          I applaud the proposals to provide improved public transportation into each of the canyons.          I endorse the land swaps -- as long as we can be assured that that's ALL that the ski resorts will ask for. (It seems that Snowbird is already looking for more!)          I am extremely opposed to any efforts to link ski resorts from one canyon to the next -- whether by tunnels or by lift systems such as SkiLink. Such schemes will provide almost no benefit to local skiers. The only ones who will truly benefit are the ski corporations, who can use them as marketing gimmicks.</p>	Brighton	3/14/2015
<p>I hope that you'll go back to the drawing board on your proposals          The jaw dropping silence at the Olympic Park meeting was obvious when the plan was revealed and announced that the blue print proposals were made by a consensus of the executive board. The outcome was not unexpected because it was obvious early on (the second group meeting and despite assurances by the group leaders to the contrary) that the goal of the Mountain Accord was a train up little cottonwood. With the forest service stance of no new facilities, especially parking, in the canyons, more land being put into protected designation and increased restrictions on building, I am very afraid of wholesale condemnation of private property and homes to build transit hubs, rail terminals and trail systems inside our communities. Brighton and Silver Fork were communities and destinations for peace and quite almost 100 years before skiing came to town and to turn our neighborhoods into seasonal rail terminals and transit hubs would be totally unacceptable and will be met with total opposition. The water systems for our communities are from mine tunnels and springs, are single sourced and are fragile and barely adequate to serve not only the residents but also the growing number of visitors. For decades engineers, hydrologists and geologists have warned that tunnels through the Wasatch Mountains would have a negative impact on the water resources of the canyons an example would be park city mines is paying or has paid Salt Lake City for water draining from Twin Lakes into a mine tunnel. Is the Mountain Accord ready to address providing water to affected communities with the blessing of Salt Lake City and its control of the watershed? BCRA representative, Brighton          Environmental Group member</p>	Brighton	2/18/2015
<p>As a member of the Environmental Systems and water subcommittee the tunnel proposal never comes up or was mentioned and we know tunnels would impact communities in the canyons with rail terminals and transit hubs. Brighton is opposed to the proposed Blueprint.</p>	Brighton	2/25/2015
<p>I know Park City does not want to connect in any way to the Cottonwood Canyons and Brighton does not want to be the center of a transit system.</p>	Brighton	2/25/2015
<p>Note that the Brighton Resort does not speak for the Brighton community.</p>	Brighton	2/25/2015
<p>Do whatever you need to do to reduce the smog!!!</p>	Burlington, VT	3/7/2015
<p>It sounds a simple expansion in your terms ,but I wonder if it is needed economically .There is law of diminishing returns,and I do not see that the current skiing population needs such a large area to ski in . It would make the Cottonwood Canyon Resorts much more crowded ,and potentially destroy their attraction and charm .Alta may be obliged to allow snowboarders ,who somehow arrived there from the other side .          I could see Park City skiers overrunning Brighton and Alta .Also global warming will change the face of skiing in the next 20-30 yrs .See the concern already this year with your smaller snow falls causing concern for a dry summer .          I would vote against rail access too .          a Canadian who skies Utah every year since it is the best snow .!</p>	Canada	3/16/2015
<p>As a skiers from NC to Utah for the past 30 years, we have welcomed all the changes, expansions, and improvements to all of the resorts in the Mountain Accord area. We stay in south SLC for easy access to Big and Little Cottonwood canyons. We are frequent skiers at Alta, Brighton, and Solitude as well as daily trips to Deer Valley and The Canyons. We have often wished we could "drop into" another resort from the Cottonwoods to avoid the drive up I-80, parking, and trekking to the slopes.          We think it would be wonderful to have interconnections among all the resorts in your study and would enjoy it.          There are some questions that arise:          1. How would lift tickets work if skiers travelled among the resorts? Charging by run, by area of origin with added charge for additional resorts as they are skied, etc.?          2. Would there be transportation available from the Park City area to the bases of Little and Big Cottonwood canyons or the reverse to enable skiers to begin in one distinct area and end in another without the worry of trying to ski back to the area of origin at the end of the day?          3. Trains would be an expensive pipe dream, but make the area so much like some Europe ski areas.          Good luck with the plan! We hope we still will be skiing in order to take advantage of the plan.</p>	Charlotte, NC	2/26/2015
<p>As an avid skier and professional ski instructor, I am in favor of connecting the ski resorts in the Wasatch front range by additional chairlifts. I would be more apt to ski there more often or even move there should that happen.</p>	Chatham, MA	2/26/2015
<p>I dont understand why there is no overnight parking at the bottom of LCC.          I would support all transportation options that would reduce traffic in the canyon.          I DO NOT support any additional transportation that includes tunnels and chair lifts to get to different ski resorts.          I do not believe that developing intensive new structures for skiing is in the best interest of our future.          I believe that our future winters will be more like last year and this year. Minimal snow with gradual warming of our winters over time.          I cannot support changing the look of our beautiful mountains for the ski industry. Skiing at resorts is only participated by a small percent of the Utah residents. (the ski resorts are pricing local residents out of the option of skiing in Utah). The wishes of these residents and ski industry do not have the right to make changes to our beautiful mountains that will affect their look for many years.          I have been to two public meetings for Mountain Accord and have read through much of the web site.</p>	Cottonwood Heights Cottonwood Heights	2/4/2015 2/24/2015
<p>I am glad the various organizations are planning for the future. I am glad that the plan will designate more of these beautiful areas as wilderness. I am glad the plan doesn't allow for more development in these areas.          My major concern is with the transportation plans. I don't know of anyone wanting to get to Park City from the Wasatch Front Area via a train system. I am concerned that the idea of having a tunnel and train system or a gondola system to get to Alta and Snowbird largely comes from skiers in the Park City area wanting to access more snow and better trails quicker at Alta and Snowbird.          If that is the case, those are the people who should pay for such an expensive proposition as a train tunnel through the mountain. Too many of the less wealthy residents of Salt Lake Valley do not have the money or time or interest in skiing or snowboarding or even get up to enjoy the Wasatch Mountains. It should not be part of their tax burden to pay for such a project. I strongly oppose having any train system linking the Alta/Snowbird area to the Heber Valley area for these reasons. If the decision is made to pursue this transportation option, the cost should totally be covered by the skiers and snowboarders, and by the companies that will benefit from this investment. I enjoy skiing and love my time hiking in these mountains, but I don't want people who live in this valley and never get up there to pay for me or anyone else to do what I do.          I also think a clean natural gas bus system going up the canyons is preferable to the development and cost of a train going up the canyons.</p>	Cottonwood Heights	3/15/2015
<p>I live in Cottonwood Heights and drive a son to Alta High school. I am very familiar with the traffic on Ft. Union and 9400 south. I think a train line on either road would be tricky, but it would be a terrible idea for Ft. Union, which is already very congested in the Union Park area and at the Highland Drive intersection. Again, buses can work very well. I have walked to the bus on Ft. Union Blvd from my home to get to the airport. I am delighted with these transportation investments our community has made for public transportation. These existing and growing systems benefit all of the community in this valley. I am concerned that a train system or gondola system from Heber Valley to Alta/Snowbird would benefit a very small segment of our population at high cost to many.</p>	Cottonwood Heights	2/25/2015
<p>Trains are exotic. Get enhanced bus service into the canyons is infinitely more flexible and reasonable. Trains not feasible or realistic. Trains/Trax service to Wasatch Blvd. should be considered. There should be an alternative with ski area size reduction. Ski area influence is too wide. Don't allow any ski area expansions. Any gondola or train connection between Brighton and PC is not feasible as a transportation alternative- it would only suit the ski resorts as a marketing gimmick. Such alternatives do not move enough people to be effective and a sales gimmick is not adequate justifications to allow it. Only result in more urbanization. Do everything to preserve dispersed recreations and curb development.</p>	Cottonwood Heights	2/25/2015
<p>Add bus feeder system to the plan. If I need to drive to a park and ride it does not work. That means we are just moving the parking to the valley. Emergency transportation and off hours access to the canyons. If trains access the canyon only, we are effectively closing the canyons at night. That makes no sense. Are we expecting Life Flight to handle all emergent healthcare?</p>	Cottonwood Heights	2/25/2015
<p>Any expansion is a slippery slope. I do not think that the proposals are good for animals and wildlife, but they are good for money. This to me is so blatantly similar to Easter Island scenario. Cut down all the trees to make statues and then you have no ecosystem left. As I look at the scars we have placed on the horizon, I do not see a need for more.</p>	Cottonwood Heights	2/25/2015
<p>Train and Road up Little Cottonwood. Double Deck i.e. Box tube for Rail under the Road on Top. 1. One Footprint - same as current footprint. 2. Tram not 100% protected. 3. Speed train to resorts. 4. Double - two way track system. 5. Allows day use on the roads for canyon use to locals throughout the year.</p>	Cottonwood Heights	2/25/2015
<p>I am for shuttle service on the weekend. I'm for users fees! 1 person in a car - \$100 pass - 2 persons \$50 3-4 - \$25 for Cottonwood Canyons - others can use a shuttle (like in Zions and Yosemite). Would be especially beneficial in summer for tourists (shuttle service). They love it! Watershed is of prime importance. How would a tunnel affect the watershed? What is purpose. We haven't had enough snow to shut down the canyon in a long time. Ski areas give plenty of time for people to leave canyon when avalanches are expected. Reconnecting canyons (tunnel, ski link) - only for wealthy - L.C. appeals to more advanced skiers - Big CW to intermediates and family - they don't want to go to a different canyon in same day! Don't ruin pristine area for more development - let backcountry skiers have access to their kind of terrain.</p>	Cottonwood Heights	2/25/2015
<p>More slow lanes are badly needed in both Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons now even. More busses and mark and ride lots could be added. But that is it. It ends there. No trains, tunnels, tramways of any kind should ever be thought of. Millcreek Canyon badly needs to be added to the watershed with its own treatment plant now even. But: NOTHING ELSE.</p>	Cottonwood Heights	2/25/2015

<p>To Whom it may Concern: I'm writing my comments regarding the Mountain Accord project &amp; I'm requesting that you enter them &amp; the photos in as public comments even though they weren't submitted by email. Please consider them carefully! In 1984 Murray City known as Tree City USA was given permission by the Utah State Engineer to divert the entire instream flow of Little Cottonwood Creek for the purpose of harnessing cheap hydroelectric power at the small dam located at Wasatch Resort. No one was ever notified! When people started to protest we were told that it was too late and that nothing could be done. Doing that turned a once beautiful living riparian ecosystem into a dead zone! The trees died, the air temperature rose, the birds &amp; wildlife left because there was no longer a living vibrant ecosystem. See photo #1. People in the area had Sen. Scott Howell sponsor a bill at the Utah Legislature to require minimum instream flows be required to be left in streams and rivers in Utah if they were going to divert most of the water. It passed however it wasn't retroactive so Little Cottonwood Creek stayed dry except for in the spring when the snow would melt and there was enough water to overflow their dam at Wasatch Resort. Then again in 1994 Murray City again tried to take the rest of the water out of Little Cottonwood Creek for more cheap hydro electric power and leave only a minimum of 4cfs Oct - Mar and 8 cfs April - Mar with no flushing flow requirements. The Forest Service recommended a minimum flow of 6 cfs be required Oct - Mar and 9.9 cfs be required April - Sept. The Forest Service also recommended a flushing flow of 281 cfs for nine days to coincide with peak snowmelt to maintain the channel integrity. The State Engineer felt the Forest Service requirements were excessive and required the smaller amounts. Finally after many letters and protests the Forest Service in their final decision on Feb. 23, 1995 went up against the State Engineer and Murray City and required the higher amounts that they had previously recommended, so because it would cost Murray City more money and they had to leave more water in the stream they withdrew their proposal. Their comment to me was that I might have stopped them up above but that I would never get the water back below. While I was on a Task Force in Murray City I happened to ask the State Engineer if he had ever been out to see what had happened to Little Cottonwood Creek since his ruling until that day and he said no. I also witnessed how our Representative from Cottonwood Heights told Murray City that he knew people up at Utah State University and for a small sum of money he could arrange to get the results that Murray City wanted on a study that was going to be done. Needless to say, he no longer was our representative from Cottonwood Heights and we finally got Dr. Gary Booth from BYU to do an unbiased study which had some very interesting conclusions which I still have in my file. After all this I asked the Forest Service if there was a way to protect this canyon? They recommended that I nominate Little Cottonwood Creek in the upper part for the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. On Aug 25, 1999 File Code 1920/2350 I received a letter stating that Little Cottonwood Creek was eligible and 10.2 miles above &amp; down to Murray City's diversion had been found freeflowing and outstandingly remarkable in the scenic, Geological Hydro, Ecological classifications and was classified as recreational. This area must be protected and preserved! Little Cottonwood Canyon and Big Cottonwood Canyon are known for many things. Not just skiing! The hiking and biking trails are spectacular. The scenery in these canyons is so beautiful and diverse. Whether you want to hike, rock climb, ski, camp, fish, bike or just enjoy the peaceful tranquility of these wilderness areas, the most wonderful thing is that they are located 20 min from our homes! These areas must be protected and preserved for future generations as well as the wildlife! To me all the Mountain Accord addressed was a massive ski expansion between Little Cottonwood Canyon, Big Cottonwood Canyon and over to Park City. Years ago the Forest Service basically stopped any ski expansion and the only new parking areas were for the buses for mass transit. The Mountain Accord looks like a skiers paradise! It doesn't take a genius to figure out that the people from Vail Colorado that own the Canyons Ski Resort, Park City Mt. Resort and I believe now Solitude Ski Resort are trying to take our local ski resorts. It's been made clear that if this major ski expansion is allowed to happen, Utah would be the only place in our entire country that would have 6 ski resorts all connected and would be the largest ski area in the entire country. This would produce millions of dollars, however much would remain in Utah would be questionable since Vail Colorado owns 3 out of the 6 ski resorts, I don't think all the money would remain in Utah.</p>	Cottonwood Heights	
<p>Greetings! I am an advanced skier that has been out to Utah nearly every season for the past 11 years. I am very much in favor of the plans to connect the different resorts. However, there is one proposal that deserves lots of scrutiny, and that is a train service. I think that there are obvious environmental concerns which must be weighed, and any final decision must make sense for the environment first.  This season, I skied in the Jungfrau region of Switzerland. Within this region, there were several trains (and buses) that interconnected the city of Interlaken, the villages and mountain peaks. I would strongly recommend that the architects of the One Wasatch plan contact officials in the Jungfrau region, study the development and impact of the transportation offered and apply their best practices to the development of transportation in the Wasatch. One Wasatch would be drawing on nearly a century of experience, and let's face it, the Swiss have their collective act together.</p>	Danbury, CT	3/14/2015
<p>To whom it may concern:  My son and I, avid skiers who hope to soon ski the greatest snow on Earth, are excited about the ONE Wasatch concept. It can improve the ski experience while minimizing the environmental impact, esp. due to cars and their infrastructure. This will enable Utah to offer an experience, whether summer or winter, similar to that available in Europe.</p>	Derry, NH	3/14/2015
<p>Hi,  I've been a Utah resident since 1989 and ski the Wasatch Front areas regularly. A few comments about your proposals that I hope you'll take into account as this thing moves forward.  1) I'm for protecting those lands from further development, but I'm worried that, even though they may be protected, they'll still get something developed on them. I love the Cottonwood Canyons as they currently are and would not want to see more commercial or residential development in the canyons. They are a beautiful place to visit year round and development and lighting spoils that. One question I have is, is the existing Wilderness Areas that are near the valley floor already protected from development? It seems that development keeps creeping up the mountain. I'd like to see that stop.  2) Looking at your PROPOSED TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES map, I am against connecting Alta and Brighton at all, and against increasing the existing connection between Brighton and Park City. I think that bit of isolation helps give each canyon it's own "personality", which would become lost over time if connected. Also, look at how the road in the Provo canyon, from Orem to Heber, has grown in the last 25 years or so. That was a nice quaint road going up into the mountains toward Heber when I moved here, and now it is a large busy thoroughfare. As soon as you create a shortcut from the Wasatch front to Park City, everybody will be driving it, to the point of over congestion, and you'll be forced to widen and expand it, destroying the rustic feel of the mountains there. That would ruin the Little Cottonwood canyon and the mountains above it. I'm also against any aerial transportation. All those poles and cables would be an eye sore and would negatively impact the appeal of the mountains and canyons. I can see increased bussing in the Cottonwood, being helpful and to that end, possibly some road improvements in the narrow portions of the Big Cottonwood canyon. Rail would be an eye sore in most of the 2 canyons too. Another possibility might be a cap on the number of vehicles in the canyon at one time. That might force more bussing. I hate more fees, but a small fee for cars and no fee for bus riders might also persuade more to take the bus. You're also going to need significantly greater parking near the base of the canyons to encourage people to stop driving there and take the bus up.  3) I think the existing trails are great. Some expansion might be helpful, but trails aren't as much of an eye sore or have as great of a negative impact as transportation does.  4) Lighting. You don't have anything specific on this topic, but with development comes lighting and Utah's dark skies are already disappearing. The mountains should be a get-away from the lights of the city, and roads, businesses and homes all include lights.</p>	Draper	2/26/2015
<p>To Whom It May Concern, First, we'd like to thank the members of the Mountain Accord for coming together to protect everyone's best interests in the Wasatch. We realize there are competing interests, and understand that every side will have to give up something they value in order to reach consensus. As long time residents as well as parents, we value Utah's economic stability through this period of rapid population growth as strongly as we believe in preserving our beautiful Wasatch wilderness.  That said, we felt we had to write to express our thoughts on potential development in Grizzly Gulch. As you are well aware, human-powered snow sports are the fastest growing segment of the winter sports market. (Source: SnowSports Industries America.) It would be an irreversible tragedy to lose one of Utah's most accessible, most valuable pieces of backcountry terrain to development. We strongly believe that Grizzly Gulch should be protected in the Public Lands swap.  Grizzly Gulch is uniquely valuable as backcountry terrain for a number of reasons: - Location: it's one of the few short-approach routes in the Wasatch that provides access to a wide variety of terrain. Grizzly's location makes it a great fit for beginners, tourists, and half-day "dawn patrolers." - Accessibility: Grizzly is accessible with existing public transportation. - Safety: even with variable snowpack and directional loading, Grizzly almost always has at least one safe aspect to ski. - Multi-sport access: with Alta's groomed cat track, backcountry skiers &amp; snowboarders share Grizzly with all human-powered athletes -- snowshoers, hikers, trail runners, and even skate skiers on the lower road. - Non-motorized ethic: unlike the Guardsman backcountry, Grizzly skiers don't share terrain with snowmobiles, making Grizzly a safer, more attractive backcountry experience.  As the human-powered snow sports industry continues to grow, the balance of developed and undeveloped ski terrain will become an increasingly important part of attracting ski tourism to Utah. Just this week, we skinned up Grizzly ahead of a group of six Europeans on a Utah ski vacation. They cannot be the only visitors who value Utah's backcountry skiing terrain.  In short, we admonish the Mountain Accord to look closely at protecting the unique backcountry terrain in Grizzly Gulch. Our small daughters are currently learning to ski at Utah's world-class resorts, but we hope to give them the privilege of "earning their turns" in Grizzly when they're old enough to negotiate a skin track.  Thank you for your consideration.</p>	Draper	2/28/2015
<p>Mountain Accord Committee:  Perhaps the following comments may be a bit myopic from a Recreation viewpoint but here goes:  1. I believe any attempts to link the Wasatch Front with the Wasatch Back place unnecessary environmental strain on the wilderness band between the two geographically &amp; economically diverse areas.  2. The Wasatch Front and the Wasatch Back do not need to be connected as the Recreation opportunities in each area are unique, depending on the recreational goals and objectives of the residents &amp; visitors of each area.  3. No attempt should be made or allowed to be made to connect the Wasatch Front (Ski) Resorts with the Wasatch Back(Ski) Resorts as this is not needed, physically undesirable and once again, a transportation strain on the environment.  4. Specifically to the above, most of the Wasatch Front and Wasatch Back Resorts &amp; Trail Systems stand alone and offer unique attributes and should be savored individually. Trying to connect the 7 resorts will require too much of a sacrifice of wilderness geography and serenity.  My comment on the mountain accord: Less is more.</p>	Draper	3/12/2015
<p>Opposed to an aerial connection between Big Cottonwood Canyon and Park City.</p>	Farmington	3/7/2015
<p>I and my family have been annual visitors to Alta since the 1950's. It is unique area that so far has remained mostly unchanged by mankind. It has an unusual character in that it has natural resources that have been unspoiled by mankind despite its location near a major city. The diversity of it's landscape, flora and fauna should remain as close to it's natural state to be enjoyed by future generations. I believe it should not be connected to other areas by tunnels or roads, trams or trains. so I agree with Mountain Accord's positions. Regarding transportation from the valley up Little Cottonwood Canon I suggest road improvements could be made in order to improve traffic flow, but I suggest that tunnels or railroads would impact the natural aspects of the canyon. An increase in the daily number of visitors will change the character of the natural landscape in all aspects and probably contaminate any water supply for people living in Salt Lake environment. The Alta area is too small to sustain any major increase in permanent population without changing the character of the entire valley area and there would be a damaging increase in sanitation services and restricted water supply.</p>	Greenwich, CT	3/8/2015
<p>I wish to comment that the idea of light rail up Parley's Canyon is a great idea. Anything we can do to reduce the amount of traffic and congestion in the Parley's Canyon and Park City areas would be a godsend. I do not think a train should run up Little or Big Cottonwood Canyons. Instead, electric-powered or natural gas buses should be used and there should be a pass with a hefty fee sold for personal vehicle use up those canyons.  I think drilling tunnels through the mountains is over the top and not a good idea at all. We are experiencing climate change and winters and their related sports will become less and less of a factor over the next 50 to 100 years. Let's be smart about this now; no need to waste money on a grandiose transportation scheme that will not be utilized in the future as much as we think it will be now. The new reality is that winters are warming and we will one day no longer have snow below 8000'. Let's plan accordingly and move to electric vehicles as much as possible, fueled by renewable energy sources such as wind and solar. It is critical that we reduce our air pollution, our impact on the earth and it's environment and control our growth. Be careful we do not kill the proverbial goose who laid the golden egg; aka our natural environment and beautiful surroundings.</p>	Heber City	3/11/2015
<p>1) I would like to see an electric rail system in the canyons. No cars. Maint. &amp; supply vehicles can go up the roads. 2) I would like no aerial system to prevent geographic and wildlife problems. Prevent timbering and bulldozing. 3) I agree w/ land consolidation to prevent sprawl and outward growth. 4) I would naturally prefer a tunnel through the mtns. with no surface construction. 5) I want to maintain our mtns. as an undisturbed environmental for the locals.</p>	Holladay	2/25/2015
<p>We love the idea of the resorts being connected! We live in Huntington Beach, CA, so we always fly Jet Blue. It would be nice to be able to see and ski more resorts without the drive. That leads to improved transportation. It is great now, but more is always welcome. We've only come to Park City in the winter but want to include summer trips. Year round transportation will make it even easier for us to come stay more often and longer.</p>	Huntington Beach, CA	2/26/2015
<p>I'm not sure what the Mountain Rail is, but it's in regards to improving or adding to public transportation, keeping emissions in check, clean and green transportation, we are totally in favor of that!</p>	Hyde Park, UT	3/2/2015
<p>To whom it may concern: When given the opportunity to comment on something as important as the future of our public lands and private industry, I feel it necessary to provide the following statement regarding the Mountain Accord blueprint: As the operator of business that is very closely tied to the ski industry of Utah, I fully support any initiative that furthers the growth, reduces the effects on the land, and promotes the industry of skiing in Utah. We feel encouraged by the Mountain Accord process, and hope to see action come from the hard work. <u>Regards: Jim Grewe, GM, Peterson-Enright Company</u>  • What do you think about resort connectivity? Unnecessary. The 7 mountains are all big enough to give a skier more than enough terrain to ski in one day. It is unlikely that I will want to spend time on connector lifts or connector trails (usually very boring traverses) that waste prime time skiing. I have skied in the Utah mountains for over 20 years (I do not live in Utah). We traveled to SLCC because there were so many mountains within an hour of each other. We would typically hit a different mountain each day.  • Would you like to see improved, year-round public transportation? Probably a good idea for the locals but I doubt it would change our habits of renting a car and driving to a mountain.  • Improved bus services? Same as above.  • Mountain rail? That is a business decision that I am not qualified to answer.  • No improvements at all? Mountains can always improve: more high speed lifts, open more terrain. But a grand scheme to connect all the mountains makes little sense. I would be upset if lift tickets got more expensive to pay for all these "improvements" that I would likely NOT use.</p>	Incline Village, NV	2/26/2015

<p>Hello,</p> <p>As a one time resident, and current frequent visitor to the wasatch I wanted to comment on a few areas of the Mountain Accord. There is a lot of information to digest, so I will just list highlights.</p> <p>Transportation:</p> <p>This is the biggest issue facing SL, Cottonwood Canyons, and Parley's Summit. As a bi-annual visitor to Outdoor Retailer, as well as 4-6 other trips annually to recreate, traffic gridlock and its effects are what I always come home complaining about. I don't even attempt Alta or Snowbird on visits anymore.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Light rail up cottonwood canyons is a nice 10 year plan, but optimizing bus ridership and parking seems to deliver a much more cost effective, immediate return. The cheapest parking lot at Teton Village is \$10, with free parking 5 miles before the resort, or free with 3 or more people per car. Bus ridership has skyrocketed.</li> <li>• Adding lanes delivers only more traffic.</li> <li>• Those refusing to take alternate transportation (either carpool or bus) should have to pay for that privilege. Alta and Snowbird, and to a lesser extent, Brighton and Solitude should be leading by example and charge for parking with 2 or fewer occupants.</li> <li>• A tunnel linking big and little cottonwood is unnecessary. Focus on optimizing current alternatives before building new infrastructure.</li> <li>• Fully support linking Park City and SL with light rail. Your community has already proven the success of Light Rail. Decreasing vehicular traffic down Parley's for daily commuters could go a long way to reducing the big brown cloud that we are so often greeted with at OR.</li> </ul> <p>Recreation:</p> <p>In general, concentrating or extending trails where density already exists is preferable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support linking existing trail networks.</li> <li>• Create better alternate transportation options and improved trailhead parking.</li> <li>• Fully support preserving non-mechanized backcountry terrain. You don't need a patchwork of trails everywhere.</li> <li>• User fee options should be based on how you get there. Charging mountain bikers to mountain bike if they take a bus up there isn't solving the problem. Charging the guy in his Nissan Xterra driving up solo does.</li> </ul> <p>Economy:</p> <p>One of the reasons I prefer the Central Wasatch to Denver is ease of access and lack of sprawl. That advantage is slowly dwindling. Limiting sprawl especially in the PC area should be of critical importance.</p> <p>• Fully support the initiatives under section titled "Ensure Utah's Tourism market is sustainable now and into the future"</p>	Jackson, WY	3/9/2015
<p>Mountain Accord Comments from Kathy Becker, Resident, Kimball Junction Neighborhood, Summit County</p> <p>1. BUILD IT AND THEY WILL COME- increasing density zoning allowed in a few locations in Summit County, then connecting these areas to high-speed transit systems are not measures that prevent sprawl, reduce traffic, or protect the environment on their own. Jurisdictions must ALSO impact how private property in the adjoining areas can be developed. Doing this would require a change in state law. The state legislature has shown no appetite for putting new limits on private property. It recently intervened to impose a movie studio in the county, and ultimately in Park City. Building a high-speed connection between Sandy and Park City will become a driving force for significant growth—both sprawl development and population expansion for many areas of Summit and Wasatch Counties. It also will result in continued traffic challenges as there will be many more residents and employees who will continue to drive cars, along with taking transit. If you only create new high-speed connections to the Salt Lake Valley—either along I-80 or in a new southern route, it will spur development in the newly rezoned areas AND adjoining areas. It will result in a net increase in population and sprawl. It will result in more traffic, even with transit improvements if the top priority for the Mountain Accord is environmental protection, then the current Accord has not presented a sufficient argument as to how it will benefit the Wasatch Back. It may have environmental benefits to the Wasatch Front, but these potential benefits require much more review.</p> <p>Recommendation: Remove the study of a high-speed rail connections from the current phase of the Accord's environmental review process as this measure will drive population expansion, without curbing sprawl or traffic congestion.</p> <p>2. TRAINS ARE NOT THE ANSWER TO CARMAGEDDON – Much of the conversation about transportation challenges in Summit County seems to be focused on peak times during the year when "carnageddon" descends upon Park City—Christmas week, President's weekend, Sundance, and the Film Festival. It also is focused on times when ski resorts close and employees arrive and depart. These peak events require a package of transportation strategies that are flexible and affordable. For example, during peak events, could there be free minivans that drive around neighborhoods and bring residents to venues, restaurant areas, and transit centers? Could there be free high-speed buses that depart every 30 minutes from the airport during peak hours that bring people to designated transit centers, resort centers, etc. where hotels, resorts, neighborhood minivans, and other transit connections can fetch guests and residents. During peak commuter times, can employers organize offer incentives for carpools, organize vanpools, and require parking fees? Even if you have a high-speed rail system between the Salt Lake and Park City, these targeted solutions are still necessary.</p> <p>Recommendation: Target county resources at studying and pilot testing a range of flexible "carnageddon" transportation options that don't absorb billions of dollars just to address two transportation connections: I-80 to 224 and Sandy to Park City.</p> <p>3. TRAFFIC CONGESTION AND ADDED COSTS TO DRIVE A VEHICLE ARE OFTEN PRE-REQUISITES FOR GETTING PEOPLE OUT OF THEIR CARS AND ONTO BUSES AND TRAINS – When people in traffic-congested communities are asked what causes them to stop driving their vehicles during peak times, a common response is that they don't like being stuck in traffic. They also don't like paying for parking, paying for gas, or polluting the air. People welcome having more transit options, but this does not necessarily mean that they will agree to stop driving. Once a lane is added to a road and people discover less congestion, they often jump back in their cars. Cars in the future will operate more cost-effectively, without using gas and without polluting the air.</p> <p>Recommendation: Research what will motivate people to continue using transit and other transportation options in the future IF people experienced roads that weren't congested AND had cars that cost less to operate AND didn't pollute the air.</p>	Kimball Junction	3/3/2015
<p>I love the idea of connecting the resorts, that would be amazing. I also love the idea of improved public transportation and especially mountain rail. That seems like a pretty environmentally friendly way to go that would also make Utah an even more attracting ve destination.</p>	Kingston, RI	2/27/2015
<p>You will never get the environment back to it's pristine state once you have undone the land and the surroundings. I would favor bus transit and a wider road lane set aside for bus only traffic. The reason I visit the canyon region is because it is natural lands, has pristine water, beautiful environment Wildlife and very little development. There are many options for development down valley, do not destroy what God has made, man cannot enhance, only destroy what he has given us and future generations. Do not let development dictate what is prudent and long lasting. ☺</p>	Kingsville, TX	3/5/2015
<p>I'm all for the protection of the environment. We can't just take full advantage of nature, because soon it will be gone. I also want all of the trails to be made because my favorite thing about the mountains are the hikes. I also think we should have more train tracks, but not too many. But I don't think there should be very many recreation centers. Think about the koalas!</p>	Layton	2/25/2015
<p>I love this plan. I like the idea of the transit, and the increasing wilderness protection. I also like the new trails. I love hiking, and it would be nice to hike more trails. I hear that you are planning to build tunnels. I don't think you should do that. Great idea.</p>	Layton	2/25/2015
<p>I do believe with my beating heart that we should finalize campsites. FOR THE CHILDREN!</p>	Layton	2/25/2015
<p>Key proposals I am in favor of! Environment protection; increased wilderness areas. Recreation - improve trails transit service. Transportation - transit improvement and expansion. Thanks for the effort to improve and protect Utah.</p>	Layton	2/25/2015
<p>I think that it would be cool if you made the train able to fly. It would be a good idea because if the train was about to fall off a cliff it could fly and save everything that was on it.</p>	Layton	2/25/2015
<p>No trains in the canyon, more trails for public use.</p>	Layton	2/25/2015
<p>I am totally for it just maybe more trails.</p>	Layton	2/25/2015
<p>I live at the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon and like the idea of making some improvements for traffic control. I think having increase, purposeful bus routes would be great. I also think there could be mandatory car pooling during certain peak hours, especially during ski season, to control the number of cars on the road. I would suggest carpooling be required from 7:30 AM to 10 AM and 3:00 PM to 5:30 PM from November through April. I also feel that parking should be improved not only at the ski resorts but also at some public areas like the trailheads in Albion Basin.</p>	LCC	3/12/2015
<p>I do NOT think a train would be anywhere near worth the money to build it nor do I think it would preserve the feel of the canyon which is why people come in the first place. In addition, the canyon can only handle a certain number of people, regardless of how they get there, before the entire experience is negated. Furthermore, there really does not seem to be a need to have a train connecting LCC to Park City. If a connection, besides I80, is needed the natural option would seem to be to improve and maintain the Guardsman pass road year round in BCC.</p>		
<p>I hope that the Mountain Accord will not get pushed through just to benefit the rich ski resort owners but rather consider the needs of the many both now and in the future. The most important concern, in my opinion, should be the preservation of the beauty and feel of both canyons.</p>		
<p>I would like to make a comment about the proposed blueprint for the mountain accord. I have lived most of my life in Cottonwood Heights and Little Cottonwood Canyon. Specifically I lived in Wasatch Resort up Little Cottonwood Canyon for 17 years. I have seen the canyon change a lot with more building in the mouth of the canyon. As well as an increase in hikers and mountain bikers on the trail up the canyon. In my opinion this proposed mountain accord would only detract from the natural experience that most people go looking for in this canyon. Who wants to hike or mountain bike next to a train in the canyon? It is one thing to have light rail trains in the valley, but quite another to take it into a natural habitat and National Forest area. I also disagree with connecting over to other canyons also. I think the claim that this is to protect our watershed is just a ploy to try to gain support for this project. With all of the proposed construction the watershed and wildlife are NOT being thought of. I would encourage other alternatives to this project. For example, what about a canyon shuttle like they have in Zion National Park. This proposed blueprint seems to be just another way to try to bring more tourists (skiers) here and for a select few of the systems groups to make some money at the expense of all of us. I am NOT in favor of this project.</p>	LCC	3/13/2015
<p>This suggestion was made at the NEPA seminar 3/10/2015 and at more than one of the earlier comment programs.</p>	LCC	3/12/2015
<p>MT. Accord is getting, and will continue to get, significant push-back on the blueprint portion that focuses on a train up the LCC. We strongly feel that there has not been enough consideration given to alternate methods and means of transportation up the canyon. As a result, the possibility of causing irreparable damage to the ecology, historic site(s), and living environment of the lower LCC canyon is not specifically included in the blueprint. In addition, the MA corridor "purposed criteria" seems to be written to support their initial goal of an expensive train and insure that less costly options are eliminated from consideration.</p> <p>During the system group meetings, members of the environmental group requested, multiple times, joint meetings between the various groups to compare notes and possibly come up with jointly a accepted range of transportation alternatives. This did not happen for whatever reason(s).</p> <p>I suggest that the system groups be re-convened to accomplish this task. In addition, it may be valuable to entertain the thought of including representatives from outside (public) groups. The objective would not be to disqualify the concept of a train/rail transportation but to formulate a minimum impact alternative that would be used as the lower limit of transportation studied during the EIS process. The criteria should read that we want less pollution in the canyon balanced by the smallest footprint possible.</p> <p>The objective would also be to look at transportation hubs where travel up the canyon(s) could be centralized and possibly be a point where patrons can park and/or transfer to other means of transport up the canyon. In addition a sensible "Flex" alternative could be developed to handle the traffic during peak and non-peak days.</p>		
<p>Your Executive Summary of the existing conditions of the "transportation system" (e.g. roads) simply acknowledges that mountain roads are snowy and thus "unreliable". That's what mountains are in nature. Stating that factors contribute to this "unreliability" is stating the obvious. Comparing the reliability of winding, steep roads to the freeway system is unrealistic and laughable to anyone who has actually had to get out of their car to put chains on their tires. Perhaps people should realize what they are getting into as they pass a large electric sign stating "4x4 or chains required".</p> <p>The requirement of four wheel drive or tire chains will not be avoided, even with avalanche guards on the road. Neither will the inclement weather bend to the will of the most plowed and cleared road. As the freeway system is dangerous enough before 7am and after 10pm; expecting anything better from a two-lane mountain road is ridiculous and unrealistic.</p> <p>Putting Big, Little and Parley's canyons into the same grouping is equally ridiculous; they are and have entirely different capacities and are expected to perform differently. You state in your summary that "Avalanches in the Cottonwood Canyons pose a serious threat to safety." This threat to safety extends to people outside the roadway to any backcountry skier as well. Simply calling an avalanche phone line, making one phone call, can alleviate this problem for anyone who wants to be informed and plan properly. The rest of the problem is workers trying to avoid being fired by the "Dick".</p> <p>Your summary of transportation trends is nothing more than a framework to justify development of public lands for private interest. Fix the potholes first then we'll talk about the concerns of the aristocracy. You acknowledge the agendas of USA, UDOT, the Wasatch Front Regional Council and the Mountainland Association of Governments are to develop pristine wilderness towards transportation objectives. The interests of the public are to have a place to go to escape traffic and enjoy the wilderness. These interests are pandered with a land swap and proposed trail network. Thanks for benign effort but I'll keep the trails as they are thank you.</p> <p>3.3 Roadway Network: Acknowledging that two lanes lead to more congestion than five lanes is very astute. Your graphic on page 11 of the "situation report" seems to indicate congestion around two lane roads but none at the mouth of Parley's where there is a 5 lane road. The graphs you provide showing traffic per hour is drawn to a conclusion "indicating a greater focus on recreational trips than typical work or household trips"; this does not exclude worker-related transit and is nothing more than a subjective explanation. Actually, a significant amount of traffic seems centered around a 9 to 5 workday.</p> <p>3.5 Mobility and Reliability: Mother nature causes problems so let's build a wider road to shut down for the same reasons. You show a very nice picture of a great stretch of wasatch boulevard citing "congestion" but neglects to indicate if a road closure has occurred or at what time the photograph was taken. As a resident that travels this stretch of road regularly, something like this could only happen during a canyon closure. I know plenty of that commute this road every weekday and what you have photographed is misrepresented as congestion when in fact it is closure-related. You state that this impacts emergency vehicle access but you couldn't get a police officer into Little Cottonwood Canyon within twenty minutes for a gunshot on a clear day. You could easily add more signage to inform people of the closure. I live in the canyon mentioned and what you have photographed only happens once a year, at the most, if ever. Any sane person would do something else for an hour. After all, it should be acknowledged that "avalanches will continue to be a challenge".</p> <p>Sincerely disregarded,</p>	LCC (Wasatch Resort)	3/14/2015

<p>I'm a big transit fan and actually worked for RTD in Denver in the 1970s as we developed the land use plan for DRCOG and the CBD mall (downtown). The expansion of UTA has been welcome in SLC. Our family are skiers and we have a house in Wasatch Resort, so we're keenly interested in this Mtn Accord - hoping there will be "accord" and not just "solutions" (that benefit resort-owners and developers) forced on those that don't have the money or power. My first concern is the massive impact both economically and environmentally from a train up the canyon. The millions it would cost to construct train access seem excessive when compared to far less costly measures like requiring Snowbird and Alta employees to use transit (rather than the current single-occupant vehicles) to get to work throughout ski season. Its my understanding that more than 2000 employees access the resort daily up and down the road. Traffic counts suggest - even when projected for the next decade or two - that we could solve major traffic jams by getting their <del>baseload out of their cars.</del></p>	Little Cottonwood Canyon	2/25/2015
<p>As an annual ski visitor to both the Park City and Alta/Snowbird area, I fully support the One Wasatch concept. The more that you can ski from area to area, the less time spent in a car driving from area to area. Especially in the Big and Little Sycamore Canyons, which can close after a heavy snowfall. And while I have used the bus services within Park City and To/From Alta/Snowbird, the One Wasatch concept would also not require an expansion of the system.</p>	Malibu, CA	3/16/2015
<p>It is nice to see so many different groups come together. My concerns: I worry about access to climbing and hiking in Lower CCC if a train is put in. There are many other user groups aside from skiers-we cannot sacrifice access to public land for ski resorts alone. We have a road! Use it better. I would support a fee for cars to travel improved bus access, etc. but I do not support a train. I do not support the ski resort expansion of Brighton and Solitude. Those areas are frequented by backcountry users-allowing the resorts to expand into them would take away the access to public land. Unless those areas had guaranteed uphill travel policies. Overall, I am happy that this process has started. I think much of the focus is on skiers. Please consider all user groups.</p>	Midvale	2/25/2015
<p>I would support a fee for vehicle plan. It would limit drivers and car traffic and encourage carpooling and generate revenue that could be used for canyon maintenance. Transit development-improve buses. Install lockers for transit riders at ski resorts. Increase number of buses stops so backcountry users can also use the bus. Increase parking-have a summer bus system. Recreation-no ski resort expansion. I'm okay with ski resorts receiving some of the already-developed land as private-but please no development beyond what is <del>already developed.</del></p>	Midvale	2/25/2015
<p>To the combined study teams of the Mountain Accord Process: I have been to a few meetings, read many pages online, and I put considerable thought into the proceedings and possible outcomes. First, thanks for the efforts of those who have been on the forefront. Thanks for the question and answer sessions and the correlation and tabulation and publishing of results thus far. My present attitude is similar to how I felt shortly after the process began. It appears that the process for all its good intents has been more than slightly slanted in the direction of money and ski resorts. Preservation of natural areas has slipped to a lower priority and appears to be hostage to a Little Cottonwood rail line and a couple of large tunnels that would primarily serve the resorts. I like the land exchange proposal only if it can be done without the rail and tunnel stuff. On transportation, I favor the SOC recommendation of shuttle buses and fewer cars in the canyons in winter. Even without the Little Cot train, we need expanded base of the canyons parking and more in-canyon parking, especially in the summer. Such expansions should be pursued as the study process proceeds; no need to wait for the final proposal or ESA. Maybe the Parleys rail has merit but it would also be invasive and mostly serve the wealthy. Maybe it's time to permanently toss the Little Cot train and interconnect proposals which would be enormously expensive and invasive and primarily serve the ski industry. Maybe it's time to ban or discourage private cars in the canyons (except for canyon residents) during the Thanksgiving to Valentine's or Patrick's Day period. By so doing, the buses would be less likely to get in traffic jams. What would the back country people do? They could ride the bus too if it stopped where they wanted to get off and on. To me, Park City area was sort of a world apart except for the recurring mention of interconnect. Then recently a couple of rather heavy-handed aliens got hold of their resorts. They seem to be in favor of the One Wasatch idea which to a casual hiker sort of seems like another bolt in the coffin of naturalness and preservation. All of the local resorts have a good thing going economy wise. What we need is snow on the mountains and off the roads. I don't see the need or desirability of pushing a biggest resort idea. Enough writing for now, though the details are extensive.</p>	Midvale	
<p>Hi Folks, I like what I see in the Mountain Accord, however I still believe strongly that you are leaving out a MAJOR piece of the puzzle by ignoring/marginalizing the Heber Valley. It could easily be a boost to help alleviate pressure, or a thorn in the side when all of your planning pushes unprincipled growth into that area. Years ago the city of Midway looked into putting in a lift to Brighton. While it didn't pass then, it might be a fascinating idea now--and it would create a connection for resorts and businesses in the European style without having to force big changes in building patterns. The Heber Valley is in need of public transportation: to/from Park City, to/from Sundance. Also, a kind of Tour de Mont Blanc could be established around this region of the Wasatch (the Cottonwood Canyons, Park City, Midway, etc.) that could enhance use of the area without over-taxing the infrastructure. So, while I like what I see from the Mountain Accord planning, I firmly believe it needs to be extended to the Heber Valley--especially Midway. I suggested this early on, but never saw/heard any response from the organization. I feel the same way now. Even stronger, for that matter, now that I look at the great planning/vision you have for this part of the Wasatch. Good luck! skier, hiker, mountain-biker, Midway resident</p>	Midway	3/15/2015
<p>Do we really need to expand our ski areas? We have wonderful ski areas now with plenty of terrain. We don't need the whole world here! What's wrong with our ski resorts now? The point here is that specific businesses would make money from this not the rest of us. How about if we focus on preservation and keep our mountains pristine and environmental benefit. Tunnels and trains make me feel crazy. I'm not sure we really need to connect all these resorts. How much time in the day does a recreationist have to recreate? We don't have time to be taking trains and tunnels from different canyons to other canyons. Let's focus on buses instead. If we have to focus on transportation. There is a lot of environmental destruction just to build trains/tracks and tunnels</p>	Millcreek	2/25/2015
<p>I support the land swaps as proposed</p>	Millcreek	2/25/2015
<p>No part of Mineral Basin should be sold off to Snowbird. Who pays for mass transit upgrades? What modes of mass transit are being considered most seriously? What are the preliminary designs for mass transit upgrades? I would not support a publicly funded mass transit system that is focused on supporting the private interests of the resort style ski industry. A tunnel from Alta to Brighton to PC is not an unreasonable project, but I want to see how it would be designed and how it would be financed.</p>	Millcreek	2/25/2015
<p>I don't think mass transit up Millcreek makes a lot of sense. If a tunnel from Alta to Brighton to PC is proposed, I think transportation should be focused there with little or no mass-transit upgrades in BCC. I would support a train up Parleys to PC.</p>	Millcreek	2/25/2015
<p>Having ski the Utah mountains for the last 15 years but living elsewhere(Mississippi), it seems to me a good idea to connect all the resorts. All areas are unique and an all-connect would give the skier the opportunity to experience them all. I also like the idea of expanded bus service with the buses running on natural gas(non polluting). The train idea wouldn't be good for the environment and be very expensive. Good luck with your initiative.</p>	Mississippi	3/13/2015
<p>I AGREE with the MOUNTAIN ACCORD initiative and the ONEWASATCH concept. More specifically: 1. I AGREE with the proposed resort connectivity initiative. 2. I AGREE with enhanced public transportation, including resort connectivity, improved bus, and implementation of rail services. THANK YOU.</p>	Montreal, Canada	3/13/2015
<p>Please be careful that you do not ruin something very unique in the skiing world! The creation of a European style ski circus would, at a stroke, remove Altas unique charm. JA Grant</p>	Montrose, Scotland	2/23/2015
<p>Having been to Utah skiing several times (8) from Northern New York, I have experienced generally excellent ski and travel days. BUT in case we have lousy travel days( and travel by our rental cars is not wise), I have not found a great deal of information on where to get a bus to the various ski areas and the availability of adequate and reasonably priced ski lockers once we get there for the day. This would make me feel more assured that I would not have to sit back at my hotel for the day after investing in air flight to get to Salt Lake City. I prefer to stay in the city rather at the more expensive resorts in the mountains. It's also warmer in the city.</p>	New York	2/26/2015
<p>Hi..if done right (with conservation in mind) connecting the ski areas could be a great enjoyment for skiers. In Cortina Italy you can do the "Sel a Rondo" skiing many miles, skiing from one area to the next...then bus back to where you started. As I recall we had a special ticket for this! Could be the "Wasatch Mts Ticket".</p>	Newbury, NH	3/14/2015
<p>To whom it may concern, I have lived in Utah my entire life and have recreated in the American Fork Canyon area many times. It has some fantastic offroading areas that are used all throughout the summer months by many recreationists. It is my understanding that snowbird ski resort is looking to take over the Mary Ellen Gulch area. Personally I am opposed to this as it will stop summer time recreation in the area. I take my Jeep up there and my UTV during the summer months. The area is beautiful and a great escape from civilization. I hope that any attempts to stop the recreational use of that area as I have stated will be stopped. To many areas have been closed to public use across this great state as it is. thanks</p>	Newton, UT	3/4/2015
<p>In the past 18 years or so I have skied in Utah for at least 10 of those years because it is easy for me to get there and the convenience from the airport. It was also more cost effective when my daughter was little (now 25) as kids skied free. Then I've been to other places in between (Taohex2, Snowmass, Vail, Breckenridge, Winter Park, Telluride, Keystone, etc). Last year I stayed at Park City and skied Park City, Deer Valley and The Canyons. This year I'm staying in the Valley and skiing Alta, Snowbird, Brighton and Solitude (which I know the best). It would be great to be able to stay any one of the 7 and be able to ski all 7 without having to drive back down through SLC. Also one big combined lift ticket. Last year I had to buy 2 days at DV, 2 days at Canyons, 2 days at PC...the most expensive way to go. This year I did find a multi day pass for the other 4 when I looked some months ago and now I can't seem to find that anymore (and will be there in 2 weeks), so now I'm forced to pay more for individual lift tickets...not the best way to go. So looking forward to your joining all. ☺</p>	Norcross, GA	2/26/2015
<p>What do you think about resort connectivity? • If it would help lower lift ticket prices for local skiers, I'd be in favor. If it will add debt burden that causes lift ticket prices to rise, I am not in favor of it. Each resort that I have visited has had enough terrain to keep me having fun for a full day. • While riding up the Mineral Basin Express lift I met a man from out of town who has a timeshare near Snowbird they use to vacation as a family. I was surprised to learn that he had not skied at any of the resorts other than Snowbird (except maybe Alta, but I think he hadn't even been there). He's able to travel to his timeshare without renting a car, and so going to another resort would require him to spend a lot of extra time and money (to rent a car) to get to the other resorts in Utah. I think he would appreciate the additional variety of terrain available if the resorts were connected and made more accessible without using a personal vehicle. • I believe multi-resort passes should be priced competitively with single-resort prices if the connectivity plans are implemented. Travel of any type (mountain rail, public buses, lifts/cat-tracks) would effectively cut into the ski day, so for me at least, I stick to skiing at one resort at a time if the price of the multi-resort pass were more than trivially higher. Would you like to see improved, year-round public transportation? • I would likely not use it. I come from a distance when I ski at the resorts above SLC, so I would still tend to drive a little further to one of the resort parking lots. I suppose if the public transportation options were good enough (i.e., included in the price of my pass, enabled me to start skiing earlier, or to extend the ski day by doing a long descent to a parking area far below the resort) it may be something I would use. Improved bus services? • I don't think I would use bus service even if it were improved. I have assumed this is not talking about shuttle bus service, such as they have at Snowbird, but rather to travel from SLC (and the cities reachable on FrontRunner) to the resorts. Mountain rail? • I would not pay to use it, except maybe once or twice as a sightseeing experience. I believe some attraction other than travel to ski resorts would be needed to entice enough riders to justify the cost of a mountain train. When I visited Switzerland about 15 years ago, I rode the Jungfrau Railway to the top of a mountain there, but I would not have done so if there wasn't something interesting to see. They had an "Ice Palace" with many ice sculptures in a visitors center at the top. I remember sending an e-mail from "The Top of Europe" to my family from one exhibit there, watching a movie about the construction of the railway, and viewing tools and other mountain railway artifacts that were on display.</p>	North Logan, UT	3/13/2015
<p>Dear Mountain Accord, I'd like to see Guardsman Pass maintained throughout Winter, or a tunnel made from PC to LCC and LCC / BCC connected at the end of their roads with another tunnel. I believe that there should be car access instead of Aerial access (tram, lift) from one resort to another as taking aerial will take 2-3x longer, and it is inconvenient to have to come back the same way to pick up a shuttle or vehicle before coming home. I also think that a central Utah ski pass for all resorts, snowboarding access at Alta, and beautification efforts be high priority for the coming ski year. Sometime in the future, I'd also like to see terrain opened up in American Fork Canyon behind both Alta and adjacent Brighton Ski reports in a way that visitors can start in American Fork Canyon and traverse via ski / snowboard to LCC and back. Not only would the opening of this public land be beneficial to the ski/snowboard population in LCC and reduce congestion in the existing canyons, but it would certainly open the Wasatch up to a bit more development and investment to grow our economy. Thank you</p>	Orem	3/13/2015
<p>Improve public transportation to remove the private vehicular traffic on the canyon roads. This would be a tradeoff to alleviate the increased influx of users in the future.</p>	Oshawa, ON	3/1/2015

I would like to see a train run from SLC airport to Kimball Junction. From there users could connect to a proposed PC/Summit County light rail. The projected growth in this area suggests the need for the train is inevitable and is necessary to control traffic on I-80, provide long term protection of the environment, and maintain safety. It would be much better to make the investment in time and resources now while it is still manageable to do construction on I-80. Waiting until it is too late will balloon expenses and make traffic due to construction unthinkable. Denver has been talking about a train to the mountains for decades. I'm afraid for them, it is just too late. We shouldn't make the same mistake.	Park City	2/4/2015
Though ambitious, this process is missing the boat in some areas- especially transportation. Park City has worked for over 40 years to build its image as a world class winter and summer resort community. Unlike the other canyons in this study area, our location, accessibility and community profile is very different. Our first priority as a community is to cater to the locals, 2nd home owners and destination visitors. If we become a transportation hub for the Wasatch front and big and little Cottonwood canyons, we will compromise our best asset. We cannot overcrowd or devalue the recreational experience nor should we desecrate the mountains by tunnels and trains. Eroding the asset is a bad idea. People will quit coming. Quiet, efficient, environmentally responsible and fiscally sound transportation alternatives are possible. Do not get carried away with pie in the sky stuff. Covet what we have and be very careful how you treat its future. No trains. No tunnels. No aerial trams connecting the canyons. Stay within.	Park City	2/23/2015
1. Question growth. It does not have to be endless and uncontrolled. Greed vs growth. Regulate it. 2. Question Cars. Park and ride bus and then other ideas. No more free parking at resorts or Main Street. 25\$ minimum. Use money for transportation. 3. Forget trains. Too expensive. Think monorails. Funicular. Trails. Gondolas. Drones. Think 3d. Go up. Out. Around. 4. Use existing stuff. Pave and plow Gaurdsms. 30 mph. Use existing tunnels. 5. Use bikes. Walk. Develop mass transit hub mindset. 6. Think exponentially for exponential growth and exponential change. Nothing is linear. 7. Consider climate. It will change. Consider natural vegetation. It will change. 8. Consider unintended consequences and problems and solutions unimagined. Think like Steve Jobs. 9. Do not let merchants and chamber of commerce drive process. Less is more. 10. Consider the people who live here and built this place. We have rights too. Do not kill the golden goose.	Park City	2/24/2015
Dear Mountain Accord, I live in Silver Summit just outside of Park City, and I try to use the free bus system in the basin as much as I can. But the times I use it the most is when it is inconvenient to take my car into town, like during Sundance or skiing at PCMR, which now has limited parking. These are to exemplify using a "carrot and stick" approach to getting people to use mass transit. A free bus system is the carrot, and limited parking is the stick. Here are some other suggestions to improve use of public transportation, using a combination of incentives and disincentives to using your car around Park City: 1) Make most of the popular parking lots paid parking (ski areas, China Bridge, hotels, etc.). I'm pretty sure we will be seeing paid parking at PCMR soon, now Vail's in town. However, the private sector should be forced to use most of the funding collected in parking lots go to subsidize the cost of transit. This will make it easier to keep the transit system free. 2) Give a discount at your event (skiing, lift served biking, Sundance, Arts Festival, dinner, etc.), if you can prove you used public transit to get to your event. 3) Give a discount at your hotel if you did not rent a car. 4) Add more buses at peak skier/visitor transit times. For the Pink bus during skier out-load, this can occur between 2:30 to 4:00pm. It is a negative when get on a bus with your ski gear and there is nowhere to sit. The basin Pink bus has very high ridership during Sundance and there have been a few times when I could not get on the bus. 5) Give a free ski ticket to someone stepping of the bus at the ski area. 6) Give a \$50 gift card to someone stepping of the bus at the Main Street Transit Center paid for by the Main Street Business Alliance. 7) Sell parking privilege cards to all residents/visitors. If you don't have a parking privilege card, you must park in satellite park lots with bus service similar to the ones setup for the Olympics. Thank you for putting on an informative event tonight. As you can tell, Park City residents are involved and informed. Chris/Andy, keep fighting for us. You know the 800 pound gorilla lives in the SLC valley, and they are sure to throw their weight around on this topic.	Park City	2/24/2015
I think resort connectivity is great. I would like to see high speed rail from the airport to Park City (Kimball Junction) with some overnight parking. From Kimball Junction see the existing bus routes to get people to the resorts/downtown. Some type of express bus service at peak seasons/times would be awesome so visitors are not inconvenienced and have an incentive to use the rail/bus instead of renting cars at the airport. Buses should be waiting for visitors at Kimball Junction when a train arrives. I'm not sure I want to see the rail service all the way to the PC resorts or downtown. ☹️	Park City	2/26/2015
Any improvements to year round transportation would be welcome. Not only for locals but for all the tourists coming to the Utah mountains both winter and summer. More and more tourists (Lower 48 and international) will be coming to Utah due to the Vail Resorts and the "Epic Pass" influence. Express buses, and light rail direct from the airport to the ski resorts should have a major impact on the number of cars making the trek to the resorts, thus lessening the traffic and the carbon footprint of said cars. One Wasatch is also a great idea. Ski tourists would be able to ski the many Wasatch Ski resorts without having to drive from one to the other. Opponents say people wouldn't ski from Park City and take a lift to Brighton and then on to Alta/Snowbird. I say they would. Think of the possibilities. Ski and stay 2 days in Park City, then take a lift to Brighton/Saltitude and ski/stay there for two days and then take a lift and ski/stay two days in Alta/Snowbird. How awesome is that. The naysayers continue to hawk the watershed, environmental impact, sight lines, wildlife impact, etc. This is shortsighted. Moose and deer frequent my backyard in Park City on a regular basis undeterred by the human presence, as do Red Tail Hawks and Brown Eagles. The One Wasatch will happen and why not. It makes more sense than increasing the motor traffic up and down the canyons year round.	Park City	2/26/2015
Comment: I'm voting YES on connecting all the resorts. I'm skier with 32 days in so far this year - all in Utah. Yes in favor of One Wasatch. Yes in favor of rail and tunnels and expanded bus service I have skied Utah since 1984, I have a home in Park City, Utah and a condo in Snowbird (and Park UTAH TAKES on both). I currently have Epic pass and Snowbird ski season passes and I ride the Wasatch trail at the top several times each summer on my mountain bike. I feel that all of these expansions would have positive affect on the environment by cutting traffic and pollution. They would also increase tourism and boost the local economies. None of us would be debating this question if not for expansions in the past which lead to building these resorts. I also would consider volunteering time from my 23 attorney firm to fight any possible legal challenges.	Park City	2/26/2015
What are you waiting for!!!! Do it and do it now!	Park City	2/26/2015
Dear MountainAccord, As a part time Park City resident, avid skier, hiker, biker and traveller I see many potential benefits to both the proposals by Mountain Accord and one Wasatch. However, should one prohibit the other, then I would say both plans are sadly misguided. The Wasatch Mountains are a wonderful natural resource that have the ability to drive tourism and delight their users and if manager correctly minimize the impact to the surrounding communities. To achieve these goals, I think we need both a better transportation system, reducing the volume of cars up and down the canyons; I believe this should be in the form of a train connected to both SLC and the airport. In addition, we need a mechanism to connect all of the resorts over the top via a series of lifts. The layout of the resorts makes connecting them practical and economic. These solution cannot be and should not be mutually exclusive. Having skied in Europe for over 30 years, I can give you countless examples of where a transportation system and lift system have been implemented reducing car volume and improving the overall skiing/hiking/biking experience. ☹️	Park City	2/26/2015
I am all for anything that expands the access to more resorts, especially in little and big cottonwood, and also access to more backcountry.	Park City	2/26/2015
Hello, I've had an opportunity to read through the Mountain Accord blueprint. As a resident of Park City, and a very strong supporter of One Wasatch, I couldn't be any unhappier with your proposal. I see tremendous recreational and economic benefit from the One Wasatch proposal and don't want a Mountain Accord blueprint to derail the vision. Furthermore, the alternative Mountain Accord proposes to One Wasatch seems misguided at best and delusional at worst. A proposed light rail, tunnel or shuttle transit instead of a few chair lifts? A tunnel, really? These alternatives are more expensive, impractical and less feasible solutions. Who is going to willingly pay for these? Why on Earth would your blueprint suggest this is a marketable alternative that realistically has a chance to attract tourists? It is dishonest to suggest tourists would prefer to jump on a bus instead of skiing between the Wasatch front and Park City.	Park City	2/26/2015
My wife and I have been skiing all over the world. We currently own a condo in Park City because we enjoy being there so much and it is one of our favorite places to ski. We have seen firsthand how many European skiers travel to Utah for the conditions. Connecting the resorts would only increase that number. It would also increase the numbers of desirable tourists you seek. By providing a European experience of massive terrain, with the conditions that exist there ...WOW. It is also important that people understand that they can get a drink at the end of the day, and it needs to be easy to do so. I still constantly hear from people that they would not consider Utah because they want to be able to get a beer and do not think they can. These are not drunken slob but mature easy going adults I am referring to. I am an aging baby who would love to ski a One Wasatch before I am too old to enjoy it Happy Turns ☹️	Park City	3/1/2015
Hello, I have lived in Utah since 1978 in park city and sic I have skied all over the Wasatch ,backcountry and lifts I skied 9900 before there was a chair lift there and all I can say is I wish the chair went all the way to the top. I am so bummed the new iron mtm chair at the canyons stopped short of the ridge it ruined that mt. It could have been some of the best skiing in the Wasatch. I think the one Wasatch proposal could open up some fantastic terrain and relay put Utah on the map it would be awesome. Like I said I've skied all over the Wasatch from North Bowl behind the canyons to Cardiac Bowl, Monty Cristo to the phiperhorn in little cotton wood to Box Elder there is so much terrain in the Wasatch so much backcountry that I didn't mention. That putting in the three lifts or connecting the three resorts would not put a dent in the backcountry still available. Opening up would only help and adding transportation tunnels or trains whatever would only be more be awesome. Maybe you could ask the forest services to allow some huts in the Wasatch to allow the backcountry skiers more accessibility or a place to spend the night if there close proximity stuff is not as available as it was. But there is so much terrain, I don't know what there complaining about. PLEASE CONNECT THE RESORTS. Its been far to long. Save our canyons from our canyons.	Park City	3/1/2015
We strongly endorse Mountain Accord's proposal to address environmental, transportation, recreational and other concerns with a plan to integrate the Salt Lake Valley and Wasatch resources. Given the success of these integrations in Europe, we would endorse a train extended from the current proposal to return from Park City to Salt Lake City. It would serve all of the purposes outlined by Mountain Accord plus relieve traffic throughout the day and evening of people driving up and down Parley's Canyon. This is a visionary proposal that you are creating, and we strongly support it.	Park City	3/2/2015

<p>Hi all,</p> <p>Thank you again for all of your time and in particular, last week during the public information sessions. I had an editorial in the Park Record (that the paper also agreed with) that can be seen here for my take: <a href="http://www.parkrecord.com/opinion/cj_27612729/letters-editor-february-28-march-3-2014">http://www.parkrecord.com/opinion/cj_27612729/letters-editor-february-28-march-3-2014</a></p> <p>I have now thought long and hard about the process, read some of the editorials and other discussion, and have come to a conclusion.</p> <p>The biggest single reason that there is so much push-back, and it might even potentially stop the Mountain Accord process from happening all together, is because of the proposed transit line between Park City and the Cottonwoods. While I personally think it's a great idea to connect the two I have two suggestions:</p> <p>1) Eliminate this section all together. I had to leave early so I never heard if there was a specific reason for this transit line (I'll read in greater depth on the website to see if there is a "why" for this line specifically addressed). It seems that all parties who are concerned; the affiliation of Mountain Accord with things like One Wasatch; pushback from residents of the Cottonwoods; the assumption that this benefits resorts more than community -- all come from this one proposed transit line.</p> <p>2) Or, if it needs to be added, make the line dotted and call it "possible phase three" and basically look at it as something you may consider or roll. Somehow make it more palatable.</p> <p>It's a bummer because it really stops and alienates what otherwise looks like very interesting planning. This one line pretty much unseals mountain accord. It also makes it very tough to digest what mountain accord actually is.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Park City	3/2/2015
<p>I would like to enter my comments regarding the Mountain Accord. Before I begin I must explain my situation. As someone that lives in Park City but travels to LCC multiple times a week during the winter and multiple times a month during the summer I am very involved in carpooling when possible. Also as someone that has lived in Utah since 1972 the expansion and development has been phenomenal. But in saying this and after attending both the meeting at the library in LCC, and the meeting at the Eccles in PC...there was a very clear distinction between the issues on the front of the Wasatch vs. the back. What I did here loud and clear was that NO ONE in either audience had any desire to not preserve our beautiful mountains. No one wanted a road connecting Park City to BCC or LCC, and no one wanted an overland lift. Everyone wanted the mountains preserved for a quiet backcountry experience, to protect our watershed, to protect American Fork peaks, White Pine and to have affordable access to these areas.</p> <p>Some points I believe in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*The LCC issue must be resolved NOW. We must install sheds in high avalanche areas and make the canyon one way going up in the morning for 2 hours and down(in the evening) for 2 hours during peak holiday times. Having people going to 9400 S. in the left lane would help the process at the bottom of the canyon, along with police. Tourists may have to move to downtown hotels or airport hotels to make their flights the next day, or when arriving.</li> <li>* The ski areas and cities should give a bonus or 5 back to tourists that do not rent cars and use public transportation.</li> <li>* The light rail from the airport must run, along with buses until 2-3 hours after the last flight arrives in Salt Lake City. How can we reduce car traffic if this isn't possible?</li> </ul> <p>A modern Cog is the only desirable transportation up LCC. Its fast and reliable. Buses are dirty, slow and noisy.</p> <p>Parking must be close and convenient. There are many times there is no parking at 3900 S. and at BCC and LCC parking lots when I go there(especially during the work week). If we have a train there must be express and non express routes. If there is a necessity to take a public form of transportation then lockers, lots of them, at the areas must be free. There also must be many of them so you do not have to pay to store anything. If lands remain in private hands we must institute strict environmental policies so that every 15-30 years we are not re-doing and re-developing any area.</p> <p>Protection of the BCC/PC/LCC ridgeline is a must. There must be protection of the PC ridgeline or developers will grab it and ruin it. Absolutely no development should be done in Grizzly Gulch. Absolutely no aerial connections or above ground lifts outside the canyon walls. If we must connect BCC and LCC it must be in an underground and quiet, non disturbing fashion.</p> <p>There should be no further ski area expansion allowed. Why is ski area expansion even related to protection of our natural resource??? Any building and development must be within their current boundaries with restrictions on removal of timber that is not dead already. A restriction must be placed on Snowbird regarding their one piece of land in White Pine (no helicopters, roads, traverses etc.)</p> <p>What I am most interested in is the creation of a National Monument/Wilderness Area that encompasses all the rest of the Wasatch so that no further development can be done.</p> <p><b>DO NOT LET ECONOMICS, DEVELOPMENT AND MONEY BE THE DRIVING FORCE BEHIND ANY PLAN. THE DRIVING FORCE MUST BE PROTECTION OF OUR BEAUTIFUL MOUNTAINS, OUR WATERSHED, OUR BACK COUNTRY TERRAIN, AND AFFORDABLE ACCESS FOR ALL.</b></p> <p>So, as the Mountain Accord Blueprint as written now, I absolutely cannot support it.</p>	Park City	3/4/2015
<p>I am a retired Professor of Biochemistry and live year round in Park City, Utah. I moved here solely because of the environment of the Wasatch Mountains and their almost endless recreational possibilities. I downhill ski, I cross-country ski, I hike, I fly-fish and I also enjoy the arts, theater and music of both Salt Lake City and Park City.</p> <p>I have read the proposed blueprint produced by the Accord and would offer the following comments:</p> <p>Environment. In my opinion the protection of the Central Wasatch should be the primary objective of the Accord Blueprint. The preservation of clean and plentiful water should be non-negotiable. Economy. Under no circumstances should economic development be allowed to degrade the mountain environment. Resort skiing is already part of the tourist economy and is crucial to the financial viability of our state. However this does not mean that resort skiing should be permitted to expand to the detriment of the other uses of the backcountry (back country skiing, hiking, fishing etc). Limited numbers of ski trails linking resorts should be considered but surface ski lifts between resorts should be managed very carefully to avoid environmental degradation. Light rail linkages should be preferred.</p> <p>Recreation. Everyone has the right to enjoy public lands. Not everyone is able to hike into the depths of the Wasatch to enjoy their beauty but some degree of access needs to be provided to those with handicaps or who may be limited by their age or illnesses. It is important that graded access to the mountains be provided to those who are young or inexperienced so that they can also develop a life-long love of the outdoors and a healthy lifestyle. There needs to be a balance. By way of example roads such as the Alpine Loop and Mirror Lake Highway provide ready access to the mountains, spectacular views and some easy trails. The Guardsman's Pass road also provides some spectacular scenery and trails such as the one to Blood's Lake are popular introductions. Perhaps Mountain Accord could facilitate the development and cataloging of a green, blue, black hiking trail system. Easy trails close to existing roadways would allow first timers a glimpse of the back country without degrading the experience for those who seek the challenge and rewards of a true back country experience. What would the experience of climbing Timpanogos be if there was an aerial tramway to the top? What would the first view of Lake Blanche be like if it was over-crowded? Mountain biking needs to be controlled as the excessive use of bikes on trails degrades the trail system and is hazardous to other users. Having said that mountain bikers do make a contribution to the economy and have a right to enjoy their sport. I have no objection to seeing mountain bikers on the Wasatch Crest Trail but it is pleasant to enjoy the hike up from Big Cottonwood without them.</p> <p>Transportation. This is the difficult one. We all need a means to get us from where we live to where we want to recreate. This almost inevitably involves the use of cars (or multiple cars for one way hikes), with a need for asphalt for parking and the concomitant generation of air borne pollution. For Park City we have to have a means to get thousands of guests a week from Salt Lake airport to town. Local businesses make large amounts of money for shuttle rides and have a vested interest in maintaining the status quo. National car rental companies want people to drive (although I imagine that there are more riders per vehicle in rental cars than there are in that of the average local on a trip to the Valley. Buses are not the answer. No one paying thousands of dollars for a ski vacation is going to ride a bus from the airport! The rail link is the only viable option but not in the way it is currently envisioned. There needs to be a loop from Sandy, up Little Cottonwood Canyon through Snowbird and Alta to Brighton and Solitude and then on to Park City as envisioned using tunnels to avoid the visual impact of surface ski runs. This would provide access to the population of the southern parts of the Salt Lake Valley and reduce the traffic in the Cottonwood Canyons (banning private vehicles if necessary). It would also allow easy access to trailheads even for one way hikers and skiers. Park City officials seem to be concerned that this would make Park City into a destination for 'day skiers from Sandy'. I am not convinced how many of these skiers would bypass, Snowbird, Alta, Solitude and Brighton so they could ski at Deer Valley or PC/MR/Canyons.</p>	Park City	3/4/2015
<p>We strongly object to the proposed Mountain Accord. We believe the environmental and financial burdens do not justify the minimal usage we think will occur during most of the year.</p>	Park City	3/5/2015
<p>I am opposed to the proposed alternative of connecting the Cottonwood Canyon with the Park City area via tunnels and roadways. A compelling need has not been proven that would justify the impacts associated with this alternative. I have not seen a cost/benefit analysis that could be considered credible.</p> <p>In addition to the unproven need and justification, any such connection runs counter to many of the stated corridor purposes. It is not certain, and in fact doubtful, water quality will be protected and the competitiveness of any such transit service is far from proven when considering a return on investment. New evacuation options from the Cottonwood Canyons are a low priority in contrast to the negative impacts and huge, unidentified cost. Parking impacts are more likely to be relocated than reduced and the notion that sprawl will be controlled is strictly rhetoric for the purpose of the reports. Access for pedestrians and bicyclists can, and should, be pursued completely independent of any mass transit plan. The pedestrian and bicycle improvements do not require the mass transit plan to be viable or accretive and would be greatly enhanced by its elimination. And finally, the notion of protecting and enhancing community character as a result of such an invasive alternative is strongly counter intuitive.</p> <p>It is inconceivable a transportation system can be developed for the Cottonwood Canyon/Park City connection that can move a meaningful number of people in a timely fashion at a cost that makes any sense. Furthermore, the location and source of demand for access from the Wasatch Front to Park City is not at the mouth of the Cottonwood Canyons. Redirecting the extraordinary funds required to develop this alternative from more logical and practical solutions and other pressing transportation issues in the State is irresponsible.</p> <p>The bulk of the demand for transit between the Wasatch Front and Park City is, and will continue to be, via the I-80 corridor. In the early 1990's transportation planners in Colorado on the Governor's Blue Ribbon Transportation Committee stressed that the State could not "pave its way out of the I-70 problem" connecting Denver and the ski areas. In spite of that prophetic warning the State of Colorado never focused on mass transit in the I-70 corridor and today suffers from a transportation problem that negatively impacts access to the mountains, interstate commerce, safety and the environment. Ironically, Utah has benefitted from that problem as destination skiers recognize the ease of access to the Utah areas as a compelling advantage. There is a lesson to be learned here - it is unlikely the highway system in the I-80 corridor can be expanded to adequately handle the projected increase in automobile traffic. The emphasis and resources should be focused on developing a comprehensive mass transit plan and system that utilizes the existing corridor and is designed around the factors that determine successful mass transit - cost, convenience and ease of use.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to move this to the list of alternatives proposed to be dropped from further consideration. I do not advocate Summit County or Park City pulling out of the Mountain Accord if the plan is not modified as some have suggested. I'm certain continued involvement is a better strategy than abdication.</p>	Park City	3/8/2015
<p>I live in the Kimball Junction neighborhood in Summit County and I appreciate the opportunity to provide input into the Mountain Accord process. I applaud the concept of the Accord, but am cautioned that some of the ideas that the Accord is advancing are not aligned with its stated objectives.</p> <p>1. Sprawl. Effective Smart Growth needs to couple Transportation with Land Use regulations. The State of Utah and most county governments in Utah have little stomach for strong land use regulations that impact private landowners from creating sprawl development on their property. State and county governments appear to be fine with allowing high-density developments surrounded by sprawl development.</p> <p>Portland is the poster child for successful Smart Growth. But their adoption of mass transit came with very strict "urban growth" boundaries. This created rapid gentrification within those boundaries, but it has worked better than most places to reduce sprawl. Compare Portland to San Francisco. When BART was built, the hope was that development would be channeled into designated locations outside of San Francisco where development could be contained. Yes, those centers have grown--A WHOLE LOT, but BART also rapidly promoted EXTENSIVE NEW sprawl development further out from all of the centers because drivers were willing to commute 45 minutes further from their closest BART station.</p> <p>Without strict land use regulations in the State of Utah that also impact regulations in counties, proposed transportation plans to build high-speed rail connections between Salt Lake and Summit Counties will not curb sprawl. They will promote high-density developments surrounded by, and choked by sprawl developments. The Accord identifies the City of Park City and Kimball Junction as two communities that should embrace further such development, because they'll get a fast train to/from Sandy and Salt Lake City. This proposal should be dropped from the Accord.</p> <p>2. Traffic Congestion. Research shows that commuters won't tolerate making multiple transfers between their homes and their workplaces. They also prefer to drive their cars if transportation alternatives are not "MORE" convenient, cost-effective, and dependable than their personal vehicles.</p> <p>Summit County needs to focus on creating convenient, cost-effective, and dependable transportation choices. We need to acknowledge that Salt Lake County and counties adjoining it to the north, west, and south already have sprawling development. Summit and Wasatch have sprawl development as well. Employers are dispersed throughout these counties. Other than the universities, there are few key major employment centers.</p> <p>Summit County should deploy well-tested convenient, cost-effective, and dependable transportation strategies targeted at commuters--organized carpools and vanpools that take people directly from a neighborhood/transit center/park-and-ride lot to a specific destination. These carpools and vanpools should be greeted with lower parking rates in city, county, or employer parking lots. The County also should focus on a range of flexible options to move people along 224 and 248. This will require county and employer personnel who are dedicated to this work.</p> <p>3. Environmental Protection. I don't see how any of the Mountain Accord plans help to preserve the environment on the Wasatch Back. Unless the Accord includes strict downzoning of private property, it will have only negative impacts on our side of the mountain. And we know that the legislature won't allow downzoning.</p> <p>OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS. 1. Remove the high-speed rail connections from the proposal, as I believe they will promote sprawl, drain future transportation resources, and not decrease congestion.</p> <p>2. Focus on a range of flexible options for transport along 224 and 248. I would like to see dedicated transit and carpool lanes, dedicated bicycle lanes, etc. 3. Require employers, event organizers, resort centers to invest in strategies that reduce car trips to and from their locations, without decreasing their success. Thanks again for your work</p>	Park City	3/9/2015
<p>It is true that Senator Niederhauer owns property that could be greatly affected by the proposed route of Mt. Accord? If its true, then this is corruption on a grand scale (racketeering, really) and the US Attorney should be notified. If its not true, then my apologies for the insinuation.</p>	Park City	3/11/2015

<p>The saying "If we build it - they will come" is already coming to fruition with the presence of VAIL and is very concerning to me. As a 13 year resident in Park city (primary residence) I am very very concerned over the influx of visitors to park city mountain resort, and I am beginning to feel like I am the outsider on the mountain. Gone are the days when riding the lifts I would have the opportunity to chat with other locals...this year 9 times out of 10 I am riding the chair with out of state folks...while I realize how important visitors are to our economy - sadly we are definitely losing the feel of a small mountain town. I see this problem as increasingly worsening with Vail touting the expansion of PCM with Canyons as it is being touted as the largest ski resort in US...they will come !!!</p> <p>My biggest concern is out of control building, and no. 1 overall - the traffic congestion and parking issues. While there are many proposed transit options, some much better than others in attempting to sustain our "independence and small town culture" I don't feel either of the councils have the long time PC residents' interest at best here, and definitely the consideration of a pathway from Sandy to Park City should be removed - no matter what !! The only sane option that I would consider is placing a "cap" on the number of individuals that are allowed access in any given day on the Mountain for skiing, and consideration of a significant Toll Fee to be placed on private vehicles entering PC from either SR 224 or via HWY 40. Full time Residents of Park City could purchase a Toll pass, but all visitors would be subject to paying a toll if transport into PC is via vehicle. Colorado has electronic Toll cameras that seem to work well. This may encourage use of other transit systems, which there are a few that seem to make the most sense both environmentally and recreationally. I would be in support of a light rail Transit (LRT) both on Sr 224 &amp; SR 248 into Park City as being the most unobtrusive option and if there is adequate parking for people coming up I-80 I believe it would be receptive. Adding BRT Bus rapid transit bus via in mixed traffic seems to make more sense as well as long as it does not diminish the bike paths. This winter has seen many days (sadly) permitting road riding...and I am a frequent rider on SR 224, and would hate to lose any bike access from Kimball into Park City. And then of course there is the dilemma of Deer Valley, and only one exit path --- we have experienced way too many nights of 45 minute time frames just to get out to Sr 224 !!! I believe the gondola may be a good option, but again that presents with parking issues as well for those that choose to ride the gondola. Once again, a FEE for private vehicle access may be one way to deter folks from driving. In closing as much as I hate our beautiful PC to become such a "Dictator" community...by limiting the number of vehicles/people to preserve the "land that I love live in" is more important than anything. If the increases in building (both residential and commercial) continues at the rate we are now seeing, and traffic and congestion on the Mountain - it may be time for us to consider moving elsewhere...sadly, as we had hope to retire here in these beautiful mountains...it may not even remain affordable as BIG corporation and growth seems to be taking precedence.</p> <p>I am in support of the Traffic Alternatives that are proposed to be "dropped" from further consideration. None of which I would support.</p>	<p>Park City</p> <p>3/11/2015</p>
<p>I am NOT in favor of the Mountain Accord's proposed land swap at Alta.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Park City</p> <p>3/11/2015</p>
<p>I have read the proposed Blueprint and FAQs, attended the open house in Park City on February 24, and listened with great interest to the comments and questions from the audience and particularly from the panelists. I also reviewed the summaries of Existing Conditions and Trends for each of the four systems. I first skied in Park City about 35 years ago. Now, my wife and I have a 4-bedroom home here and during the winter months we have a succession of relatives and friends visiting from around the country and Europe. I also chat with many of the visitors with whom I ride various ski lifts or otherwise meet while skiing. My own experiences and my conversations with relatives, friends and visitors help to inform my comments on the proposed Blueprint. I fully subscribe to the Mountain Accord's desire to address economic, environmental, recreation and transportation issues in a balanced manner. And I think it is clear that we all owe a debt of gratitude to the many people who have endeavored to create a comprehensive blueprint for the future. I appreciate the opportunity that has been given to me and other members of the public to share our own perspectives on these issues through our comments. My own views differ significantly from the proposed blueprint in a number of respects, particularly its outright rejection of ski lift connections which seems to me arbitrary, illogical, and not well balanced. Arbitrary because the blueprint gives only the most cursory explanation of the reasoning behind this key recommendation. Illogical because ski lift connections would provide benefits in all four systems of the central Wasatch Mountains addressed by the blueprint-- environment, recreation, transportation and economy. Not well balanced because some key factors are over-weighted while others are severely under-weighted. I did note that the day after the One Wasatch concept was unveiled, certain groups and individuals announced their intention to oppose it very vigorously and it would appear that they have been most successful in using the Mountain Accord as a vehicle to forward their aims. I approach this issue from a different perspective, namely that of a dedicated downhill skier whose entire family shares my passion for both resort and backcountry skiing. Neither I nor any of my family or friends have any ownership interest in any ski resort or ski related business, nor have any of us ever worked in any of them, nor do we know any executives or owners of any of them. I'm not a member of any organized group and so my own comments are solely from the perspective of an individual skier and homeowner in Summit County, although I can say that many of the views I express below are shared by other thoughtful skiers and residents with whom I have discussed these matters. Automobile pollution is indisputably one of the most pressing environmental issues -- it affects the atmosphere and the water. The blueprint describes the harmful effects of rampant automobile use in great detail and advocates non-auto transportation options. But then the blueprint rejects ski lifts out of hand even though they offer a near-term opportunity to significantly decrease auto use and vehicle miles traveled. During the course of the ski season, we make at least 20 roundtrips from Park City to the Cottonwoods by automobile to accommodate the desires of visiting relatives and friends all of whom want to spend at least a day at Alta/Snowbird and/or Brighton/Solitude. I also have had occasion to ski with a large group of cruising sailors who have an annual ski gathering in Park City. They too, as well as many doctors, dentists, lawyers and others who attend conferences in Park City make the drive to both of the Cottonwoods each year. In addition, virtually every visitor I have met on the ski lifts or in a pool or hot tub in the evening, talks about driving to one or two of those resorts during their stay in Park City. I believe it is clear that the installation of ski lifts connecting Park City with the Cottonwoods would eliminate several tens of thousands of automobile trips each year. I further believe that the ski lifts themselves would cause very little pollution, particularly if run with green energy, and that the water pollution attendant to several new ski runs connecting the areas would be miniscule, particularly in comparison to the amount of automobile pollution that would be eliminated.</p>	<p>Park City</p> <p>3/11/2015</p>
<p>First and foremost, thank you to all that have participated in the creation of Mountain Accord and facilitation of panel discussions for public input etc. A thankless job at times I am certain! Concerned that there was no one from UDOT, UTAH, a representative of the Rail Road or a highway, bridge, tunnel engineer on the panel. I realize it may be premature for this and that Mountain Accord may morph into something new and different multiple times before a project of this nature could ever happen. Additionally and of greater concern is that many in Summit County as well and likely Wasatch and SL Counties may have little knowledge of this organization, what they are ultimately trying to accomplish etc. Educating the public in the end may be one of the biggest hurdles ahead. It seemed at the Park City Forum that many citizens felt that Mountain Accord was here to discuss traffic matters including the recent "carnageddon" in Park City/Summit County. Many are not aware that Jackson Hole experienced the same traffic matters on the same day. A VERY SAMLL price to pay for the success we have attracted over many years of working to bring so many to our community and the tax dollars that we enjoy long after the tourists return home every season. Mass transit needed, YES. Loving "The Canyon's" (big and little cottonwood) to death, YES. Loving the BOX Canyon Community of Park City to death, hard to argue, YES. Need for additional parking spaces in town, NO. Need for less in town parking replaced by more convenient, timely mass transit, YES. Until these changes are made how about a request of our Local, County and State Police Departments assisting the ingress/egress of traffic during the 50-75 busiest traffic hours we experience each winter season? They along with every one of us benefit from our success as a destination resort!</p> <p>Thank you ALL again for your efforts. Please let me know if there is anything that I can do to help.</p>	<p>Park City</p> <p>3/12/2015</p>
<p>Lots of great info and conversations Tuesday at NEPA seminar.</p> <p>Federal Highway man, Harold Peaks, said the Mountain Accord is definitely NOT ready for NEPA. He said it needs to be much more precise and clear in it's vision.</p> <p>I brought up the Zion NP model of shuttle buses and restricted auto traffic. They said that is NOT represented in The Mountain Accord. They told me it needs to be proposed by me, and/or anyone else, to Mountain Accord, EIA, NEPA, etc... ALSO, if they went with the Zion NP model it might not even need NEPA if they just used the existing roadway.</p> <p>I PROPOSE THE ZION NATIONAL PARK MODEL</p>	<p>Park City</p> <p>3/12/2015</p>
<p>As a 40 year residence of Park City here are my comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Summit County and Salt Lake County have two different problems. They should keep working together but on 2 tracks.</li> <li>SLC needs to get day visitors to the mountain, Summit county needs to get day workers and destinations visitor's to their destination.</li> <li>With Summit County workforce and the visitor's time and cost are important, but I believe time is the most important transportation factor.</li> <li>A rapid bus or train from the airport to somewhere in Summit County would be the best for our guests. A rapid bus or train from a park and Ride in SLC and a common drop off in Summit County would be the best for SLC workforce.</li> <li>A park and ride in SLC and a train that would go up one canyon and down the other would be the canyon's best option.</li> <li>Any surface connection between the canyons and Park City would only increase sprawl.</li> <li>Park City and Summit County have spent 10's of millions of dollars for open space and trails. We did this for our residents and destination guest. Day visitors do not generate the revenue to pay for these amenities and will only overcrowd them. ☹</li> </ul>	<p>Park City</p> <p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>What do you think about resort connectivity?</p> <p>I may be okay with "limited" connectivity that does not open larger parcels of what is now considered backcountry skiing. I am not sure I would be in favor of connections from Park City to the Cottonwoods.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would you like to see improved, year-round public transportation?</li> </ul> <p>In a word, YES, though I am skeptical it would have much impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved bus services?</li> </ul> <p>Again, yes, but I am skeptical that it would have much impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mountain rail?</li> </ul> <p>From what I hear, this is not truly a viable option</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No improvements at all?</li> </ul> <p>Perhaps this may actually prove to be best idea of all...</p>	<p>Park City</p> <p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>As a resident of Park City, I like the idea of being able to get on a lift and making my all the way over to big/little cottonwood and ski. If done properly, the environmental impact should be minimal and ultimately reduce the amount of gas expelled by my car and me driving all the way into SLC just to hit the canyons.</p> <p>My only concern is if I miss the last lift in big/little cottonwood and I'm parked at PCMR. How do I get back home? More importantly, if ski conditions go south during the day and equipment is forced to shut down. I'd hate to be stuck at Alta with no accommodations or a way to get back home.</p> <p>I'd personally like to see each connector lift be enclosed and stay open later than 4:30pm so people could get to Park City for dinner if they're staying in big/little cottonwood.</p> <p>One last concern: Parking in Park City as a whole is horrible. This needs to be figured out if SLC and the surrounding areas are expected to grow like the projections say. If the Mountain Accord happens, where is everyone going to park?</p>	<p>Park City</p> <p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>I Vote yes to resort connectivity</p> <p>I Vote yes to clean energy for SLC (LNG, rail to PC, rail to Cottonwoods)</p> <p>I Vote yes to improving air quality in SLC- electric car tax credits</p> <p>I Vote yes to moving people via gondola</p> <p>Less cars on road= good for SLC, good for climate change, good for tourism, good for snow on our mountains, good for human kind</p> <p>Thank you for your time and energy!</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Investment property owner, Park City</p>	<p>Park City</p> <p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>Hello all,</p> <p>The big picture view "One Wasatch" is very exciting--and presents many hurdles. From a skiing perspective awesome--traffic and other hurdles, huge challenge.</p> <p>How we will connect all the resorts is a hot public discussion, we have private and state owned land to deal with and all of the environmental concerns with this. The 3 PC resorts are easy, nearly done--2 will be connected this summer and DV is a matter of one rope across taken down. Connecting Parleys to Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons is where the bigger issues are although not insurmountable. If you hike, bike or ski back country there its obvious for all where the most likely connection points are.</p> <p>Resort connectivity: Rail?? The topography and cost of cutting thru seems out of line. What has been suggested and the potential cost--where would this money this come from? Is there a way to have a tram or some other way to connect? In Europe there are lots of trams and good public transportation. We need to increase available public transportation everywhere--is there a possibility of the rail going along Wasatch BLVD, with transportation stops at the base of the 3 Canyons?? With bus services at these locations.. Maybe the cost of this is attainable?</p> <p>Traffic is a major discussion--in PC this year there was one day in particular that was especially challenging--despite the local talk, it is not every day, and still a sign of what is to come.</p> <p>Parking and traffic are huge concerns for all of the resorts. Start with parking???? All 3 resorts in PC have the ability to build parking garages and charge for them. Locals should ride the bus-----we don't like or want to pay for parking----- however, at many other resorts you do pay for parking in Colorado and CA if you want to get close to the resort. Traffic issues are related to access roads--which in all areas need to be wider and engineered to move traffic better. 248 out of PC is a perfect opportunity to widen, add lanes-----Kimball is still a mess even with the road changes. ☹</p>	<p>Park City</p> <p>3/13/2015</p>

As a resident of Park City, I support the One Wasatch concept and connecting all of the ski resorts. I think it is a great idea!	Park City	3/13/2015
What I would like to see Mountain Accord address is the issue of congestion and cars on our roads. Our small towns are becoming over run with car traffic. I think it is a good idea to connect our towns rail or public transit of some kind. I want to see foot traffic not car traffic. I'd like to make our transit so reliable and thoughtful that our tourists do not have to rent cars.		
Thanks!		
I would like to see the lifts connected to all resorts. If they are going to put in a rail system it would not make any sense without going to the Heber Valley and Kamas Valley for the locals and the lift option would be best for our vision at this time.	Park City	3/13/2015
Transportation has and will always be a problem. I appreciate that this group is being pro active, in trying to solve this problem. Thank you. My concerns as we go forward have to do with our Natural settings. The disturbance to our Back country is going to be invaded. Our Animal habitat, weed invasion, pollution, animal migration? Who is watching this? Who will keep it clean? On the he outskirts we have congestion, parking issues, Major Transportation problems! I don't like the idea of trams, trains and Tunnels, too costly. From the wasatch front side your going to have to build another Base Area for movement of Skiers and for Parking? Just for this Project. Maybe from our side on the Watch Back you do the same? But I don't know where that could be? Park City is already too crowded and fighting Transportation. Another Resort should be built in order to handle Parking, skiers, transportation, etc.... Personally I don't like the idea! But I know its coming.	Park City	3/14/2015
I attended your info session at PCHS a few weeks back. Here are my thoughts: 1. It is a valiant effort of the stakeholders to get out ahead and try to create a "grand bargain." 2. Up until last year, I had been merely a chairlift-riding alpine skier. As such, my view was always "the more chairlifts the better." I had no comprehension of or appreciation for the backcountry. 3. I started backcountry skiing in the Spring of 2014, took an avy course, and really got into backcountry skiing. 4. I now have an appreciation for the solitude and serenity of backcountry skiing in the Cottonwoods. What a bummer it would be to see gondolas or chairlifts criss-crossing the Cottonwoods over what is now an island of peace and quiet in sea of noise, cars, commercialism. 5. In a former life I was a commercial real estate developer with a law degree. So I understand how that end of the spectrum works. The door open a crack will lead to a door wide open. The financial pressures will be intense to keep developing, keep encroaching. Soon, with more chairlifts etc, the lovely pitches accessed by earning turns will be just another frozen-mogul ski trail that no one uses most of the time. The peace and quiet and natural beauty that we now enjoy will be just a memory. Too bad for the next generations. 6. Let me know if you need any free help from a former shopping center developer who dealt with a lot of regulatory law and issues in the furtherance of shopping center development. I think I can see several sides of the puzzle: a. developer, b. resort skier, c. back country skier, d. road and mountain biker, e. Park City home owner who lives part of the year in PC and part in North Carolina.  Good luck in your most important work. It's not gonna be easy :)	Park City	3/16/2015
I like the bus idea - it will help a lot on traffic and parking? Everyone hates parking structures and it is safer driving home if there is any après ski activity.	Park City	3/16/2015
Not so sure on the train yet.  Ultimately no one wants it to become as a Vail or Summit County, Co. Resort. That is no fun for anyone.		
I am a freelance planner and office tech in Park City. Over two years ago, I moved to Utah from Tyler, Texas, where I was working as a transportation planner. I have always admired how Utahns were able to work together and create plans for sustainable growth that have garnered national attention. I think the Blueprint is a natural outgrowth of this planning process, which will build on the state's economy and quality-of-life. In addition, it should protect the natural environment of the Wasatch Front, which I enjoy as a skier, hiker, and bicyclist. Here are my thoughts regarding each of the four systems as described in the Blueprint: Environment: The protection of the watershed is absolutely vital, as it is the primary source of water for the region. For the protection of land in the upper canyons, the Blueprint should weigh the merits of different levels of Federal protection, from a National Recreation Area to designated Wilderness. The lack of any mention of reducing air pollution, however, seems to be a glaring omission from the Blueprint. Recreation: The land-swap system proposed sounds like a great way to complete major trails such as the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. Economy: The Blueprint needs to work toward integrating the economies of the Wasatch Front and Back while not sacrificing the environment. That must involve identifying the strengths of each city and how they contribute to the overall economy of the state. There must also be a focus on providing people with the greatest access possible to jobs throughout the region. Otherwise, there will be a mismatch between workers and the jobs best suited to them. Transportation: This is the most important and transformative part of the Blueprint, as it will provide a reliable public transport connection between the Salt Lake Valley, the Cottonwoods, Park City and beyond. Therefore, every option proposed must be analyzed in terms of cost and value. Zion National Park uses its bus system to handle peak tourist flows, making it a good example for UTA to use. In terms of a rail link between Park City and Salt Lake, the Blueprint should consider that Sandy may not be the ideal place to connect the Wasatch Back to the UTA system. For the I-80 corridor, a rail connection may be much more feasible in the near-term than the Little Cottonwood/Park City tunnel. Both options deserve thorough consideration as funding will likely constrain what can be built. I think that the rail connection should be part of a greater system linking both sides of the Wasatch, and because the distances between these places are great, rapid commuter rail may be a better technology to look than the light rail used in Salt Lake. Overall, I am excited to see the Mountain Accord taking shape, and I hope that the final Blueprint becomes a plan that further benefits both the Wasatch Front and Back.	Park City	3/16/2015
1) Transportation: Do what's easy, cheap & flexible first. Ban/limit cars in canyons on busy days (use fees?). Run buses up/down each. Connect with transit in SL Valley. High frequency bus or rail up Parley's to Kimball - interconnect at new Kimball transit WB with Summit County bus. 2) Water: Only new (c) water for snow making; employ advanced treatment techniques and recycle/reuse. 3) Recreation: Submit expanded rail system and ski-area interconnects. No ski area expansion, though. Protect open space and wildlife corridors! 4) Promote mix-use (r) at higher densities along existing as primary transit corridors.	Park City	2/24/2015
RE: light rail from PC to the Cottonwood Canyons. I am excited about the possibility. Many of us cross over to play there throughout the year and some cross over for work. A light rail connection benefits residents and tourists. This low snow year reminds us about the loss of snow at lower elevations: In teh future, a light rail connection can help us with that too. Residents and tourists will need access to additional acreage up high. A light rail connection would be a high service tool to help us maintain an awesome guest experience for skiers and snowboarders. Park City can provide the beds along with an elevated vacation experience while the Cottonwood Canyon resorts provide snow. I live across the street but many people who like the plan will not show up.	Park City	2/24/2015
Thank you for all of your efforts and thanks for coming to Park City. If it comes to a transportation link I think light rail is the most viable along 80. There used to be a narrow gauge railroad down Parley's. Why not build rail again? Please press on for the best, not the easiest solution. I work in the outdoor industry leading backcountry trips. Most of my clients mention the need for a train link to Park City - so much infrastructure for light rail already exists in SL. Let's not be NIMBYs.	Park City	2/24/2015
I think the resorts need to be asked to contribute to the costs of the project. Why not ask them to contribute to pending the exploration/planning phase. If the traffic situation gets so bad that guests have a bad experience, the resorts will suffer. Environmental considerations and climate change action needs to be a much bigger priority for this group. Thank you for doing this and for your consideration.	Park City	2/24/2015
Transportation: Do what's easy, cheap and flexible first. Ban/limit cars in canyons on busy days (use fees?) Run buses up and down each, connects with transit in SL valley. High frequency bus or rail up Parley's to Kimball-interconnect at new Kimball Summit.	Park City	2/25/2015
I believe it should remain the way it is. It is great the way it is.	Peru	3/15/2015
I have been visiting Utah in winter for at least 15 years. Our group usually rents a house in Sandy, with one exception 2 years ago when we stayed in Draper. Skiing in Utah is simply the best. I skied in both Cottonwood canyons, Park City, The Canyons, Deer Valley, The Snowbasin, Powder Mountain and Sundance. I read about this plan to connect both sides of the Wasatch mountain range for the first time about 3 years ago. I thought it was a fabulous idea then and I certainly have not changed my mind. To connect several ski areas with chairlifts gives each skier more options whether one follows the sun, wind, crowds or snow. Having skied in Whistler many times I know how both individuals and families now enjoy the opportunity to use the Peak-To-Peak gondola in Whistler and ski both the Whistler Mountain and the Blackcomb Mountain. So you have my vote - One Wasatch Concept is a wonderful idea and I hope it will enjoy the end result before I am too decrepit to ski. But please hurry - I am 65 years old.	Peterborough, ON	
As an Owner of a company that runs ski and snowboard trips both nationally and internationally, I like the idea of turning the Wasatch into a "Chamonix" like interconnected group of resorts, maybe with a single lift ticket possibility.	Philadelphia, PA	3/13/2015
The one hurdle I see with this idea is the lack of Snowboarder access to Alta and Deer Valley.  <del>Let's hope that both sides of the Wasatch interconnect and we see more. In Chamonix for example, you can ski down the back of Tignes and take a train back to town. ☺</del>		
I visit Utah each winter to ski at the resorts and in the back country. I see no need to connect the resorts and reduce existing back country skiing. Rather, I think it would be imperative to develop effective mass transit to the slopes, either by train or bus. Thank you.	Portland, OR	2/26/2015
I reside in Portland, Oregon and ski in Utah 1-2 times a winter. I love the snow and the number of great ski areas close to SLC where I stay while in Utah. I feel that if Utah could add rail transportation to its mountain resorts would be a selling point unlike no other mountain resort in the United States. A train system would give a European feel, and have less of an environmental impact on the Utah mountains.	Portland, OR	3/1/2015
I would heartily support as much interconnection as is deemed feasible for all involved as a viable more efficient sustainable means of skier visits to this vital resource. Thanks for the vision to make this a potential reality.	Portland, OR	3/3/2015
My wife and I have owned a home in a Promontory for 8 years. Economically we have seen boom and bust cycles. Our home was bought as an eventual retirement home. That day is rapidly coming around. We are both avid skiers. It is our intent to ski into our seventies, at least another 15 years. Our skiing seems to focus on the Canyons ( ease of getting to, and a good many ski runs in the double blue diamond category ), Alta ( because of tradition, and we love that there are no borders allowed / plus it's just plain spectacular ) and Brighton ( because we like the local ambience the area emits ). The above being said, you bet we would love inter connectivity between each of the three areas. Since we live in Park City, it would save us a 2 hour round trip between the areas. Traffic, especially on snowy days would definitely get better. Also, it just makes sense. As far as those who think interconnecting lifts would spoil the environment, we say, you can already see every ski area, along the backside of the Wasatch front. You can also see Alta from Brighton and visa versa. I think you can see from Park City / Deer Valley to both Alta and Brighton. Also, it's hardly a secret to every body who is a local or long time Utah skier, the known fact of closeness of the 7 areas. However, those people who support non development, do so, because they hate anything new, or anything that has the slightest environmental impact. Frankly speaking, these days the more radical enviros don't downhill ski. They prefer snowshoeing and cross country skiing. Plus, they would be opposed to any development, just because it's development. As far as your other bullet points, we are for any public transportation, that would reduce overall traffic, certainly to get worse and worse with time. Especially, to reduce the number of trucks and cars in both little and big cottonwood canyons. We all know those roads have a relatively high grade to them, are narrow and dangerous when it's snowy or icy. I've been driving in wintery conditions for 4 1/2 decades. I know how to handle driving on roads that have been effected by winter weather. But, we all know it's not ourselves that's the issue, it's those others who hv little experience, or don't know the capabilities of their motorized vehicles. Let's go for it.	Promontory, UT	3/13/2015
I moved to Utah in 1980 at age 4. I have lived here ever since. I Snowboard, mountain bike, and trail run a great deal. My father was an ultra runner, mountain biker, and participated in numerous Overland cross-country ski races from one side of the watch to the other. I do not think that a single person who has an interest in enjoying the outdoors in Utah does so without a thought to the environment and the impact our activities have. All outdoor activities has some form of negative impact on the environment, even if it is miniscule. That being said every form of outdoor activity has a positive effect in the State of Utah, be it financially or environmentally. I do not feel it is right limit access to our mountains if done responsibly. I think at the very least connecting adjacent resorts to one another via lifts, trams, gondolas and ski runs is a good idea. Increased and improved roadways, bus access, tunnels for light rail etc, I am on favor of all of them. These ideas can be enacted in a way that lessens the negative impact on the environment while dramatically increasing the positive impact of recreation in the state, community and residents. I feel deep down that those who are overly against enlargement of canyon access and usage are forgetting that the first day they ever stepped foot in the outdoors, there was someone already there, saying, "you're ruining it for the rest of us!" When we moved to Park City someone said, you should have seen it in the 70's, town is ruined now. But the fact is that people in the 60's said the same thing. I don't think they are trying to be elitists. They honestly are trying to protect what they love, but to do it by locking out other peoples opportunity to enjoy the same thing is wrong. These progressive improvements will bring millions of dollars in tourism to the state, which will benefit every resident, not just those who are outdoor enthusiasts. We should work together and do all these things the right way, because it is going to happen eventually. Let's get on board early and have a say in the matter. Money is going to be the deciding factor in the end, so these things will happen. We can't kid ourselves otherwise. Please feel free to reply, share or contact me. Thank you for this opportunity and forum. ☺	Provo	2/26/2015
I have been skiing in Europe for 35 years and the one thing that really separates the experience from that available in the US is the interconnectivity and creation of vast ski circuits. They have done it while preserving the charm and environment that means so much to the alpine experience. I believe there is the opportunity to create that kind of experience in Utah as well. The plan as presented looks well thought out and, while not inexpensive, financially feasible. The impact on backcountry should be minimal and additionally offset by reduced auto traffic among the resorts. While our home address is in Pennsylvania, we (my wife Margie and I) also own property in Park City so we have a local interest as well. We fully support the plan.	Reading, PA	2/26/2015

<p>I have been coming to Utah to ski every year (usually 3-4 weeks a year) for the past 18 years. You requested opinions. Here are some of mine. I am opposed to connecting all or any of the resorts for several reasons: 1. Right now each resort has its own distinctive personality with its own distinctive type of skier who particularly 'loves' that particular resort. Intermingling the various types of skiers (from the thick-they-are-racers, to the older people who ski just fine but are not into racing), to the kids who need time and place to wander over the hillsides) would destroy the distinct personalities of each resort. I would rather see the racers stay at the resorts where the steep and icy's lure them—Not to have them attempting to intermingle with the folks who are just normal skiers. I.e. I don't want them crashing into me because they are racing someone else and are trying to skiny around me to beat them—or do I want to be in the way of some skier who is artfully going fast. 2. What on earth would be the reason for connecting the resorts? What would be the point of going to say Alta and then traversing to, say, the Canyons??? Your car is at Alta? Are you going to spend half the day sking from one resort to the other just to say, what you've been there? Most people I have met over the years come to ski for more than one day (an obvious condition for those who live in SLC). They plan to go to the different resorts for the different skiing conditions ON different days. So, are you planning that a family should say start at Alta, but there being no "green" skiing at Alta, taking the kids to a different mountain, and then their teenager wants to go to the Canyon white tops and you just wanted to ski and now you are miles apart from the rest of your family whom you have to worry about until you collect them all at the end of the day. 3. Which brings us another problem. Your family is spread out between the 7 resorts and someone breaks a leg. Forgetting the physical trauma for a minute, how do you get the patient back (which is at a different resort) to the car so you can get him to a hospital (or whatever). How do you collect all the family members from the various resorts to get them into the car with you and the patient. 4. Competition between distinct resorts is a GOOD thing, not a BAD thing. Each resort can make different policies to "lure" the skier. Having only ONE 7-mountain would only be a dis-service to the skier and I am sure would end up costing more. You might make one big 7-mountain scene, but it will become unavailable precisely to the average skier. It is GOOD to have a fine bakery on one block and a fine restaurant on another and a fine hotel on yet a third. People can enjoy the differences and distinctions. There is NO reason to lump them all under one roof and then declare that "MALL" to be the only place one can go. For instance, EVERY TIME one airline buys another (just using airlines as an example), the service is NOT better, the flights are NOT shorter and the costs ARE always higher. The "lumping" together of the companies is NOT for the benefit of the customer, but for the company owners. 5. Those of us who do not live in SLC have to spend hours on lines at the airports and connections etc. Now you want us to stand in lines to get from one mountain to the other as well? 6. This entire concept sounds like nothing more than an "advertising" gimmick, thought up by people who DO NOT ACTUALLY SKI to get people to come to Utah to supposedly have the "biggest" skiing experience. But the idea is bogus for the actual skiers. You can still ski only so many trails in one day. It is hard enough to keep up with the fellow skiers you came with when you are all on the same mountain! AND, I don't know anyone who can actually ski ALL the trails at any one of the 7 mountains and then have the time and/or energy and/or knees to go ski all the trails at another resort??? Thinking on this line even further, Given the miles of skiable trails at all the 7 mountains, one would probably pick one area of the vastness for one day and then another area for another day. Is that not the same as going to one resort and then another resort? 7. Who is going to pay for all the lifts for such connectivity? It will surely be the skier. You are trying to force us to pay for something WE don't want!!!! SLC has the best skiing conditions in the nation. As more people find out about what soft, fluffy powder actually is, they will flock to SLC. All you need to do is to promote that there ARE 7 different resorts all within a 40 min. drive. That is what skiers want to hear. They can pick and choose where to go or where to not go, and when.</p>	Roanoke, TX	2/26/2015
<p>Hi, My wife and I have been skiing the mountains of the Wasatch for over 40 years. We have two sons who have been raised skiing your mountains as well. We may for a moment sound like local folks however we live in Connecticut. We have come to your state and to these mountains to ski and recreate because of their beauty, the remarkable snow quality, the wildlife we often see including eagles, moose, elk, deer, coyotes and a host of other bird life, fish life and unnamed wildlife. You the people of Utah are very lucky indeed. You are lucky enough to have these natural wonders at your doorsteps. On occasion in life when things are so close to us we can grow to take them for granted. My hope is that this would never, ever happen in the Wasatch. My hope is that the people of your state, the SLC area, the Park City area and surrounding communities will do whatever is within their power to maintain the natural wonders unique to this area. In my opinion natural resources should take precedence over all else. That should be priority 1. However the resources you are then considering adding, modifying or otherwise introducing are brought to bare do so with this #1 priority as the charter. Thank you for offering me this opportunity to share my thoughts.</p>	S. Glastonbury, CT	2/26/2015
<p>I think that this proposal is a great step forward. I think that a few ideas still need to be tweaked and/or analyzed further, but in general I think that this proposal is a good start. Environment: -I strongly the additional protections for federal lands, the initiative to protect additional lands, the identification of wildlife corridors, and the broadening of watershed protections. I think that the environmental section of this proposal presents very worthwhile goals. Recreation: -I support the improvement and connection of the regional trail network. -I strongly support the preservation of riparian areas. -I support the improvement and addition of public transportation options to cut down on traffic and crowding. I do have some qualms with the transportation plan, as I will describe below. -in regards to future growth, I think that it is important to stop ski resorts and development areas in the mountains from expanding beyond their current boundaries. -I don't think that use fees should be instituted. Public lands should be accessible to anyone, and use fees unequally affect low-income families' ability to access the land. Maintenance costs should be covered by taxes. Economy: -I like that the economic plan focuses on improved transportation and preservation of our wild landscapes. See below for my transportation plan critiques. Transportation -I strongly support increased bus service in the Cottonwood Canyons and between SLC and Park City. -I believe that transportation between SLC and Park City should be concentrated around I-80 through Parley's Canyon. This infrastructure already exists, and is an efficient means of moving between the two locations. I would potentially support a train through Parley's Canyon, because this is an area that is already affected by the highway. -I oppose the idea of a train going up Little Cottonwood Canyon. This will result in watershed pollution, environmental degradation, harm to the natural beauty of the area, and the destruction of wilderness area. -I strongly oppose the construction of a train between Little Cottonwood, Big Cottonwood, and Park City. This will have the same negative effects that I described for the Little Cottonwood train, but on a larger scale.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/4/2015
<p>SENT VIA EMAIL February 10, 2015 Mountain Accord Comments on the Proposed Blueprint To Whom It May Concern: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Proposed Blueprint (PB) for the Mountain Accord Project. I have taken the time to read the PB, as well as the other documents that the PB has linked to it, and measured them against my experiences in life. Overall, the PB admittedly puts forth ideological goals, instead of addressing reality. The PB should be pursuing practical and realistic goals instead of ideologies. My comments follow the order of the five categories set forth in the PB. Environmental proposed actions: The environmental subcommittee membership was not balanced. Their proposals, admittedly, are ideological and not realistic. At the October 28, 2014, meeting of the Environmental System Group, the chair took the position that "it was inappropriate to advance the Idealized System without data to back it up." While all the issues addressed are important, the apparent bias of the committee appears to push ideology and ignore reality. The membership of this committee needs to be better balanced and the issues this subcommittee raised needs to be reconsidered under a better balanced group. The concepts of protecting watersheds and resources and working with ski resorts are important issues and need to be realistically addressed. Some of the suggestions such as changing Forest Service land designations, acquiring private property from supposed willing owners, and various transportation changes (which will be discussed later) must be closely reevaluated. Private property rights need to be respected; Forest Service land designations can do more harm than good, and transportation options for accessing the canyons must allow for fair access. The environmental subcommittee needs to have a better balanced membership which would then reevaluate all the environmental issues. Recreation proposed actions: The recreation subcommittee, overall, has put forth some very good ideas. Such ideas as improving and connecting hiking trails and working with ski resorts to improve backcountry access are positive ideas. The backcountry access, however, needs to respect the rights of the private property owners. Various transit options have been discussed for many decades, trams and cog-trains have been discussed since the early 70s. Comments on transit issues will be addressed below in the Transportation proposed actions. The concept of fees to go up the canyons is something I do not find acceptable. The US Forest Service lands should not charge the citizens fees to enjoy public lands, it is simply wrong from my point of view. Other issues, such as bicycles on trails, dogs up canyons (they should be banned in all canyons); motorized vehicles on hiking and biking trails, and hunting need to be addressed. Economy proposed actions: These issues, for the most part, deal with important issues, but many are outside the Central Wasatch Mountains, the Mountain Accord boundaries. This section needs to be focused on the Central Wasatch Mountains, instead of the broader area currently addressed. The transit issues, like the environment and recreation issues, are important; I will comment on them below. Wasatch Choice: 2040 is an interesting document, but meant for areas much broader than the Central Wasatch Mountains, the economy proposals should be limited to the boundaries of Mountain Accord. The concept of improving year around visitor experience in the Wasatch Mountains is proper and should be addressed, but provides no direction, other than transit, as to how to improve the visitor experience. There are other such ideas in the economy proposed actions that do not provide direction. Development in the Central Wasatch Mountains needs to be closely watched, but, again, private property should be respected and reasonable development allowed. Increasing tax revenue to accomplish some of these concepts needs to be revisited. Before taxes are increased, current tax revenue should be reviewed and reallocated for better uses. One of the key issues missing in this economy subcommittee is the costs of the Mountain Accord goals. An estimated cost of the whole of the project, along with breakdowns of the costs of the various options provided in environment, recreation and transportation proposals needs to be provided before moving forward. The fiscal costs need to be realistic; the estimated costs need to be provided before PB moves on. Transportation proposed actions: Each of the three previous PB sections have raised the issue of transit in the Central Wasatch Mountains.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/10/2015
<p>Dear Mountain Accord, Three major factors loom ahead of us as we consider the future of the Wasatch: 1) The dying (or at best stagnant) ski industry 2) Managing climate change and/or drought (which will affect #1) 3) The desire and need for year-around mountain use to offset lost income from #1 I am an avid year-around hiker, biker, skier, climber living in SLC. My preferred mode of mountain travel is human-powered. Although I am in the minority in that regard, the implications of losing opportunities for human-powered travel far outweigh the number of people who engage in it. There are multiple reasons for that, the most important of which is preserving wild places for future generations. I agree with the following MA proposals: 1. Contain or minimize ski area expansion by using land swaps. I am against OneWasatch. 2. Creating a bus shuttle in Mill Creek Canyon (reduce cars) 3. Create avalanche-proof (covered) railway transportation in LCC (reduce cars, increase safety) 4. Create tunnels linking LCC, BCC and Park City (reduce miles driven) 5. Creating destination trails for all canyons. These projects will be costly, but they are the right thing to do.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/10/2015
<p>I do not want any ski area expansion or base area development in the Wasatch period. Ski area interests are only aligned with their wealthy owners - definitely not the public. Ski area interests should not even be considered when deciding how we deal with our citizens' home mountain range the Wasatch. No land swaps. All undeveloped areas should be protected with wilderness designation. No trains or tunnels - too environmentally damaging and expensive. Transportation thinking should focus on reducing traffic and emissions in the Cottonwoods. Would like to see more buses (something similar to what they do in Zion NP), and/or avalanche sheds, tolls, incentives for carpooling and low emission vehicles. Interconnecting resorts should not be a considered issue. No One Wasatch!</p>	Salt Lake City	2/12/2015
<p>Thanks you for all the hard work you have done to date. I think we have a long way to go. I am 66 years old and moved to the SLC area in 1980 to be a "ski bum with a real job". I have been backcountry skiing, hiking, and biking in the tri-cotton area for 35 years. Here are some comments that I would like to make with regard to resort expansion and Cottonwood Canyons transportation. Resort Expansion • I think most of the dispersed recreational users would agree with resort expansion at their base areas but you have proposed expansion at both Brighton and Solitude would basically take more ground for ski runs. We have had this discussion several years ago and the consensus then was no more ski resort expansion beyond their current boundaries. This is the official USFS position backed by overwhelming public support. • Solitude wants to expand into Silver to pick up Flanagan's as a new ski run. This is a heavily used backcountry ski area and prime hiking area in summer. Currently, there is no indication of a ski resort on the other side of the ridge making upper Silver Fork canyon appear undeveloped (except for the historic mining debris). I see nothing but conflict arising from this and it violates the will of the public at large and the USFS's current policy. • Brighton wants to expand its Great Western terrain over the ridge into Hidden Canyon. Again this is in violation of the will of the public and USFS policy. • Both of these expansions violate a process that was contentious and time consuming but arrived at the right decision based on the will of the public at large rather than the vested interest of the ski industry. Just as you would like the Mountain Accord honored in future land use decisions, you should be willing to honor prior land use agreements. Transportation • While a tunnel to connect LCC with BCC does not seem that invasive, I think the price will make this a non-starter. • I do not see any reasonable way to connect Park City with BCC other than upgrading the Guardsman Pass road and keeping plowed all winter. • I think we should forget about connecting the heads of the canyons and spend the limited dollars that will become available to build snow sheds over the LLC road so that it does not have to be closed so often. BCC road rarely is closed for avalanche control. • To move more people up LCC and BCC and reduce traffic, we just have to expand the current bus system and perhaps charge a fee to park in the canyons during winter. The current bus system is completely overloaded during peak morning and evening hours. We need to double the number of buses and increase their frequency during non-peak hours to disperse the load of passengers. For example, amongst my group of friends, if we miss the morning peak hours of bus operation we just drive up the canyon because we know the buses will be few and far between. If we knew the next bus is just 15 minutes out, we would use the bus, regardless of the time of day. The buses could start earlier and finish later as well. • Parking at the mouths of the canyons is completely inadequate. People are getting tickets or towed because they can't find a space in the parking lot and then park illegally. We need to greatly expand the parking at the mouths of the canyons. Note this needs to happen even if we were to go with trains or express buses. • The overwhelming majority of users of the Cottonwood Canyons are locals with cars and even tourist have cars because SLC is so big and spread out. If we don't want these cars in the canyons then we need to provide a viable alternative. Trains and dedicated express buses sound like a cool idea but in reality just adding more regular city buses, larger parking areas at the base of the canyons, and charging for parking in the canyons would accomplish the same thing (or more) for a fraction of the cost.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/19/2015
<p>Hello! I was encouraged by much of what I saw in the Blueprint and think it represents a lot of good dialogue and discussion between the many stakeholders and their very diverse interests. I ski Alta 30-40 days per year and the backcountry in the tri-canyon area 20-30 days per year, so I think I have a good sense of what could/would appeal to various user groups. To that end, I have some comments: 1. Grizzly Gulch has to be part of the designated area that will not be developed. It is one of the busiest, trail heads in all of the Wasatch, so leaving it as a TBD item seems like a deal-breaker to me. I am sure Alta wants to keep its options open on putting a lift up there, but I think that has to be included in the proposal before you can get the many groups looking to protect what little is left of the BC to sign off. 2. Putting a tunnel from LCC to BCC but then using an aerial transport method from BCC to PC makes no sense whatsoever. There have to be two tunnels or else it just does not make sense to put in one. Putting in the two tunnels would allow people in PC to get to LCC easily, and much, much, MUCH faster than by the proposed OneWasatch method. 3. Speaking of OneWasatch, I hope that the Blueprint will do away with that concept once and for all. I am not sure why SkiUtah keeps pushing this idea when so few locals support it. Is their goal really just to satisfy the demands of people who visit for a week each year rather than at least consider the opinions of the people who live here all year? Do they really think that people will go from Snowbird to Deer Valley just to have lunch when it means they have to take half a dozen or more lifts just to get a bowl of turkey chili? It will take all day to do that, and would be much faster just to drive around and actually ski the Deer and then eat lunch there. The tunnels would make this possible, but OneWasatch is silly. UT will never be CO or Europe for many reasons beyond our ski terrain (ie. our "peculiar" liquor laws that still make people wonder if they can get an apres ski beer) and we have to stop having such an inferiority complex here in UT when someone goes to CO instead of coming here. 4. I would support putting some kind of permit/pass/payment plan in place for people driving up LCC for 2015-2016. Make people pay an annual fee for a parking pass, or restrict cars to at least 2 or 3 people, or both! I think that any kind of measure like this would help reduce the number of cars that roll up there every day, thereby increasing the experience for everyone. 5. Finally, who is going to pay for all of this? How is that going to work? What kind of increase to my property taxes here in SLC would I see? I am all for making good decisions today that plan for tomorrow, but we need to have a better understanding of the economic impact first. Thanks for reading this, and for all of the effort that is being put into this concept.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/20/2015

<p>To whom it may concern: I am surprised by and disappointed in the Mountain Accord findings and decisions. I obviously misunderstood the purpose of the project, as I had hoped for a more far-reaching outcome. The material I've reviewed fails to protect the environment of Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons from the predictable and easily foreseen result of the population growth occurring and anticipated in the Salt Lake Valley. I worked for about a year and a half as an appointed member of Mayors Corroon and McAdams Blue Ribbon Commission to make recommendations for the Salt Lake County Foothills and Canyons Overlay Zone [FCOZ]. The BRG group found many things lacking in the Cottonwood Canyons [Big and Little]. Almost all of those problems are left unaddressed by the Mountain Accord. I think the work is insufficient and incomplete. The FCOZ problems need to be addressed, they need solutions immediately. The problems are: the heavy traffic in BOTH Big and Little; the lack of access to trails and recreation due to traffic, congestion, and parking limitations; the needs that our anticipated much bigger population will have for recreation and some limited access to wild places; and the protection of those places from the damage people do. #1. Driving is the main access to the canyons, and is anticipated to remain so for another 25 years or more, according to Mt. Accord. During summer, winter, and fall driving up Big is like driving through a parking lot. One expects to arrive at Mall of America at the top of the road. The same is true for Little, except that because of that canyon's constrictor there are fewer places to park, and less of a "parking lot" experience. Big and Little need well-funded, frequent transit. Parking at the base of the canyons is needed as well. Money budgeted for these amenities can be reallocated for additional Valley transit when and if Little gets some kind of track transit. The canyons cannot wait. There is no plan to purchase more parking area at the base of the canyon; no plan for funding more public transit; no plan to encourage outdoor opportunities at the destination resort areas to take the people-pressure off the Forest; no plan to allow space for purveyors of necessities of life so resident traffic can be limited. The road congestion degrades the air quality and the health of the adjacent forest and wildlife. It is so bad that some traffic must return to the valley without ever parking and experiencing the outdoors they came for. #2. Land use and land trades are an excellent vehicle to protect the forest and cope with increased population and demand for the mountain experience. I see land trades suggested only in a very limited way. I recommend in FCOZ and repeat: The various holdings of land in the Forest Service land pose a danger of development at some unknown future time. I believe those holdings should be traded for expanded buildable area at the base of the resorts. The resorts should be encouraged to develop outdoor summer facilities, what some dismiss as entertainment, to accommodate families with small children and the older or otherwise less energetic population. More trails are a lovely amenity, but with the increasing population, preserve those trails for able and knowledgeable hikers for the health of the forest. More diapers and poop piles behind more bushes on more trails is a crummy outcome. None of the above is addressed in the plan.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/21/2015
<p>#3: The presentations are not understandable to the general population which uses the canyons. The map being used shows landholdings overlaid on a very faint topo map with very few reference points understood by ordinary people. The mapping is only useful to backcountry users, and is only generating comment from them. Mapping this way seems to be a deliberate choice. The presentations include no in-hand paper maps or written work with which one could follow along, if places mentioned during the discussion were indicated with a pointer—which they aren't. Mapping should show roadways, resort areas that are built upon, and lift locations, so ordinary people can orient themselves to what is being proposed. [At minimum, mapping should be the new USGS High Definition. I hope the public response is considered in light of this. I don't believe we non-backcountry-using citizens are getting a fair chance to comment. #4 Very little substance is proposed. It's all up in the air for a second iteration. So far as I've heard at three recent meetings, the accomplishments are limited to: [a] No ridgeline development or incursion, which completely eliminates any kind of ground transportation between the west Wasatch and the east Wasatch except through a tunnel. [One Wasatch is announced to be "dead" at one meeting, eliminating a relatively cost-free interconnect which could generate massive revenues to the counties and the state.] [b] A multi-billion dollar train project is the preferred transportation method, to be implemented in circa 25 years. This was the intent before the project studies were undertaken; two years of study haven't changed the outcome. [c] No particular route has been demonstrated. [d] The cost of the system is not discussed. Paying for it is not discussed except as a federal grant. [e] It is meant to serve Little only; travel to Brighton looks to take well over an hour, and though it is shown to go through Brighton it isn't clear that the route accesses the resort; there's no connection to Solitude or mention of access to the many recreation/trail opportunities there. [f] Two additional TRAX lines for access to the train are shown, at completely unknown cost. Federal funding is presumed? These are not discussed, though drawn and labeled on some maps. No parking spaces are indicated to access the TRAX lines. #5 There seems to be no planned disaster escape route from either of the dead-end canyons for at least another 25 years. Little has some lodging available in case of avalanches, but as more people live in the valley, more people can be day visitors trapped in the canyons. With beetle kill and less precipitation, fire is increasingly likely in the canyons. I can't give appropriate public input when most necessary information is "unknown" and the plan has no solutions for problems I know to exist.</p>		
<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>I already submitted some comments via the survey form, but now that I've examined the "blueprint" more closely, I have some additional comments and question:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why are you considering the construction of a Light Rail Line up Little Cottonwood Canyon before one up to Park City? You would think more people would be more apt to take public mass transit to a larger "urban" area such as Park City (and environs), than to 2 resorts in such a small confined area such as Alta and Snowbird. Why not consider a "mono-rail" system instead? Supposedly a monorail wouldn't require half as much surface disturbance or space to build than a Light Rail line. Besides, couldn't it just be elevated right above the existing highway or at the very least parallel to it?</li> <li>2. Why are you so anxious to build costly tunnels as connectors? Or even more importantly, why are the resorts so anxious to be connected? And at who's expense? Granted, tunnels are a better choice than more aerial tramways and/or lifts, (especially to keep the Lake Mary, Martha, Catherine and Grizzly Gulch areas as scenic backcountry areas intact) since the aerial methods would require all kinds of maintenance roads and more trees to be removed, etc., etc.. And how will the tunnel construction be financed? I'd say, since many of the transportation options seem to be benefitting the resorts the most—I would hope they are willing to "foot" most of the bills—especially for such costly ventures as tunnels.</li> <li>3. I sincerely hope that the proposed "increased environmental protection" of the backcountry areas truly means that—especially in terms of additional Wilderness designation of worthy lands, and that the proposed "trail-building" means only foot-trails in those "wilderness worthy" lands. Plus, I'm not sure I want to see any more "new" trails in the wilderness areas (not the potential wilderness areas)—as the Forest Service can barely maintain the current ones. However, just maybe, in the areas that do not qualify for wilderness, a few more mountain bike trails might be warranted.</li> <li>4. In short, I do support the notion of consolidating development into small or already impacted areas, and leaving the rest to remain natural. However, I can't help but feel that most of the heavy impact transportation options seem to favor the resorts over everything else. Granted, the public could use the transportation venues (instead of continually taking their automobiles into the canyons), and I support using public tax dollars to help finance new construction—especially a Light Rail to Park City. However, again, because the resorts seem to be the main beneficiaries of such "improved" transportation venues, they should be willing to finance them—especially the connecting tunnels, if they are approved.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for your attention.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/22/2015
<p>To Whom it May Concern,</p> <p>I am blown away by the progress that has been made by the Mountain Accord. It has done an amazing job of creating an amazing view of the future of the Wasatch mountains that really provides benefits to many users.</p> <p>I am a frequent user of the Central Wasatch - in fact it is the reason that I, as a young professional with a graduate degree, decided to move to Utah. I mountain bike and hike in the summer, and ski both at the resorts in LCC and in the backcountry of both canyons during the winter.</p> <p>I am so pleased to see the ski areas on board with a proposal other than One Wasatch. This proposal will provide SIGNIFICANT benefits to the resorts - both in marketing, but also in that they will be able to further develop their base areas. The mountain accord proposal benefits the whole region and the whole - not just the ski areas.</p> <p>This will allow someone staying in Park City or at any of the resorts to easily access any of the other resorts. One Wasatch would take hours to get from one place to the other - not very practical.</p> <p>As a backcountry skier I am VERY pleased to see the level of commitment to increasing conservation of this resource. I would encourage the mountain accord to remove Grizzly gulch from development. Adding a lift of grizzly gulch would turn almost all of the backcountry skiing into "Side country" skiing from Alta.</p> <p>My main comments are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. as stated early - please consider including grizzly gulch in the areas to be designated as public.</li> <li>2. One of my main uses of transportation from SLC to PC during the summer will be for mountain biking. What are the provisions on an express bus for bikes?</li> <li>3. I also commute from SLC to PC and all of these transportation options would have to be aimed for commuters as well as recreation.</li> </ol>	Salt Lake City	2/23/2015
<p>Clearly a lot of time and effort has gone into this effort. It is not the first. In the 80's I attended public meetings regarding development within the Canyons to facilitate an Olympic bid. I was one of a few attendees who did not have an economic interest. Proposals were eerily like the Mountain Accord and included interconnecting tunnels, elaborate traffic patterns, snow sheds, etc., all in the name of the Olympics. Mainly as I recall because of water issues these plans were scrapped and the Olympics were staged without impacting the Canyons. This proposal suffers from the same weaknesses. While lift service is given to recreational opportunities and the environment, it clearly is drawn to fit the ambitions of the resort skiing industry. This is a seasonal industry whose who season - Winter - is being shortened by climate change. There is a credible body of science that support the notion that this may not be a short term phenomenon. It is also an industry that caters to a small portion of the populace both nationally and local. This is simply a question of cost as the \$100 lift tickets is becoming common. I have been a frequent visitor to the Wasatch Mountains since the 70's. While I was first attracted to the skiing, I have learned to appreciate the year around attributes of this unique resource. In some respects the Summer and Fall season are just as enjoyable as the Ski season. For me it is what make Salt Lake City unique. Notions promoted by the Ski industry such as One Wasatch fail to recognize this uniqueness and its ability to provide for a broad section of the populace be it water, physical beauty, or just a place to escape from urban development along the Wasatch front. To compromise these attributes to satisfy the wants and economic goals of a few is simply misguided and should not be allowed. Admittedly the roads into the canyons are sometimes quite congested, it is most often the result of attractions such as "Powder Days." To try and meet this demand which often is gone by noon does not make fiscal or physical sense. It should also be noted that dogs are prohibited - rightly so - in certain canyons to protect the water quality. Yet this proposal envisions the canyons being a construction zone for many years which will certainly have a negative impact on water quality for generations to come. While there is no doubt that something should be done to deal with the impact of urban growth this proposal is inadequate for the reasons cited. Plans should be developed that retain the unique aspects so it can continue to be enjoyed by a cross section of the population and not just those who view it as a place to alpine ski. am a bit skeptical of request for comments on what seems to be a done deal. Hopefully this skepticism is not warranted in this case.</p>	Salt Lake City	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>Yes for it.</p> <p>Plan it- involve all constituents.</p> <p>Compromise some things so you can get some things. And get something instead of nothing.</p> <p>Use European model: transit, rail, lifts, funicular, gondolas.</p> <p>Be prepared to bond for public works. Be prepared to involve private investment/tolls- see Texas transportation corridors.</p> <p>Look at foreign investment: see McQuarrie Bank Australia looking at fiber optic.</p> <p>-Big Cottonwood Property Owner</p> <p>-Former Park City resident</p> <p>-worked for Deer Valley, Park City, ParkWest- Ski raced for Alta and Park City -historian, environmental conservationist, SL County/ State of Utah tax payer- both personal/business -political pragmatist, coalition builder, doer</p>	Salt Lake City	2/26/2015
<p>My comments come from the perspective of a father of several kids who lives locally in East Millcreek. Ski resort connectivity is great. I would rather have one ski lift between the canyons than 1000s of cars going up and down the roads to get between the resorts. I can't imagine, as a local, ever taking a lift from one resort to another. But I would be happy to see tourists doing it. The other day I took 4 kids skiing, including a 5 and 7 year old. There is no way I would do that on public transportation. It would be a nightmare to get all of their gear on a bus or train. If I couldn't drive, I wouldn't go (as a father of little kids). The cost of daily passes has me seriously thinking about choosing another winter sport other than skiing. It is very hard to justify paying almost the price of Disneyland to sit on a cold mountain and have my kids cry and ask to go home after a few hours. Why would I pay \$400 a day for that? Brighton is the only resort that has pricing that works for my family.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/26/2015
<p>To the Mountain Accord Stakeholders -</p> <p>First things first. I greatly appreciate the Mountain Accord process in that it has managed to get the majority of stakeholders to the table while allowing for public participation and comment. We're all in this room because we are hopeful for the future. I do feel that the four focus groups of environment, recreation, transportation, and commerce are the key groupings here and believe that they needn't always be in direct competition with one another. Rather, I'd argue that recreation, transportation, and commerce exist because of the environment - and in that way I feel that protecting and preserving the environment and aesthetics is central to the existence (much less flourishing) of the other three. To be clear - recreation, commerce, and development is present because of the Wasatch Range - and transportation corridors are there in support of those. Water quality and the the natural beauty of the mountains is never enhanced by progress, it is only diminished.</p> <p>With that said, my arguments below are three-fold -</p> <p>Development - if any - should remain concentrated within the rough footprint of the existing bases of the mountain resorts. This reflects current ideas of urban planning (the idea of concentrated human habitation and business with broad reaches of open space.) Ski area (lift use) numbers demonstrate little to no growth in winter while backcountry use numbers are growing exponentially. The ski areas as they are now can accommodate current and future numbers without further incursion into the mountains. I would also comment that the mountain resorts here are quite good - but the real gem of the Wasatch is the world class backcountry. The Wasatch backcountry is truly in a league of its own with unparalleled ease of access to amazing terrain and 500"/snow/yr.</p> <p>Transportation - Transportation is the elephant in the room. The current one-person/one-vehicle paradigm is unsustainable. I support a rapid transit rail system complete with avalanche sheds going up both Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons as well as up Parley's to Park City. Strong disincentives should be in place for personal vehicles and not limited to simple financial disincentives. I strongly do not support a tunnel connecting Little/Big/Park City. The tunnel may test as convenient but at a significant aesthetic and monetary cost. I would rather see the rail system along the east bench of SLC connecting PC and Alta/Brighton than tunneling through the mountains.</p> <p>Environment - With a thirsty population estimated to double in the next 40 years, the watershed should remain inviolate. That said, valley water consumption should become more efficient - and despite not being part of the Mountain Accord Process - should be integral to the long term planning for the future.</p> <p>Thank you !!</p> <p>I am opposed to tunnel. Who pays for it? How does that help reduce traffic in the canyon(s)? Who wins? Builders, owners. Who gets the tunnel revenue? Allow no cars up Big Cottonwood Canyon. Park at bottom and take buses up to resorts. If car allowed it must pay fee to go up canyon or have at least 4 people in car. 2000 acres of private land in trade. Can the land be developed? If not, then what's the sense in trading? With reduction in car traffic (buses), why not suggest to resorts that they develop the large parking lots to whatever commercial enterprise they choose.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/27/2015
<p>I am opposed to tunnel. Who pays for it? How does that help reduce traffic in the canyon(s)? Who wins? Builders, owners. Who gets the tunnel revenue? Allow no cars up Big Cottonwood Canyon. Park at bottom and take buses up to resorts. If car allowed it must pay fee to go up canyon or have at least 4 people in car. 2000 acres of private land in trade. Can the land be developed? If not, then what's the sense in trading? With reduction in car traffic (buses), why not suggest to resorts that they develop the large parking lots to whatever commercial enterprise they choose.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/28/2015

<p>Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments on the Mountain Accord's Proposed Blueprint for the Central Wasatch. My comments are detailed below.</p> <p>I applaud and support the collaboration of stakeholders in developing a comprehensive land use plan for the Canyons and Wasatch Mountains. Please continue this good work. However, overall, I do NOT support the Proposed Blueprint for the Central Wasatch as it stands today because it does not sustain and support a vibrant economy, diverse recreational opportunities and it does not protect the beautiful and natural character, natural ecological systems, wildlife, and water of the Wasatch community. The proposed blueprint therefore fails to meet the vision of the Mountain Accord. The proposed blueprint should be substantially revised to implement the proposed land transfers, to remove any expansion of ski area boundaries, to remove any underground, overground or aerial transportation connections between the canyons and Park City, and to include the removal and restoration of Guardsman Pass Road.</p> <p>Cottonwood Canyon Scenario:</p> <p>I support the transfer of 2,150 acres of private ski area owned land to public ownership in exchange for 258 acres of public lands to private lands along the base of the canyon for base area management and future development. I think this is more than enough fair exchange due to the undevelopable nature of the 2,150 acres of private lands for the developable land gained.</p> <p>I do NOT support the transfer of 416 acres of public lands in the American Fork Canyon. These lands are not mapped and I do understand the rationale for transfer of these public lands into private ownership.</p> <p>I support an increase in the amount water used for snowmaking as long as it supports the overall best use and management of our drinking water and other water needs in the canyons and in the valleys.</p> <p>I do NOT support an expansion of the ski area boundaries by 210 acres. I think the ski areas should stay within their current boundaries. I do not want to see an over all increase in ski area boundaries except for a moderate amount of growth at the base of the ski area along the roads and existing development. The amount of skiable land with ski area infrastructure is already a high proportion and disrupts the natural character of the Wasatch. Any increase in this footprint would change the character of the Wasatch and limit other uses (wildlife habitat, natural area protection, bird watching, hiking, snowshoeing, cross country and backcountry skiing.</p> <p>Transportation</p> <p>I do NOT support any transportation connection between Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons to Park City.</p> <p>I do NOT support expansion or improvement of the current summer season Guardsman Pass Road. In fact, I support closing this road permanently and year round to any traffic. I propose ripping up the concrete, restoring the roadbed into the natural mountain landscape, and maintaining the restored natural and public land for hiking, snowshoeing, cross country, and backcountry skiing.</p> <p>I do NOT support building a tunnel to connect the Canyons to Park City for a light rail, for a rapid bus service, or for car traffic.</p> <p>I do NOT support building a tram, gondola or any other aerial transportation option to connect the Canyons to Park City.</p> <p>I support one Wasatch and putting a gondola up LCC not a train or tunnel.</p>	Salt Lake City	3/1/2015
<p>As long time residents of Salt Lake County and Lambert Canyon, as well as people who enjoy the back country of Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons, we are very concerned about the current proposal because of the potential long term risk to the environment. This seems like an extremely important time to not act rashly.</p> <p>We are impressed with the proposed approach of the Wasatch Back Country Alliance to these issues, and agree that preservation of Grizzly Gulch is imperative. Questions that need to be answered in a very thoughtful way include concerns about lift alignment on proposed ski resort expansion, and transportation plan details (which could have an extremely dangerous effect on the environment).</p> <p>We trust the Wasatch Back Country Alliance in their efforts to negotiate a balance solution to these issues, and support their discussions and recommendations.</p>	Salt Lake City	3/2/2015
<p>I have submitted a couple comments previously, but I wanted to clarify and summarize my main points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I am strongly in favor of the increased protection of undeveloped areas in the Central Wasatch, whether through the expansion of wilderness areas or the establishment of a National Monument.</li> <li>- I am strongly in favor of the focus on more efficient public transportation to the mountains to reduce traffic and emissions in the Central Wasatch. This does not mean that I am in favor of the construction of a train.</li> <li>- I am in favor of the improved trail system throughout the Central Wasatch, which will help people experience the natural beauty of our wilderness areas.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I am strongly opposed to allowing for potential resort expansion in the areas known as Grizzly Gulch and Emma Ridge. These areas provide easy access to beautiful backcountry terrain, and lifts in the area would rob thousands of SLC residents and tourists of that experience.</li> <li>- I am strongly opposed to the construction of a train from Little Cottonwood through to Big Cottonwood or Park City. This would be a tremendous expense, have a significant impact on the watershed, and destroy part of the wilderness quality of the upper Cottonwoods.</li> <li>- I am opposed to the construction of a train up Little Cottonwood. This seems like unnecessary development, in that I think improved bus service would do a comparable, if not better, job of improving the issues of traffic and emissions in the canyon. If the train were to be constructed, I hope that it would be constructed in such a way as to maintain the natural beauty of the area, not affect backcountry access, and keep the watershed as pristine as possible.</li> </ul> <p>Thank you for your consideration</p> <p>I am appalled at the proposed plans to build trains in our canyons!! Trains would be very detrimental to our canyon environment, and there is no room for trains without wiping out trails and rock-climbing areas. Furthermore, the sound of trains charging up and down the canyons would sabotage any outdoor enthusiast's experience!!</p> <p>Given that there are not many people riding buses, I can't imagine that there would be a lot of train customers (especially not enough to pay for this costly plan). If you really want to improve transportation, you should just add more buses at peak hours (and then perhaps more people will ride them).</p> <p>Given that the proposed plan is likely too expensive to execute, the more probable result will be Trams connecting resorts instead, which is also detrimental and ski-resort centric.</p> <p>Please count me in the "strongly disapprove" category for the proposed blueprint.</p>	Salt Lake City	3/4/2015
<p>Thank you</p> <p>Many of the sentiments among back-country skiers and hikers are anti-train. I think this may reflect the fact that their back-country experience begins once they leave their vehicle, and the thought of a train is unsettling to them relative to their time-honored car trip up/down the canyon.</p> <p>As a cyclist on the mountain roads, I deal with the continuous stream of vehicles, and I have a very different perspective. There is continuous exhaust from drivers in a hurry to commute to their back-country experience. There is also danger to cyclists, as demonstrated in a significant number of cyclist deaths from car collisions on canyon roads.</p> <p>If done correctly, a canyon train could create a cycling paradise in the Wasatch. The roads could be relatively vehicle free, and possibly even connect between canyons through tunnels. The back country skiers and hikers might write this option off as a commuter experience. It is not. Cycling through the Wasatch is a mountain experience in its own right. It is one that has been hampered by the vehicle- and exhaust-clogged canyon roads. It is also one that produces less fossil fuel burning since the commute to the mountain experience is born by the pedaler.</p> <p>Those conducting negotiations in the Mountain Accord should recognize the validity of the cycling experience. Trains should not displace cyclists from the roads. Those negotiating must consider, and protect, the possibility that trains will enhance the cycling</p> <p>I support the proposed recommendations for recreation and environmental protection. Of particular importance is the need to assess the impact of proposed development activities on habitat fragmentation and connectivity. Thus the importance of identifying wildlife corridors and assessing the viability of wildlife populations under the various development scenarios.</p>	Salt Lake City	3/4/2015
<p>Thank you.</p> <p>As a Salt Lake Transplant, I have enjoyed so many aspects of the living on the Wasatch Front. I am a firm believer in the mission of Mountain Accord. I look forward to the day when I like many people will be able to experience the amazing ability to enjoy the experience of the connection of the beautiful Wasatch resorts. As a senior citizen or a handicapped person, I may not have the capability to "back country" ski. However, I truly look forward to this amazing experience during my lifetime. I also look forward to a time of less motor vehicle traffic in the beautiful scenic Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons</p>	Salt Lake City	3/7/2015
<p>Hey Folks,</p> <p>I understand the need for flexibility but the devil is in the details and this plan has not faced them yet. The exact alignments and modes of transportation are way too vague for me to support.</p> <p>Further, with dwindling participation and higher costs associated with changing weather patterns, the ski and snowboard industry is in trouble. Why should we tilt the wilderness/development balance toward a troubled industry? In the hope of winning a bigger percentage of a decreasing market?</p> <p>Mountain Accord makes a weak argument about describing how this plan benefits EVERYONE. I see how it benefits a relatively small industry with a questionable future and a handful of Summit County real estate developers. How does it benefit small to mid-sized valley businesses in tech, biotech, applied materials, health care, finance, and education, all of whom need to entice national caliber employees with the opportunity to enjoy an accessible, one-of-a-kind back country canyon experience?</p> <p>It is unfortunate that a single industry has been able to steer Mountain Accord so far from a conservationist approach. The tri-canyons are clearly a gem. The conversation should begin with how to best preserve and enhance it for generations by improving public transit and trail head facilities and other non-destructive access opportunities for use.</p> <p>One measure of the narrowness of Mountain Accord is that it fails to address the limited socioeconomic demographic that currently use the tri-canyon area. Where's the plan to offer this opportunity to a broader spectrum of the citizenry? Does this issue even register with the Mountain Accord agenda? Why is the most prominent feature the hope and prayer that we can sway a rich Texan from re-visiting Colorado?</p> <p>Thanks for your attention</p>	Salt Lake City	3/7/2015
<p>The main thrust of my comments is to preserve our beautiful canyons as perfectly as possible in the following ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Make preservation of the environment and species of flora and fauna the prime mover of any decision or agreement, even if it means limiting the total number of visitors that may be in the canyons on a given day. If we do not protect the canyons, they will not serve us ecologically, recreationally, or spiritually in the future. I advocate the "precautionary principle" when thinking of putting in new features.</li> <li>2) Limit roads in and around our canyons and do NOT construct tunnels through the mountains. I see no need to connect the ski areas by road or transit. Skiers and hikers may want to ski or hike from one canyon to another. Keep the environment as pristine as possible.</li> <li>3) Do not put in trains or Trax, except perhaps to the mouths of the canyons.</li> <li>4) Limit cars on the canyon roads. Provide shuttle buses for hikers and skiers wanting to go up the canyons at times of great demand.</li> <li>5) Buy private property when possible and convert it into forest habitat and sustainable park areas. Remove the old cabins and houses.</li> </ol>	Salt Lake City	3/8/2015
<p>Hey Folks,</p> <p>I understand the need for flexibility but the devil is in the details and this plan has not faced them yet. The exact alignments and modes of transportation are way too vague for me to support.</p> <p>Further, with dwindling participation and higher costs associated with changing weather patterns, the ski and snowboard industry is in trouble. Why should we tilt the wilderness/development balance toward a troubled industry? In the hope of winning a bigger percentage of a decreasing market?</p> <p>Mountain Accord makes a weak argument about describing how this plan benefits EVERYONE. I see how it benefits a relatively small industry with a questionable future and a handful of Summit County real estate developers. How does it benefit small to mid-sized valley businesses in tech, biotech, applied materials, health care, finance, and education, all of whom need to entice national caliber employees with the opportunity to enjoy an accessible, one-of-a-kind back country canyon experience?</p> <p>It is unfortunate that a single industry has been able to steer Mountain Accord so far from a conservationist approach. The tri-canyons are clearly a gem. The conversation should begin with how to best preserve and enhance it for generations by improving public transit and trail head facilities and other non-destructive access opportunities for use.</p> <p>One measure of the narrowness of Mountain Accord is that it fails to address the limited socioeconomic demographic that currently use the tri-canyon area. Where's the plan to offer this opportunity to a broader spectrum of the citizenry? Does this issue even register with the Mountain Accord agenda? Why is the most prominent feature the hope and prayer that we can sway a rich Texan from re-visiting Colorado?</p> <p>Thanks for your attention</p>	Salt Lake City	3/9/2015
<p>The main thrust of my comments is to preserve our beautiful canyons as perfectly as possible in the following ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Make preservation of the environment and species of flora and fauna the prime mover of any decision or agreement, even if it means limiting the total number of visitors that may be in the canyons on a given day. If we do not protect the canyons, they will not serve us ecologically, recreationally, or spiritually in the future. I advocate the "precautionary principle" when thinking of putting in new features.</li> <li>2) Limit roads in and around our canyons and do NOT construct tunnels through the mountains. I see no need to connect the ski areas by road or transit. Skiers and hikers may want to ski or hike from one canyon to another. Keep the environment as pristine as possible.</li> <li>3) Do not put in trains or Trax, except perhaps to the mouths of the canyons.</li> <li>4) Limit cars on the canyon roads. Provide shuttle buses for hikers and skiers wanting to go up the canyons at times of great demand.</li> <li>5) Buy private property when possible and convert it into forest habitat and sustainable park areas. Remove the old cabins and houses.</li> </ol>	Salt Lake City	3/4/2015

<p>Realtor Snowbird Pass Holder Township Planning Commissioner Back Country Skier 32 year County Resident and Taxpayer</p> <p>I have read the Mountain Accord Blueprint as well as other assorted other on line information I could find, attended the Cottonwood High School presentation and asked questions of those in attendance and last week I went down to the Salt Library and attended that presentation. I believe I have more questions than answers but these are some of my thoughts:</p> <p>It seems like the most pressing issue at hand is an overcrowding problem in Little Cottonwood Canyon. Lots of parking on the side of the highway making for a safety problem and in climate weather leading to lost revenue to Snowbird and Alta. This problem along with a desire of all of the ski resorts to expand, keep from losing any possible business and the desire of the resorts to grow their brand, has lead to the Mountain Accord process. A high efficiency bus system, possible toll road and resort and canyon parking structures should be a first step. Having to pay for parking at the resorts and preventing or creatively discouraging single occupant vehicle trips should help solve the problem. What the plan really doesn't talk about is Little Cottonwood Canyon is quickly approaching its carrying capacity and efficiently getting many more recreationalist and tourists in LCC is not well advised.</p> <p>Environmentally and recreationally Little Cottonwood Canyon is Salt Lake County's primary asset and it can not and should not try to be more than that. It doesn't need to compete with Kennecott Copper economically or the ski markets of Colorado and California. The idea of importing skiers and riders in from tunnels, trans or trains from other access points seems like the hardest part of the plan for me to understand. Little Cottonwood Canyon has the best ski terrain, the best snow, the most scenic backdrop, it is Salt Lake County Water Shed and it has an overcrowding problem. The solution recommended is make LCC more accessible from new access point so the ski resorts can become more profitable and the Salt Lake County tax payers should pay or help pay for this. Or worse we can off load loads of the cost to Summit County in exchange for access and that Summit County can provide access of a kind to come over State visitors can more safely travel up to 80 to Park City and then travel to Little and Big Cottonwood via tunnels and trans</p> <p>Here is a vote for preservation of existing backcountry areas, especially including areas such as Grizzly Gulch, Emma's, Superior, Catherine's and White Pine that are relatively high up in the Cottonwoods. These are jewels of the central Wasatch. As things stand the Wasatch has a unique balance of readily accessible backcountry and world-class ski resorts, however further encroachment stands to compromise this delicate co-existence. Increased density/development of existing areas is a reasonable compromise, as well as transportation modalities such as train, bus or tunnel that increase connectivity while mitigating environmental impact. However these economic initiatives should NOT come at the expense of the wonderful Wasatch backcountry.</p>	Salt Lake City	3/9/2015
<p>Leave Little Cottonwood Canyon the beautiful heavenly place it is. Don't destroy this natural wonder out of greed and corruption. "No extra lanes, no trains, and no turning Little Cottonwood canyon into a transportation corridor and nothing more."</p>	Salt Lake City	3/10/2015
<p>Although we are located in Millcreek Canyon, the first two of our comments apply generally to the Executive Board's Proposed Blueprint. 1. Respecting Private Property Rights. The Executive Board's Proposed Blueprint does not include even a single sentence about respecting private property rights. There were express statements made in some of the committee reports, but they have been excluded in the proposed Blueprint. Is this the "balanced" approach that MA purports to be taking? Even FCOZ, with its broad restrictive provisions and intent, includes references to respecting private property rights. Revising MA's Blueprint to expressly state that it intends to respect private property rights is extremely important not only today but for the way that future government officials will interpret MA's intent. So if MA's Executive Board really means to respect private property rights, then you need to say so. The restrictive zoning statutes in the canyons, as increased by FCOZ, already make private property repairs and improvements extraordinarily difficult. A truly balanced approach would not make necessary repairs or desirable improvements even more difficult for private property owners to achieve.</p> <p>2. Broadening the Definition of "Diverse" Recreation. MA says that it is promoting diverse recreational activities, yet its definition of "diverse" is limited solely to athletic and exercise activities. That is a narrow definition, not a broad one. Working in Millcreek Canyon every day, we can testify that only a small percentage of the bikers and joggers in the canyon are over forty. Only a slightly larger fraction of the hikers are over fifty. So MA's current definition of "diverse" is limited primarily to young athletes and to exercisers. What about the much larger portion of the population that is over forty, disabled, or non-athletic? Aren't they entitled to have a definition of diversity that includes them too? One of the most pleasurable ways for people of all ages and abilities to enjoy the beauty and relaxation of nature is to eat meals in a rustic setting among the mountains and trees. The National Forest Service and other federal and state park administrators recognize the recreational importance of eating outdoors by virtue of the large number of picnic sites that they maintain. Yet eating in a rustic setting is not limited to picnics. People of all ages and abilities also find it particularly enjoyable to dine in a more formal setting, especially if it includes a lodge-type building and beautiful waterfalls, as we have here at Log Haven. Celebrating birthdays, anniversaries, weddings and other special events in such a setting is a form of recreation that is available to everyone. In addition, this type of dining is used as an important recruiting tool by local businesses and the University of Utah to attract the talent that they need to maintain and improve the economy. So we ask that the Executive Board expressly include picnicking and outdoor dining as diverse and desirable forms of recreation in MA's final Blueprint. This is particularly relevant for Millcreek Canyon, given its proximity to Salt Lake City and its long history of supporting both picnicking and outdoor dining.</p> <p>3. Making the Millcreek Shuttle System Optional Rather Than Mandatory. The Executive Board's proposed Blueprint includes the creation of a Millcreek Canyon shuttle service as one of the easiest and fastest projects to implement. Yet the success of any such system will be determined by its details. One of the most important aspects of the proposed shuttle system for Log Haven and its owners is that the system be kept optional rather than mandatory. As local governments and transit systems realize better than anyone, very many people will just not give up their cars and use public transportation today. While governments have the financial resources to slowly educate people, private owners do not. So we fear that any public shuttle system that would completely exclude driving would have a devastating impact upon our business and land ownership. It would likely constitute a taking for which fair market compensation would be required. We do not want to see that day, and we hope that you do not either. Therefore, we ask that the final Blueprint expressly specify that the proposed Millcreek Canyon shuttle system be optional. Thank you for taking our concerns seriously and for making the preceding revisions in the final Blueprint.</p>	Salt Lake City	3/10/2015
<p>Following are my comments and feedback on the Mountain Accord Blueprint proposal. I'm a 51 yo married male, Salt Lake City resident for 20 years, work for healthcare IT company in Lehi, Wasatch Front resident for 20 years, married, 3 children. Entire family are active hikers and skiers (Brighton, Snowbird). I also regularly hike, mountain bike and backcountry ski in Mill Creek and Big &amp; Little Cottonwood Canyons. Transportation These elements I strongly support: -improved bus service and schedule in canyons. Current bus service to BCC and LCC is far from optimized. +Add Mill Creek Canyon shuttle/bus service. +Charge per-vehicle fee in Cottonwood Canyons, as done in Mill Creek Canyon. Consider raising per-vehicle fee in Mill Creek Canyon to encourage bus/shuttle use (if implemented.) +More/better parking at or near canyon mouths. These elements I'm strongly against: -Train. Not necessary. Huge, impact, huge expense. This reeks of developer-boondoggle. (Maybe we should relocate the prison up Big CC??) -Tunnel. Again, not necessary. Mainly a marketing point to tout to ill-informed out-of-state tourists. Huge impact, expense. Recreation These elements I strongly support: -Extended multi-use, non-motorized trail network in upper Big &amp; Little Cottonwood Canyons. These elements I'm strongly against: -More inter-resort connections, a la Ski-Link or One Wasatch. These schemes serve no purpose beyond marketing hype to ill-informed out-of-state tourists, and negatively impact terrain, trails and scenic beauty.</p>	Salt Lake City	3/11/2015
<p>Thanks for considering my input! To Whom it May Concern -</p> <p>Please leave Alta and the surrounding areas open and accessible to the public. We don't need loads of unfettered commercial development ruining what is a pristine and cherished part of our Wasatch range. I plea with you to consider the consequences, aside from the economics to the private developer(s), of such a marked change. Thank you for your help in this matter.</p>	Salt Lake City	3/11/2015
<p>Mountain Accord: I am a native Salt Lake resident, and I have been recreating in the Central Wasatch for over 40 years. I and my family are heavy recreational users of the Wasatch Mountains where we ski and snowboard at the resorts and in the backcountry, as well as hike, run, and mountain bike in the summer. I applaud Mountain Accord for its efforts to preserve the Wasatch and its precious resources while accommodating increased growth and use. Thank you. I recognize that there must be compromise in dealing with all the competing desires of the different interested parties, and, for the most part, I think the proposed Blueprint addresses many of these issues. I do have the following concerns/comments/suggestions: 1. Ski resort expansion should be limited. The existing ski resorts are world-class AS-IS, they do not need to be connected or expanded to make them better or draw more people to Utah. The Wasatch's terrain, snow, access, and people make these mountains a destination spot. It seems that those who want to expand the resorts into a mega-Euro resort, are those who may not even ski and simply believe that bigger is better and that by having a mega resort will draw more people and create more development, jobs, etc. The backcountry is already very small, and the number of backcountry users is rapidly growing. Open space and quality backcountry must be preserved. People should have the opportunity to get into the mountains without having to purchase a lift ticket. The ski resorts already have most of the best terrain and they should not be able to take any more. Mount Superior and Emma Ridge must not become part of a ski resort. Neither should Grizzly Gulch (see below). Additionally, I am concerned that by adding more chairlifts, especially those that connect multiple canyons, we create additional access to resort side-country that lures inexperienced resort skiers and riders into the backcountry where they easily can get into dangerous avalanche terrain without proper equipment and training. 2. Grizzly Gulch should remain backcountry. Due to its location and terrain, Grizzly has historically been a portal for a variety of backcountry uses (alpine touring, cross country, snowshoeing, free-ride jumping). Some of my first backcountry outings were in Grizzly Gulch in 1988. I've since returned many times accessing Patsy Marley, Wolverine Cirque, Twin Lakes Pass, and Silver Fork. I also have taken two of my sons on their first backcountry tours in Grizzly Gulch. Just last week, I spent the afternoon with my twelve-year-old son in Grizzly Gulch where we conducted avalanche training. I recognize that much of this area is private property; however, the current land swaps, as well as water rights and transportation improvements, seem to be giving Alta more than enough in exchange for keeping Grizzly Gulch free from resort expansion. 3. Alta should not be allowed to expand given its anti-snowboarder policy. If Alta is allowed to expand, Alta's current no-snowboarding policy also expands. Alta's policy is outdated and prejudicial towards approximately 40 percent of the "skiing" population. Over the last 20 years, more and more resorts have opened their lifts and terrain to snowboarding, promoting harmonious relationships between skiers and snowboarders. Only three resorts worldwide remain that prohibit snowboarders from accessing their mountain. Hopefully, Alta's discriminatory policy will change in the future, but if Alta expands without changing its exclusionary policy, we will be taking a step in the wrong direction by actually increasing ski-resort terrain that is closed off to a significant percentage of the winter-sports recreating population. For more information on this subject and efforts to change Alta's policy, visit <a href="http://wasatchequality.org">http://wasatchequality.org</a>. 4. The summer trail network needs to be expanded and improved. Park City and Draper City are good examples of creating, improving, and maintaining trails. Salt Lake's Bonneville Shoreline Trail, as well as the Millcreek trails, are heavily used and need expanding (installing more trails that can be designated up and down traffic, or designated bike/pedestrian trails). LCC and BCC could use more trails suitable for mtb biking. While I am generally in favor of preserving wilderness, I am reluctant to ask Congress to designate additional land as wilderness unless mountain bikes can be removed from the mechanized definition and allowed in wilderness. 5. Transportation needs to be improved in all canyons. Mass transit should be developed and encouraged to make the canyons more accessible and less congested. If a rail system can be implemented economically in LCC, it would not be opposed. However, I question how disruptive and cost-effective this would be. I would like to see the roads improved, with wider bike lanes, additional passing lanes for increased bus use, and avalanche passage ways. I think a rail system from Salt Lake to Park City would be a worthwhile addition, as would a rail system along the East Bench from the U of U to Sandy or Draper, allowing better public transportation to the canyons.</p>	Salt Lake City	3/11/2015
<p>I was busy filling out my comments on the online form provided when I accidentally clicked on the DONE button before I was finished. I can't find any way to retrieve the survey form and complete it properly, so I guess I will need to do it via this email. Most of my comments had to do with the transportation alternatives. For the Little Cottonwood Canyon/Park City area, I am very much in favor of alternatives A and B, and opposed to alternatives C and D. I am opposed to alternative C because of the visual and environmental impact it would have; I am opposed to alternative D because I do not think we can provide the long term transportation solution necessary without additional transportation infrastructure structure like alternatives A and B would provide. For the SLC Airport to Park City via I-80 Corridor, I favor alternative A or B, and I am opposed to alternative C because of the slower transportation times as stated in the document. For the Summit County Connectors, I think either of the proposed alternatives would be fine, overall, I am strongly in support of the Mountain Accord process so far, and am very impressed with the proposed Blueprint. I will continue to support the process as long as all parties continue to negotiate in good faith.</p>	Salt Lake City	3/11/2015
<p>Congratulations and a heartfelt thank-you to all who have contributed to the Mountain Accord process. Overall I support and agree with the proposed blueprint's key observations and proposed actions, in each of the four focus areas. The one area where I would reserve judgement until the findings of further financial, engineering and environmental analyses are available is, inevitably, the proposed rail link between Little Cottonwood Canyon and Park City. This is a very large undertaking that will significantly change both the way we access the Wasatch alpine and the experience we have once there. It's also a lot of money. I absolutely hate the need to contemplate rail on this scale and in these places, but I acknowledge the need. I understand that the ski areas want some type of interconnect in exchange for their undeveloped lands, and I think a set of road / rail links is preferable if they largely preserve the current resort boundaries and the side country frontiers between them. The road / rail links will probably be necessary even if lift connections proceed. As a Wasatch skier (resort and backcountry), hiker, and part-time recuser for almost 40 years, I understand and accept (grudgingly) that within the tri-canyon area, at least, population growth will inevitably drive new user fees, access restrictions, and other unwelcome changes. I think the proposed blueprint is a sound attempt to wrest the best possible outcomes from the change we can't control. I'm just not sold on that rail line yet.</p>	Salt Lake City	3/12/2015
<p>Obviously a lot of hard work and imagination went into the proposed blueprint. The residents of salt lake valley are fortunate to have such a collaborative effort in place. As the plan moves forward I would like to ask that the recreational opportunities of the free flying community be protected. I am a member of local organizations representing paragliders and hang gliders, speedfliers and speed riders, and basejumpers. As board members may be aware Utah is a world class destination for these sports and participants travel from around the world to fly here. National distance records have been set from sites in big cottonwood canyon. Many of our sites are within the borders of areas that have been notated as under consideration for enhanced protection.</p>	Salt Lake City	3/12/2015
<p>Flying sports in the wasatch can easily be documented to be a usual and customary use and have taken place for decades. Our users are extremely low impact, lower than hikers runners skiers and bikers by far. The majority of our use occurs in the air, however we rely on access to multiple hillsides and mountain tops to launch or jump and various areas in the canyon bottoms for intended or unplanned landings. We use no fossil fuels in our enjoyment of our public lands, make no noise, and leave no trace. However we feel a potential threat from the mountain accord project. This is a shame because most of the projects goals and values are shared by members of our organizations. Many of us are also avid climbers backcountry skiers ultra runners and hikers. Some like myself are also property owners in the wasatch.</p>	Salt Lake City	3/12/2015
<p>Unfortunately almost all of the federal land managers controlling wilderness, national monument, and national park land have severely restricted or more often prohibited paragliders hang gliders and basejumpers. Generally we are lumped in with powered aircraft. Very often our pilots are aggressively harassed and commonly criminally prosecuted for both intentional and unintentional use of our public. This does not occur with land managers who administer national forest and BLM land. The wasatch is unique as our use of these lands will predate any change in designation and we expect to have continued access to our land. Our organizations would like a part of the discussion about land designation changes and to secure the right to continue our recreational use of our lands. I work, recreate, and own a homestead in the canyons. I moved to Utah years ago to enjoy the recreation and quality of life. I would appreciate the chance to discuss this facet of future proposals in greater detail with members of the executive committee. Thank you for all your hard work.</p>	Salt Lake City	3/12/2015

<p>I'm impressed with the comprehensiveness of the Blueprint. It's complicated, but the challenge is complex, so "complicated" is what's called for.</p> <p>My main concern is that the use and enjoyment of the Wasatch wilderness must not be restricted (intentionally or unintentionally) to an elite audience of entitled outdoor enthusiasts. Wilderness is inspirational and it must be accessible to everyone. ☺</p>	Salt Lake City	3/12/2015
<p>As somebody who lives in Salt Lake City and has to deal with the negative effects of smog, I do have a positive position on this project. My biggest worry is just the idea of a train up LCC again. As somebody who partakes in outdoor recreation all throughout the year in little cottonwood, it seems that a train through the canyon floor could take away from the feeling of escape and seclusion that the canyon can provide. However, the red snake that we see going up the canyon every powder day or the unavailability of parking in the summer contributes to this loss of escape as well. While the idea of the train may be a bit unsettling, the benefits that would come with it seem to be worth it. I hope that the next phase of this project is implemented as soon as possible as it is obvious that we have some issues with the pressure on our canyons at the current time.</p>	Salt Lake City	3/12/2015
<p>I am a veterinarian who moved to Utah with my family 15 years ago for all the skiing, climbing, mountain biking, and hiking that the Wasatch have to offer. I have seen the Wasatch change and have become reacquainted with the issues. These are my formal comments regarding the "Blueprint" put forth by the Executive Board.</p> <p><b>Transportation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I recognize that the traffic situation in Little Cottonwood Canyon is unsustainable on some winter days, and while I understand the impetus to promote a train version of a fixed guideway, I feel that the bus system is far from optimized and with proper implementation, could service both the ski resorts and dispersed users on a year-round basis far more effectively than a train, and it could do so for both Cottonwood Canyons, and also could be done for Millcreek and American Fork. Also between Kimball Junction and Deer Valley, the Canyons, and Park City.</li> <li>- Providing copious parking near the mouths of the canyon would be a critical component of this.</li> <li>- Without trying an optimized bus system using the existing infrastructure I feel it is impossible to justify major infrastructure changes (adding lanes or installing a train)</li> <li>- Charging a per-vehicle fee - either via a daily fee or an annual pass - would help subsidize the optimized bus/parking system and provide an incentive to ride the transit system.</li> <li>- Incentivize ridership by making the bus fee free or only a nominal price.</li> <li>- The bus system would need to have both a Snowbird-servicing bus and multiple Alta express buses.</li> <li>- Current and future UDOT plans to add passing lanes on hwy 210 for private vehicles should be focused on improving bus transit systems.</li> <li>- Snowsheds and/or bridges over slide paths can/should be added for increased avalanche mitigation for the highway.</li> <li>- I fully support optimizing year-round Bus Rapid Transit for Big Cottonwood Canyon. Again, with copious parking at the mouth of the canyon.</li> <li>- A tunnel linking LCC and BCC is not needed. Improved public transit would alleviate the traffic issues associated with LCC, and the "safety" issues that have been ascribed to a tunnel have been overblown; there have not been any documented injuries/fatalities associated with overuse of LCC that would not be overcome with improved transit.</li> <li>- Tunnel connections would create more defacto resort sidecountry terrain, effectively increasing the resorts' footprints, and side country avalanche accidents are more common.</li> <li>- The tunnel would basically be a taxpayer-funded connection that would exist to benefit four businesses (ski resorts) with no/very little validation that such a connection would actually be economically beneficial to those businesses. There are no significant "problems" that an LCC/BCC tunnel would solve, despite a considerable cost to taxpayers.</li> <li>- The same argument is applied to a fixed guideway system connecting BCC to Park City. It would not necessarily save time for PC-BCC travelers, is not supported by Park City officials, and would again be a taxpayer-subsidized benefit to a handful of businesses (ski resorts) who have not proven that such a connection would even be beneficial today, much less in the future considering global warming and the flat/declining trends of the resort skiing industry (according to their own study). The access to Park City is increasingly difficult, is not a good alternative way to access the Cottonwood</li> <li>- The question on the survey asking if the transit "solutions" are "environmentally-sustainable" is fundamentally flawed: transit systems are not intended to be "environmentally sustainable"; they are intended to transport people from point to point. Since NO ONE - including transit engineers who have looked into this project - knows if they'll actually be environmentally-sustainable (eg degrading the watershed, putting pressure on Wildlife, ...) that point is misguided at best and badly misleading and irrelevant at worst. The</li> </ul>	Salt Lake City	3/13/2015
<p>2nd response:</p> <p>Yes- for Mt Accord/one Wasatch</p> <p>Use Euro Model: Mt Rail/Funicular Example: Val d'isere France Connect- resorts by lift. Keep Little Cottonwood thru Mt. Funicular Leave Little C wilderness area alone. Interim canyon traffic- bus system.</p> <p>Seek Public/Private funding- public bonding private tolling? Use State of Texas Dept. Transportation example. MacQuarrie Bank Australia. Look at Europe resorts. Federal funding- anticipation of future Olympics? Use UTA funds in canyon instead of street car in SLC?</p> <p>Good luck-</p> <p>I am not thoroughly familiar with all of the arguments underlying potential Blueprint alternatives. Still, from an intuitive standpoint as a Salt Lake City resident, I favor transportation improvements as a main focus of future development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Systems such as year-round bus transportation or mountain rail would be convenient for residents and tourists.</li> <li>• By facilitating easy travel between resorts, this could create a unique ski experience with secondary economic benefit.</li> <li>• By reducing vehicular traffic, we could all enjoy the environmental benefit of better air quality.</li> </ul> <p>I am opposed to the ONE Wasatch ski lift proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I think that further development would degrade the experience in an already busy backcountry ski area.</li> <li>• I worry that the price for a ONE Wasatch pass would make it inaccessible to most skiers, tourists and residents alike. It would be interesting to see data on how many of the \$3000-4000 SKI Utah silver and gold passes are sold, and what proportion of all season passes sold this constitutes.</li> <li>• I also worry that relatively few skiers would be able to take advantage of the resort interconnections in a single day, because it would take a great deal of time to travel between resorts using the proposed connections. As a starting point, it would be interesting to see data on how many visitors pay extra for combined Solitude/Brighton or Alta/Snowbird tickets.</li> </ul> <p>In short, while I think we all benefit from better transit into the mountains, I don't think the mountains need more commercial development.</p>	Salt Lake City	3/13/2015
<p>Thanks for your consideration Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments.</p> <p><b>Environment System</b></p> <p>The Environment System is the most important to pay attention to. It is vital to preserve the environment of the Wasatch. We depend on it for a clean water supply. It is aesthetically important to preserve natural values. We, the local citizens love the wilderness parts of our Wasatch. We need to preserve these serene, unspoiled areas to allow us to find some peace and quiet, and to recharge our souls. Do not let these wilderness areas become less wild, even if that means making some land exchanges.</p> <p><b>Transportation System</b></p> <p>Any development of the transportation System must be carefully monitored so it doesn't run amok. Please avoid construction of trains or aerial trams. They would overly mar the visual and aesthetic appeal of these charming canyons. To support a peaceful Wasatch, please reduce traffic, by increasing parking lots in the valley and increasing bus access. Only buses should be allowed in the Canyons, with exceptions for emergency vehicles, delivery trucks, and maintenance crews. Also, increase bus service up Parley's Canyon to Park City and Deer Valley Resorts. But make sure they go by way of Parleys, rather than slicing right through our Wasatch.</p> <p>We don't need additional parking places or roads in the Wasatch. That just robs more of the scarce open land that is left. Most of all, please do NOT allow interconnects between ski areas, especially if they link one canyon to another. That would make our precious little Wasatch Mountains seem even tinier. That shrinkage would greatly reduce their appeal. They are not a toy to be tinkered with.</p> <p><b>Recreation System</b></p> <p>The Recreation System should give equal rights to backcountry users. Keep plenty of areas where we love to travel by our own power (not using ski lifts, helicopters, or other mechanized transport) can still have an enjoyable outing. We need to have a place where we can get far away from the sights, sounds, and smells of machinery. We need this to stay sane in this noisy, fast-motion world.</p> <p>Also, please focus on building more trails in areas such as the Bonneville Trail System on the benches, so there are still plenty of places for mountain bikers to go, without overrunning the Wasatch. Wherever mountain bikes are allowed, the trails will need extra layers of maintenance due to the erosion caused by the bikes.</p> <p><b>Economic System</b></p> <p>The Economic System should focus on buying up tracts of land to preserve them from further development. It will only get harder and harder to do this as time goes by. Save the land now, before it is too late. Charge entry fees to help pay for this. ☺</p>	Salt Lake City	3/13/2015
<p>Thank you for soliciting public comment on the proposed blueprint. Here are my comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I do not support infrastructure development in Little Cottonwood. LCC was deemed as too ecologically delicate for infrastructure development during the 2002 olympic game assessments, and has not become less so. I agree that access and traffic are issues. I would support a fee for personal vehicles entering the canyon (with an annual pass option, like in Mill Creek Cyn), and enhanced shuttle service and base parking facilities. I would ask that shuttle services accommodate dispersed backcountry users, at least at common backcountry/climbing trailheads. Building a billion dollar taxpayer subsidized train is NOT something that I support - the ski resorts should be fronting that cost. Expanding the road will have profound ecological impacts and may destroy many popular and classic bouldering problems. I do NOT support this either. Finally, I think either of these options also jeopardize the ecological integrity of this important watershed area. Water is already a precious resource in our city, and I do not support additional development in the cottonwood canyons that would jeopardize its quality or availability.</li> <li>2. I do NOT support development up Grizzly Gulch. As a frequent backcountry user up Grizzly, this is one of Utah's best backcountry access points. To have this area developed by ski resorts would be a great loss to me personally as well as to the backcountry community.</li> <li>3. I do not have a problem with additional snowbird developments in American Fork areas. I do NOT want to see Snowbird expand into White Pine.</li> <li>4. I do not support extensive retail development in Alta - I think many people who visit Alta do so to get away to a quiet place, NOT to go shopping. Furthermore, I do not support any plan in which the Alta Base parking area would not be open to backcountry users for free.</li> <li>5. I DO support the construction of snowsheds in LCC to help with snow and avalanche management, as a viable alternative. I do NOT support a tunnel connection between Park City and the Cottonwood canyons.</li> <li>6. I think it is of utmost importance to preserve the ecological integrity of our delicate mountain areas. As an alpine ecologist myself, I am happy to provide further information and commentary on the ecological effects of development and transportation infrastructures.</li> </ol> <p>The Wasatch backcountry is an amazing resource and a key reason why so many of us love to live here. Please do not allow it to be over developed like the Park City areas.</p> <p>Thank you again for the opportunity for public comment, and please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions</p>	Salt Lake City	3/13/2015
<p>I am a 20 year resident of Salt Lake City and I regularly trail run, ski, rock climb in the Cottonwood Canyons. I am an environmentalist, but I am in favor of connecting the resorts and improving public transportation in the canyons. I like the One Wasatch plan, and would love to see a mountain rail system, perhaps with tunnels beneath the mountains to allow skiers to ski between the resorts and then hop a train back to their hotel at the end of the day, or to shuttle their luggage to a new hotel in a new valley. A rail system would likely be better for the environment than alternatives.</p> <p>Thank you for seriously evaluating the future of our precious mountain environment and allowing for input by citizens.</p>	Salt Lake City	3/13/2015
<p>I have long heard of plans to connect the area resorts and plans to operate a train in Little Cottonwood Canyon. I am a Native Utahn and consider my Wasatch Mountain and nearby outdoor access to be a large factor in my decision to remain in Utah. I have also lived in Vail Colorado and travel extensively with my family. I love living Salt Lake home! I am avid hiker and skier, I am a timeshare owner in Park and Snowbird and my family has owned a cabin in Albion Basin since the 1970's. I drive our roads, share rides when I can, greatly appreciate our area public transportation and I make effort to conserve water at home and at my rental investment properties in Salt Lake.</p> <p>I attended a public hearing of the Salt Lake Mayor and had the opportunity to discuss proposals of Mountain Accord with my guests on a recent stay at Snowbird. In general, these are our conclusions:</p> <p>We are generally in favor of land swaps, allowing resort area development in exchange for private land within or contiguous to public land outside the resorts being set aside and left undeveloped. Expansion of Snowbird further into American Fork Canyon is acceptable but recognize it may be more of a business gamble than a public concern. Park City private development benefits very few, only those who can afford to buy luxury housing within the ski areas. Big Cottonwood Canyon development is perceived among my contacts and me to be an improvement to the resorts but should in no way be allowed to encroach on back country areas and should be limited to control watershed quality.</p> <p>The transportation alternatives are very concerning and have the largest consequences by allowing increased access and use of the Canyons rather than just limiting automobiles. To an extent, the current roads and parking capacity in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons are already self regulating. The road capacity limits use, expanding access either by increased road traffic or a public alternative will increase use.</p> <p>We can see that a train up Little Cottonwood Canyon would solve some problems but can't imagine how it would be feasible. If resort guests take a train from the Salt Lake International Airport or anywhere in the city, they can't possibly take the local tax with dozens of stops along the way then transfer to another train capable of the ascent to the resorts with luggage and ski gear. Are train porters and train compartments part of this concept? What about getting from "train stations" at the resorts?</p> <p>The largest concern of the train proposal is connecting Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons to the 10,000 beds in Park City. They have lots of room and incentive to continue building and developing without restriction, the Wasatch Canyons shouldn't be part of their recreation plan when poor ski conditions force them to look elsewhere and the easy access through the mountain makes a collection of individual decisions an easy one. The Wasatch Canyons shouldn't be parceled out like seats on an airplane for luxury first-class options available for those who can afford to buy them. This will only serve to increase use of our canyons, especially for those who can most afford it.</p>	Salt Lake City	3/15/2015
<p>I live in Salt Lake City. I strongly oppose bulldozing through Cottonwood Canyon. The skiers will find their way up to the slopes on buses. The devastation to the Canyon and Environment is unforgivable. The effect on locals and future generations cannot be undone. Money and greed seem to be the motivating factors.</p> <p>Do Not let This Happen ☺</p>	Salt Lake City	3/15/2015

<p>Please accept my comments in your discussions about the Wasatch Mountains:</p> <p>Mountain Accord is doing a disservice to our community by calling this project a "blue-print." That term implies a highly technical and detailed drawing of future construction. With a nod to my scandinavian heritage, I would hope that the current status of your meetings is more at a smorgasbord phase — there are a lot of ideas out on the table at this point and the chef is interested to see what's popular with the crowd. So I'm trying not to fall into the pessimistic attitude that other people with power and influence are making deals and have a blueprint all arranged to which I'll have no say.</p> <p>My main concern is the character of Little Cottonwood Canyon. Yes, there are more people using the area than ever before. Yes, there are lawsuits and user conflicts. Yes, the ski industry would like to take over the entire Wasatch, if allowed. But still, let's try to give the mountains and canyons what space they have left as well as we can. Let's preserve the canyon as-is so we don't slip into incremental "improvements" that would leave an area that is unrecognizable by grandchildren from their times spent up there with grandparents. Let's let the green and rocky world up there push us back — traffic jams, lack of parking, and cramped access are ways of having us pushed back. It was agreed, after all, that Big and Little Cottonwood were eliminated from the 2002 Olympics as venues because there would be too many people up there to handle. If there are too many people, so be it.</p> <p>If Mountain Accord is dead-set on declaring a transportation crisis, I feel that imposing drastic changes such as a rail-line and tunnels in Little Cottonwood is the wrong way to try to solve the "problem". Rail is a connotation of urbanization and these canyons must not be urbanized. Adding infrastructure, hubs and more utilities there would irreversibly ruin Little Cottonwood by trying to jam too much stuff into it, even if mitigation and negotiated land transfers elsewhere are tempting.</p> <p>Is Mountain Accord using Little Cottonwood to buy indulgences? I don't like the idea with its questions of who would pay, who would benefit and then you have a canyon that is changed dramatically. Conflict is part of life — deal with it as part of your jobs. But don't use Little Cottonwood for leveraging or as a bargaining chip for legal settlements or political strategy.</p> <p>Use the roads that we already have and use the buses we already have. Let the canyon push back hard with enough congestion and users will accept bus service. All it'll take is a level of frustration or, if our leaders want to be proactive, mandatory or dedicated bus transit.</p> <p>I appreciate the time, energy and passion you're putting into trying to determine the future of this part of the Wasatch. Your alternatives are the result of much analysis, communication and consideration. Thank you. But please keep your hands off Little Cottonwood. I</p>	Salt Lake City	3/15/2015
<p>The website was awkward to use and I found that I really could not figure out what was going on until I read comments from environmental groups who generally are not enthusiastic about the proposals. If you wanted more unbiased feedback, the site should have been more user friendly.</p> <p>I found it difficult to make intelligent responses to the questions on the website. They are asking whether the plan(s) meet the stated purpose and need. That seemed a futile exercise in semantics more than a place to express an opinion. There is no place to question the purpose and need, or to substitute a more meaningful one.</p> <p>However, I think I understand the proposals to the point that I can make the following comments.</p> <p>I am adamantly opposed to any form of interconnect between the two Cottonwood Canyons and between Park City and either of them.</p> <p>If a train, or light rail is permitted, it should follow the existing roadway and substitute for vehicle transport. Surely that would be more exciting for tourists and using the same roadway would be less damaging - and hopefully less expensive.</p> <p>There should be no avalanche sheds in Little Cottonwood Canyon. It is geologically unique for the Wasatch and the view should be preserved.</p> <p>Preserving the environmental values and stability of the Cottonwood Canyons should be the first priority, not just on esthetic and moral grounds but because it is our watershed. Drought is not a rare event in this part of the world. More destruction of the water collection and absorption system is madness. This probably means that access will of necessity need to be limited at some time in the future.</p>	Salt Lake City	3/15/2015
<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am a Salt Lake City resident and have been a partner for 43 years in an outdoor specialty store, Wasatch Touring. We rent and sell human-powered outdoor equipment for Nordic skiing, back-country skiing, biking, kayaking, and hiking. Our customers come from all over the world. They comment on the pristine beauty of our Wasatch Mountains. Often Europeans mention that they come to Utah because it is not over developed with ski lifts crisscrossing every mountain. In the Wasatch, they can ski at an area one day and tour or skate ski the next, without leaving the range. For this and other reasons, I believe we should have controlled and limited development in the Wasatch Mountains.</p> <p>Now is the time to protect this precious resource for clean drinking water, dispersed recreation, wildlife and a beautiful, undeveloped vistas for future generations.</p> <p>Transportation We could solve the traffic congestion problems by developing a bus system that is efficient and affordable. Some buses could drive directly to the ski areas while others could stop at side canyons for dispersed recreation. A simple, efficient, and affordable bus system could solve the problem.</p> <p>Charging people to park up the canyon may discourage people from driving their vehicles, but I feel having an incentive might be more powerful than a penalty. I would not recommend widening the canyon roads or installing trains or tunnels. This solution is too expensive and has a detrimental environmental impact on a sensitive watershed.</p> <p>Recreation The Wasatch Mountains provide many ways to recreate. Our focus should be to protect the undeveloped land for dispersed recreation. We no longer live in an era where bigger is better. Today, you can have a unique skiing experience at eight different ski areas all within one hour of Salt Lake City. Connecting the ski areas may seem like a good idea for marketing Utah as a destination for downhill skiing, but it will have a major negative impact on all the other forms of recreating.</p> <p>Economic Wasatch Touring's vendors that have moved to Utah include Petzl, Black Diamond, Rossignol, Solomon, Marker, Voile, Alfs, Suunto, Quality Bicycle Products, and Specialized Bicycle. They chose this area because their products are used in the mountains and their employees enjoy playing in the outdoors.</p> <p>I approve of land swapping and developing the ski areas at the base for accommodations, restaurants, and cultural options that will draw people and revenue to the business's year round.</p> <p>I don't want ski areas to expand with ski lifts or mountain-top construction, such as the eyecore on Hidden Peak. Adding more ski lifts won't improve the quality of the skiing experience and will increase the cost of lift tickets. By preserving and protecting the land around the ski areas, businesses can build a new clientele offering year-round, alternative forms of outdoor recreation and mountain activities.</p> <p>Environment The best thing we could do for the environment of the Central Wasatch would be to protect it. We have a valuable resource that provides us with our drinking water and a habitat for wildlife and alpine vegetation. This fantastic natural landscape in proximity to a major metropolitan area is unique and offers an escape from the busy mechanized city life. This sanctuary of undeveloped landscape offers a connection with life in it's natural state and provides solace to all that have the opportunity to hike its trails. By concentrating future development at the base of the ski areas we can protect the surrounding environment (plants, animals, and water quality) for all of us and future generations.</p> <p>"Mother Nature should be respected with reverence." Edward Abbey</p> <p>Thank you for reading my comment.</p>	Salt Lake City	3/15/2015
<p>I live in Salt Lake valley and am both an Alta season pass holder and an avid back-country skier. The following are some comments on the proposed Wilderness Accord Plan:</p> <p>1. Alta Ski Lift Company Land Swap</p> <p>A. The Grizzly area (Twin Lakes Pass around to Emma) where Alta runs their cat skiing operation is land owned by the ski lift company. They have made no secret of their desire to eventually develop lifts in the area. While this would be a loss to the thousands of hikers, runners and backcountry ski and snowshoers who use the area it would also have the effect of turning Silver Fork into difficult to access backcountry at best and Alta Ski Lift sidecountry at worst.</p> <p>B. The interested parties wishing for expanded development in the Alta base area are not in line with what the skiing public values in Alta. They presume that we as users wish there were more shopping, dining and man-made recreation opportunities. We like Alta the way it is: relatively undeveloped with public lands and public access for all.</p> <p>C. The swap may include all the public parking in Alta. If such a deal goes through, all users of the surrounding National Forest Land would be required to park on land and in lots owned by a private owner. It is possible that this parking eventually could either be restricted (in winter to those purchasing Alta lift tickets for example) and/or require a parking payment, summer and winter, to park and access the surrounding public lands. I strongly oppose any change that would limit public access to public lands.</p> <p>D. A land swap opens the possibility that a private owner could charge a "backcountry fee" for visitors who wish to use the town of Alta as a starting point for their ski tour, hike or climb.</p> <p>Currently all of Alta's buildings are on Forest Service land. It would make sense to trade the land under their buildings for the undeveloped parcels up on the mountainside. Perhaps a land buffer around these properties could be included in the swap. But the road through town, the parking, and the currently undeveloped areas should remain public in order to insure access to the surrounding public lands for future generations.</p> <p>2. Transportation:</p> <p>I believe that the best and most economical near-term solution to the transportation issues up Big and Little Cottonwood is an expanded public UTA bus system. If there were regular buses running up both canyons 7 days per week every 30 minutes, this more-convenient schedule would result in increased ridership. Furthermore, a toll booth should be set up at the mouth of each canyon and charge \$10 for each single-passenger car and \$5 for each multi-occupancy vehicle. The tolls collected should be used to subsidize the cost of these additional buses (ideally generating enough \$ so that there would be no bus far charged).</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	Salt Lake City	3/16/2015
<p>Below please find my comments regarding the proposed "blueprint" which I do not support. I do not support it because I think it strikes a balance which favors private economic incentives over public conservation and enjoyment value. The Utah ski industry has built a faulty foundation on the premise that more development is better and "enhances the skier experience." When the truth is more development devalues the user experience and an individual's connection to the mountains. I find it ironic that a room full of 8 year olds fully grasp the conservation lessons of the Lorax but grown-up spending hours working up glossy slideshow presentations just don't get it or probably more accurately, won't admit it. I understand that is an oversimplification but there is no doubt to me that private financial interests are at the wheel and the public gets taken for the ride.</p> <p>Transportation Until UTA optimizes the utilization of bus service it is premature to implement something as expensive, intrusive as a train or fixed guideway in LCC. I have been advocating to UTA for years to have bus service which goes directly to a particular resort or access point in the canyon. I want to use public transport but I don't want to do a lengthy tour of Snowbird when I am desiring to go to Alta Central. Sometimes small changes can have significant benefit. The lane change and merge at Entry 1 and 2 was genius and has substantially improved downhill traffic flow. The number of days of the year that traffic is really a problem in LCC are relatively few and primarily a weather/avalanche issue. If interlodge is in effect, is the train going to be taking people up the canyon? Unlikely. Also, you need to incentive public transport by rewarding riders — free or inexpensive travel and discouraging drivers with tolls/season driving passes/min number of vehicle occupants at certain times. We do not need trains or tunnels.</p> <p>I have adopted the following comments from someone more intimately involved in the Mountain Accord process. I support and agree with these comments::</p> <p>Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am in full support of creating a trails network in the upper reaches of the two canyons</li> <li>The trails should be a mix of hiking exclusive, mountain biking exclusive, and shared (and/or with management techniques conducive to habits; ie Snowbird's new trail being uphill until the tram runs and then it becomes downhill).</li> <li>Any new road/transit construction must have improved road cycling facilities (wider shoulders, exclusive bike lanes, disconnected paved bike paths)</li> <li>LCC/BCC parking areas need to be enlarged and enhanced for the major dispersed user trailheads, with optional stops for the Bus Rapid Transit at White Pine, Argenta, Butler Fork, Mineral Fork, etc.</li> <li>I support the permanent protection of the Emma Ridges to Superior ridgeline from development.</li> <li>I do NOT support a chairlift in Grizzly Gulch. I recognize that it is private property, but I also appreciate that much of Alta's operations are on public land and that they stand to benefit greatly from enhanced base development on a lot of lucrative land, additional water use, increased snowmaking, and improved LCC transit. Grizzly Gulch and the surrounding area should be put into some sort of permanent protection.</li> <li>I could be supportive of chairlifts and development into the American Fork Canyon depending on alignment and scope.</li> <li>I could be supportive of a re-aligned chairlift in Honeycomb Canyon, depending on the alignment, provided there are no effects on Silver Fork backcountry</li> <li>I am supportive of Brighton's formal adoption of Hidden Canyon, provided any chairlift reaches back towards the Great Western chairlift.</li> </ul>	Salt Lake City	3/16/2015
<p>To Mountain Accord,</p> <p>I am a local skier, hiker &amp; climber. I have been trying to learn what I can about the Mountain Accord blueprint and it has me scared. It seems to completely disregard the rapidly growing contingency of backcountry skiers and snowshoes as well as the millions of annual hikers who visit the Wasatch Mountains year round. I do visit resorts, and I am ok with Solitude and Brightons' plans, because these areas are very easy accessible side country already; but Alta's plans will really hurt prime safe backcountry terrain and wouldn't add much value as a lift access skier. I have skied that terrain many times and it is great as a back country skier because the avalanche conditions are easy to predict and relatively safe, however it is less than interesting terrain when using a lift. I believe this area should go under some kind of permanent protection.</p> <p>I am also scared of the transportation plans. I support a dedicated bus lane and increased shelter from avalanches in Little Cottonwood Canyon. I am afraid that a train will not be convenient for backcountry users (skiers, snowshoes &amp; hikers) who stop at locations other than the resorts plus I fear the price of riding the train, due to the enormous cost of implementation, would be too expensive for most families. I am in favor of dedicated bus lanes and increased avalanche mitigation with snowsheds and/or bridges over slide paths. I think an optimized year-round Bus Rapid Transit for both canyons would provide better service to both the ski resorts and backcountry (dispersed) users on a year-round basis than a train. I am also in favor of a per-vehicle fee, with a daily and annual pass available, for the canyons. This could help subsidize the optimized bus system, a much needed increase in parking at the base of the canyons, and reduce the bus fare, incentivizing bus use. I am highly against the LCC/BCC tunnel. I don't think it would solve any problems and the enormous cost does not warrant any benefit from it. I am also in support of a year-round bus shuttle system for Mill Creek Canyon.</p> <p>I understand that the ski resorts need to make money with a fickle enterprise like snow, especially given global warming. I support enabling the ski resorts to utilize more water for snowmaking; I support adding potential land and altering zoning for additional development at the various resorts' bases; and I support enabling the ski resorts to expand their summertime activities within their existing footprints. I just want to make sure that the resorts do not expand at the expense of environmental and backcountry terrain preservation.</p> <p>Given my opposition of a train, tunnel, and Alta's expansion into Grizzly Gulch, I do not support the "blueprint" in its current form. I am hopeful that a more reasonable balance can be found between the resorts and the precious and amazing resource that is the Wasatch Mountains.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>	Salt Lake City	3/16/2015

<p>Dear Mountain Accord</p> <p>I am a Mountain and Ski Guide who works for Utah Mountain Adventures, the Utah Avalanche Center, the American Avalanche Institute and the American Mountain Guide Association. I represent a large group of backcountry skiers and snowboarders, both professional and our clients who also love skiing the Wasatch backcountry. I moved to the Wasatch from New Zealand in 1999.</p> <p>Below, in blue, are my comments regarding the issues that are important to me, my colleagues, friends and guests to the Wasatch:</p> <p>Transportation</p> <p>I recognize that the traffic situation in Little Cottonwood Canyon is unsustainable on some winter days, and while I understand the impetus to promote a train version of a fixed guideway, I feel that the bus system is far from optimized and with proper implementation, could service both the ski resorts and dispersed users on a year-round basis far more effectively than a train.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing copious parking near the mouths of the canyon would be a critical component of this.</li> <li>• Without trying an optimized bus system using the existing infrastructure I feel it is impossible to justify major infrastructure changes (adding lanes or installing a train)</li> <li>• Charging a per-vehicle fee - either via a daily fee or an annual pass - would help subsidize the optimized bus/parking system and provide an incentive to ride the transit system</li> <li>• Incentivize ridership by making the bus fee free or only a nominal price.</li> <li>• The bus system would need to have both a Snowbird-servicing bus and multiple Alta express buses.</li> <li>• Current and future UDOT plans to add passing lanes on Hwy 210 for private vehicles should be focused on improving bus transit systems.</li> <li>• Snowsheds and/or bridges over slide paths can/should be added for increased avalanche mitigation for the highway.</li> <li>• I fully support optimizing year-round Bus Rapid Transit for Big Cottonwood Canyon. Again, with copious parking at the mouth of the canyon.</li> <li>• A tunnel linking LCC and BCC is not needed. Improved public transit would alleviate the traffic issues associated with LCC, and the "safety" issues that have been ascribed to a tunnel have been overblown; there have not been any documented injuries/fatalities associated with overuse of LCC that would not be overcome with improved transit.</li> <li>• Tunnel connections would create more defacto resort sidecountry terrain, effectively increasing the resorts' footprints.</li> <li>• The tunnel would basically be a taxpayer-funded connection that would exist to benefit four businesses (ski resorts) with no/very little validation that such a connection would actually be economically beneficial to those businesses. There are no significant "problems" that an LCC/BCC tunnel would solve, despite a considerable cost to taxpayers (\$500 per Utah resident apparently - not exactly fair).</li> <li>• The same argument is applied to a fixed guideway system connecting BCC to Park City. It would not necessarily save time for NO-BCC travelers, is not supported by Park City officials, and would again be a taxpayer-subsidized benefit to a handful of businesses (ski</li> </ul>	Salt Lake City	3/10/2015
<p>Thank you for the opportunity to offer my comments regarding the Mountain Accord.</p> <p>I was an Alta resident for 10 years and have worked there for 25.</p> <p>I believe that the Mountain Accord LRT alternative makes a great deal of sense for many reasons and completely support it. The plan exhibits forward thinking our children will thank us for.</p>	Salt Lake City	3/16/2015
<p>Comment on Mountain Accord Blueprint: It would be hard for anyone to argue with the idealism of the Accords mission and vision. However the blueprint falls short in several particulars. There are many laudable goals: protecting the environment, resolving land ownership, managing, improving air quality, dealing with the canyon traffic mess to name a few. Many of the more clearly articulated recommendations in the blue print show the heavy-handed influence of ski resorts interests. Should those recommendations be the basis for ensuring phases the resorts would be the big winners with the public paying the bill. The blueprint makes many assertions about the future direction of canyon management with little cited to substantiate it. In many steps that lie ahead the blueprint will heavily influence future plans for the Wasatch. Because of the lofty goals and purportedly open Accord process the public is expected to put inordinate amount of faith in the integrity of the recommendations. Economic: The resorts are certainly consequential, but the greater interests of the adjacent communities are subordinated to the narrower goals of a resort industry determined to build a nonpareil destination ski complex on top of the heart of the Wasatch Range. The highest priority for considering the fate of the tri-canyon Wasatch core should be protecting the watershed. With water resources likely to be even more taxed between population growth and a potentially declining quantity of water due to climate change protecting water should trump everything else. The second priority should be to sustain the easy access wilderness-like recreation and accessible resorts for Wasatch Front residents. Population growth along the Wasatch Front will continue unabated, and those future residents deserve a recreational landscape comparable to what is available today. It is a unique quality of life that has and will continue to be an important factor in attracting business and industry to the Wasatch Front. The economic value of what happens in the valley is incomparably greater than the value of the ski industry. Make the value of the mountains to the communities next to it the driving priority for planning. What resorts want from the plan might seem modest to some, but their real impacts would be far reaching. What is sought is the invitation to dominate the upper Cottonwoods and turn the area into an industrial recreational landscape dominated by luxury accommodations served by an extravagant transportation system built at taxpayer expense. More importantly the area is finite and cannot accommodate the resort expansion, which is not necessarily in size, but decisively towards a destination ski orientation. Transportation: I am guessing that the Transportation group's biases in Little Cottonwood Canyon are bus rapid transit (BRT) and light rail (LRT). Both BRT and LRT are fused to the tunnel network proposed to connect Big Cottonwood Canyon and Park City. I agree that the best transportation alternatives need to be considered, but I don't believe that much of a case has been made for the tunnels. The "escape route" argument is largely a fiction since it has virtually never been a problem. Local users choose to go up one canyon or the other because it leads them to their destination. I consider the tunnel idea along with the tram as largely self-serving for bigger aspirations of the LCC resorts. Whether you enhanced canyon travel reliability resulting from the construction of snow sheds a feature of both BRT AND LRT the argument for tunnels has even less validity. Make the tunnels idea separate from BRT AND LRT. Alternative C is One Wasatch, Interconnect or whatever you have offered to the public as a serious transportation alternative. Really? When has a gondola ever been an efficient way to move large numbers of people? The fact that this even made it to the final four serves to reinforce my suspicions about the impartiality of the whole Mountain Accord process. I do not believe that most people (most being locals not tourists) have no interest in trailing from BCC to LCC, or to Park City by gondola. The system would be under utilized, superfluous and unsightly. Alternative D Transportation System management Alternatives seems as the most potentially reasonable if I only knew what it means because it is so vaguely described as to be largely incomprehensible. I am assuming that it might at least be its most fiscally responsible alternative. If read correctly it means try the obvious and easily achievable things first: Why not start there? Less costly solutions might prove to be sufficient for a significant amount of time. Increasingly expensive and complex plans can always be proposed for the future if justified. With destination skier numbers declining nationally, climate change, and the Wasatch Front population growing exponentially what looks attractive and reasonable now may make less sense ten years from now. Costly transportation systems usually make essential connections for users like home with school or workplace. Improvements in transportation between Park City and the Salt Lake Valley at least meet the definition of essential.</p>	Salt Lake City	3/16/2015
<p>Hello,</p> <p>I visited a public venue on this for a couple hours and have a lifetime in the Wasatch with family and friends. I have a few comments on specific items proposed.</p> <p>1) Transportation:    UTA rep said, in response to query about the current buses to ski resorts not being used that much, that UTA would increase service hours, frequency and days of operation.    That is exactly the opposite of what they have done in Salt Lake County over the past several years, where they start by cutting days of service, then hours of service and then frequency. I've been riding UTA for 44 years. They do have some good drivers. They are not to be believed. They lack accountability and are careless with funds.    More people in Salt Lake wait for UTA to get out of the way than ride it. They destroy traffic flow with their dream of rail everywhere. At least when a bus goes by, the entire roadway is left available for traffic. UTA is not the answer. They propose rail lines to Park City and Park City doesn't want to be a destination end. They propose extra lanes up the canyon (lanes up the canyon?) when UDOT cannot even put in a decent bike lane. I asked why anyone would ride UTA up canyon. He said that they would have incentives like charging a bunch to park in the canyon at least at resort lots. Then it came to cost. I asked how much it would cost to take a family of 5 on a canyon hike, should one be able to get on/off at the needed spot. He said it would be \$5.50 per person each way, \$55 for a family hike. I asked how often he would take his family on a canyon hike at Alta rates. He said never, it would cost too much.</p> <p>2) It seems that the entire thrust is to get more money from tourism and the heck with people who live here. These lands are not Utah's to make a mess of. They belong mostly to the American public. Your plans mostly cater to the business interests. They have full time people who push and work for their companies. They only have to win a battle once and it's over. The public has to win every time or they lose another piece forever. Already Snowbird is floating their next planned assault with a tram from Tible Fork to Mineral Basin. I have watched them and gone on 44 years in their plans, one step at a time as they change the precious lands to their liking. If you want to encourage people to drive hundreds of miles to get away from the commercial mess and expense that you propose, then you don't already have the plan. The charm that brings people to work and live here is more the nearby, easy to reach, affordable open spaces. The canyon business side is corrosive to this. Sure, some locals can afford those places, but not most. And many who can afford it don't indulge in that lifestyle. Some of your consolidation plans may be OK. The Wasatch is more than just three big canyons. You need to also keep access or create access to more of the front. Private entities are always trying to close off access to public lands along the front. Look at Heugs Canyon. Home owners took down the sign indicating the trailhead and instead word a street sign to discourage people from finding it. Ferguson is still available for now. What about the mountains between Emigration and Parleys, where there is some good hiking to be had. How long will it be the little access now there last? Preserve nearby lands and the health and happiness of the people in Salt Lake will flourish. Don't let business set the path. Their stock holders couldn't care less about what is preserved for local folks.</p> <p>3) Millcreek established a fee that wasn't too onerous. AND, the canyon improved / recovered beautifully. Of course in the Cottonwoods all the home owners, businesses and all their patrons would be exempt, so it wouldn't be at all fair. Those two canyons are different.</p> <p>If you busy to business, then the next generation may never know what they missed. Bet we know what the outcome is. Just like in research park and the museum. Public comment is a nuisance hoop to jump through. In the end the politicians can be bought and the public, too busy to make cover all the bases, will lose. Just look so far up there. Do not let anyone touch more of the Crest Trail Area. It is precious. HANDS OFF.</p>	Salt Lake City	3/16/2015
<p>Dear Mountain Accord,</p> <p>As a member of the Environmental Systems Group, I wanted to provide a specific comment on Snowbird's possible expansion into American Fork. Throughout the Mountain Accord process, the Environmental Systems group was concerned that the resorts "not get a free pass". Clearly, there is a need to concentrate development - but those areas of high use should still be held to a high environmental standard given where they are located, e.g., riparian areas, wetlands, and alpine meadows.</p> <p>So, if Snowbird is allowed to expand into American Fork, what was previously National Forest and subject to federal environmental review, would be governed by Utah County regulations. I don't believe Utah County has a review process that is equivalent to NEPA. So in order to protect important environmental values in American Fork, I would recommend that a "development-by-design" process be a condition of approval. That process would require an inventory of sensitive resources and the avoidance of sensitive resources when possible. If avoidance is not possible, then minimization of the impact. If that isn't possible then off-site mitigation.</p> <p>Thanks for the opportunity to comment!</p>	Salt Lake City	2/11/2015
<p>My thoughts on the proposed blueprint: I am disappointed in the Cottonwood Canyon Task Force process. To have an open, transparent public process capped with a closed-door negotiation, kept secret from the rest of the Systems Group Participants, negotiating issues that were never brought before the Systems Groups, casts doubt on the entire process. I have been asked about the process and if it is true that the Mountain Accord outcome was determined by development interests prior to starting the process and, based on the recent Task Force developments, the answer is not clear. I am encouraged to see that concepts that generated little controversy, such as an expanded trail network and the Millcreek shuttle, made it into the Blueprint. I am concerned about the fixation on the train option in LCC. It is my understanding that that was a condition dictated by the resorts, driven primarily by marketing concerns out of fear that buses were far cheaper and easier to implement but were associated with poor people and trains were far more complicated, expensive, and cool. If that is the case, it only seems fair that the resorts would pay for a significant portion of the cost to implement a train system, a scenario that is hard to imagine. Other issues with a train:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can it be built without adversely impacting the watershed?</li> <li>• Will it provide adequate stops to service dispersed recreation or will it only stop at resorts?</li> <li>• How will locals get from home to a point where they can get on the train and where will they park?</li> <li>• Can we afford the cost and will the cost be born by the public to benefit a few private entities?</li> </ul> <p>These are massive unknown issues and all potential show-stoppers. I don't understand how we can commit to a train without understanding the consequences better. I'm not necessarily opposed to a train, I just feel that selecting this option with so many unanswered questions challenges our credibility and allows for a complicated situation should the train option not prove feasible. All the Systems groups agreed that connecting the Wasatch Front and Back with aerial lifts was not a transportation option and the Blueprint FAQs state clearly that aerial lifts were rejected. Yet an aerial lift is shown in the Blueprint. Most of the proposed Environmental and Economic "actions" described on page 3 are vague and not actually quantifiable or actionable. The Transportation proposed solutions are a mix of actionable items and vague aspirations. Prioritization of issues doesn't seem to be addressed. For example, I think most Wasatch residents would agree that maintenance of a sustainable water supply outweighs all other concerns combined. The only issue of obvious high priority in the Blueprint is economic development. Trading away water for development and snowmaking without seeing a credible engineering analysis alarms me. Perhaps that action will not significantly impact SLG water supply, but I don't see how we can even put that option on the table without understanding the consequences. Again, if that is part of a grand bargain and doesn't prove to be feasible, what happens to the rest of the agreement? The public questionnaire is vague and poorly written. I have low expectations for the quality of the data it produces. The projected growth in non-local skier visitation is not supported by ski industry data, either nationally or locally. It was my understanding that we are trying to accommodate growth in use, but the blueprint is clearly intended to promote growth. There is a significant difference between those two objectives. In general, it appears to me that the resort and development interests are the big winners in this process. The public loses water quality and quantity, pays the bill for an enormous public works project intended to promote resort use targeting non-locals, loses backcountry terrain, and gains a little over 2,000 acres of land that is largely unsuited for commercial development. The resort and development community gives away land of questionable value in exchange for subsidized transportation and promotion and the ability to further develop an area that the public has repeatedly shown a desire to preserve. The one piece of land that public opinion seems to support preserving as undeveloped public space, Grizzly Gulch, has been removed from the bargaining table. Maybe the most discouraging aspect of this process is the sentiment, expressed publicly by several Executive Board members representing special interests, that they don't feel bound by this process - if the outcome is not in their favor, they won't be bound by it.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>I am in favor of permanent land swaps that will ensure the preservation of the watershed and backcountry skiing terrain. I am opposed to any tunneling or lift transit development. Costs to the environment and taxpayers would be far too high.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>I think the current bus system could be much better. I like the idea of \$5 or \$10 to park at the resort. If buses were faster, direct and more frequent, (a season passholder for Alta for ten years) would be much more inclined to use. Or \$10 to drive solo. Carpools are free at Jackson for 3 or more people and you pay for driving with 2 or 1.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>I do not agree with connecting Park City with Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons as it will turn the entire area into a massive ski resort and destroy the natural beauty that makes the Wasatch Front wonderful. Let's not turn our mountains into a big business. I think the National Forest being so close to the city is a big asset to community development. We don't need to "develop" this area for our city to thrive. Having a place to get away from development is a huge asset and brings people to our pretty, great state.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>I feel like the Mt Accord has a good vision to try and preserve our fantastic wilderness. I am especially concerned that the areas of Grizzly Gulch, Flagstaff and Superior to NOT get developed. I think that would be absolutely horrible. For the transportation - why aren't buses more of a consideration than the train? Buses up LCC and BCC that run more often (no 2 hour time period where there is no bus!) and buses that go straight to Alta (rather than all the stops at Snowbird) would be great. A heavy parking price at the ski areas might help this. But you would need buses often and buses that would stop at all the backcountry ski areas (literally everywhere) for it to work. Also... a bus system up Millcreek would be fantastic but parking would be a problem. (maybe a bus from the gate area?) Also, you don't have a heavy parking fee for if you park in Millcreek to help pay for the trails... I do like the proposed trails and the proposed bike lines by the canyons - Please fix the One Wasatch ski link. That would be horrible and the Wasatch just isn't that big. Thanks for all your work!</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>I would like to know what the plan is for Grizzly Gulch/Flagstaff/the entire ridge. Do the resorts plan to expand there. I notice that Hidden Canyon is planned to be developed/expanded. But what about Grizzly Gulch? Shouldn't that be in Red (expansion). I have a hard time believing they will not go there, or at least try.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>I really like the idea of the land transfers between the upper mountains and resort base areas. I am very opposed to an interconnect (One Wasatch) lift system. I think the proposal strikes a fair compromise between the resorts and the public. I would like to see Snowbird restricted from developing areas originating from Utah County. Make bus service very frequent and charge tolls in the canyons (the license plate readers, not a toll booth) to subsidize there service improvements.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>You are going against the expressed wishes of most of the citizens of the Salt Lake Valley. You have a large coalition of organizations agreed with the Wasatch Mountains. Including the Transportation Group and the Ski Industry who have come up with a complex of compromises with a little bit of what "everyone" wants - a dream team comes up with a "Dream Plan". However, we must protect the watershed, limit cars and enhancing the bus service. Protect the mountain vistas, streams and forests and the ski industries do not need more land and more skiers! Don't touch Millcreek. No interconnect please. Don't let the ski resorts put in more lifts. We should use wilderness eminent domain to reacquire and delegate their undeveloped land.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015

<p>The more I look at this Blueprint the more it stinks. As a backcountry skier/hiker the ski area expansion and resulting backcountry use will be devastating. No Grizzly Gulch is a deal breaker. The cost of the rail project to Utah taxpayers would more than offset any benefit of the tourist industry. The environment plan doesn't take the impact of climate change seriously. We're going to chop up and overdevelop our watershed as water becomes more scarce and polluted. Winter tourism is going to drop off dramatically as winters become warmer, ultimately this appears to be an elaborate giveaway to the tourism industry at too high a cost to the rest of us. The simplest solution is to put snow sheds on LCC road and close canyons on peak days to cars and run dedicated shuttle buses. Chopping up the Wasatch no matter how beautiful the slope is still destroys it and that's what the current plan is.</p> <p>As an equestrian, I am concerned about the shrinking areas for equine use in our canyons. It is disturbing that equine use is not even mentioned, or apparently not even a consideration for the future use or trail development in the Mountain Accord proposal. Horses and trail riding are a vibrant part of our local economy and recreation interests. They (horses) are an important part of our western history and should be encouraged and supported for future use, but we live up to this choice for future generations. My equine enthusiast friends, neighbors and riding club members need more and improved trail access. Equine use should not be an afterthought.</p> <p>Please NO ski connect. Please NO train up the canyon. Preserve our rustic wilderness. Once it is disturbed, it will never be restored to its original beauty.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>With population density being greater on the east side, and past bus service being less, or, having fewer hubs and bus service lines for me as an east side resident, I BEG you to see that "the proposed Central Wasatch Blueprint" does not service the existing population density, sadly, in proportion to what is a reasonable transit concern.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>Trains are absurd, lets use existing resources and establish a real bus system first. Its good we are addressing the population growth but this plan is over doing it... like on steroids/HGH/Epo overdoing it. Most of this is catered to visitors, while the majority of Wasatch Front users are locals. Let's see a REAL plan together before wasting millions on Enviro studies that will lead to nowhere.</p> <p>If the ski resorts were to be connected it would create massive problems. If you had lifts or any kind of transportation connecting Brighton and Solitude or Brighton and Alta, it would destroy the beauty and breathtaking recreation of Lake Mary Duke Catherine, Train Lake, Guardian Pass etc. It would destroy the opportunities families have to experience the natural beauty of nature. We need to protect those areas at all costs. And don't even get me started on the noise. Second if we put trains or mass transportation vehicles going up and down the canyons it would ruin all the ambience. The canyons would lose so much plus the mass transportation would be expensive for our community. All of this will be coming out of tax payers' wallets. All the new implants would destroy the canyons and their majesty. The ski resorts have expanded enough. Please stop worrying about improving our canyons with "upgrades". Please focus on just maintaining our canyons keeping them natural and beautiful without major lifts or trains/mass transport. These canyons mean so much to me and I want to be able to enjoy them for the rest of my life and I want my children to enjoy them as well. Implementing the use of trains and lifts as well as tunnels will destroy our wonderful canyons and mountains. Please do not.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>The problem with a train is that they use friction to work so it could be problematic with snow in the winter. To solve that I think monorail should be considered even though they are harder to repair.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>I'm a teenager at Wasatch Jr. High and one of the greatest parts of my day is looking up to the mountains. If we do anything it should be with preserving the majesty of our mountains in mind. I think we should minimize the effect of the transit up the canyons by using tunnel systems. That way people can still get up into the mountains without harming the ecosystem. I also believe keeping watershed areas is important. We depend on the mountains for our water and if we end up destroying our greatest water supply we could end up in trouble. I think its important that we keep up tourism also, because it is such a huge part of our economy. I know that my thoughts are all over the place I apologize for that, it's just that this is very important to me. I plan to grow up in this area and I want to preserve the natural beauty of our state.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>Don't like the idea of the tax payer funded bullet train through LCC when 7% of residents ski... and this could be serviced by a better valley public transit system with each canyon, individually, served via better canyon public transit; AND... a bullet TO/FR SLC and the P.C. area (i.e. RT, 80). Let the residents and valley benefit from state-of-the-art public transit that avails all-year-long environmental impact of clean-air (i.e. light rail, etc.) and resort/canyon service as leifs off this phenomenal linking web of valley transportation. I suggest changing the focus to THIS to enhance our resident's as well as tourist's experiences! Thereby each resort and canyon will retain its own unique integrity!!! Hey...I like this idea more and more :)</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>Transportation route expansion is difficult to lead with. Specifically connecting Little Cottonwood Canyon to Quinn's Junction in any way. However small the connection road/tunnel/ram it opens up the loop from I-80 to Little Cottonwood. I don't remember the last time a road in Utah has not been expanded by the state over time. Take 224 in Summit County for example. It was one lane in each direction at one time. Transportation connectivity always seems to benefit commerce and development over environmental protection over time. Environmental protection is a priority for me. Let's let sleeping dogs lay and protect the land between Little Cot. and Quinn's Jct. or as much as we can and not propose transportation connection which will open the fates for resort integration and thus residential/commercial development in open space. Thank you.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>1) We need short term transportation and parking solutions. 2) What I hear from the presentations are 5 to 15 year concept plans. 3) Bus service has gone downhill for Snowbird and Alta in the last 2 or 3 years. 4) Parking is problematic - Require bus service for ski races! 5) Need 2 or 3 year plan!</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>Please don't allow the unique personality of Alta to be diluted, made into what it is not, by a train/tunnel through to LCC and then to BCC, PC/D.V. The uniqueness and greatness is going to suffer, if people want to go there, please provide/consider transport STRAIGHT there... not through, or, via linking LCC to everywhere else. This risks the possibility of the exploitation of Alta to the epic pass, or, entitled skiers who may very well financially benefit... not LCC... but outside "pockets" (think VAIL associates.)</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>The Wasatch Mountains are NOT the Alps. We would like to retain the individual personalities of the different resorts. We do not want to connect Alta-Brighton and Park City. The traffic problem might be alleviated by express and more buses and a user fee. Resorts have agreed to no expansion (in the 80s). Do not allow ski lift expansion. Don't forget - there are summer users who do not appreciate chair lifts (and roads). Thanks for the hard work.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>Please allot a per-skier-lift-ticket dollar amount to the forest service... as well as fee-per-campers". The forest services presence if uber under present and available. I have called the wildlife representative for wildlife concerns at the ski area of Alta, left several messages, and later learned there is 1 person in charge of a very large physical area... of course I did not get a call back, and, likely, the wildlife I was advocating for did not get the care/advocacy it deserved. "I believe the private company collecting camping fees in LCC... they are responsible for the forest service... as well as fee-per-campers".</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>It is my experience and insight that there is increased pressure from Millcreek Canyon permit holders to influence public use of Millcreek Canyon. In particular I refer to the citing of dog-on-leash issue in its entirety. So, I am bringing this issue up in a comment, hopefully that I find a progressive and open-minded, unbiased, representation that this issue is reasonable to consider in the master plan of all that is being addressed: Dogs and open space and off leash. Plus... we're not being consistent with our permits (for example there is a HOUSE up Millcreek Canyon that is certainly outside of the original spirit of the permit...and, actually, MANY for that matter). Should we really subsidize their evolved exclusive use of forest service lands...Please address and support the limits in the Forest Services budget. And what's up with that pipe up/down the side of the creek on the road w/ all the "cabins" that again are VERY outside of the permit's criteria'.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>"If you build it - they won't necessarily come". I have been taking the UTA "ski" bus to ski in Little Cottonwood Canyon for approx 7 years. Some observations - very few skiers luf ALL of their equipment to the resort on the bus. They leave lockers at the resort where they store their equipment. Very few bus riders pay for a bus ticket. They are employees or season pass holders who ride for "free". I would not ride the UTA bus unless I had a season locker at the resort and it was free. So...simply putting transit in will not in itself change how people get to the resorts to ski. It is too big of a logistical nightmare for skiers/boarders to pack their vehicles with gear, unpack it at a transit stop, lug it to the bus/train, unload it at their destination, and find a comfortable spot to "dress". Then repeat this whole process on the way out. Bottom line - their must be incentives to use public transportation. Such as - free rides on public transit - fees for parking a private car at resorts - convenient means for loading/unloading gear on transit (UTA buses do NOT currently have these) - accessible day lockers at resorts with lockers for storing gear/lunches etc. - quicker access to the resorts. One final thought - UTA does a horrible job of scheduling buses to the resort. There are 3/2 empty buses and over-crowded buses simply due to their.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>After looking at proposals at the Mountain Accord Open House at Skyline High School and basing it against years of experience of enjoying the Canyons (Big, Little, Millcreek Parleys) I have many concerns. Namely, watershed, overdevelopment and transit alternatives. It concerns me to link the ski resorts via chair or tunnel. It seems it would take away the unique aspect of each resort. The Olympics in 2002 went well without ever touching Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon. When I go up into the Canyons with family and friends to either board, ski, bike, hike, camp or relax I do not like the idea that it will turn into a Disneyland experience by having over-head chairlifts or manmade tunnels or skiers in the backcountry that did not work to get there. It also is a pleasure to know where our water comes from and "Less is more" when it comes to natural resources. Thanks for holding the open house and hope and trust our love of the Wasatch Range and the unique area we live will be kept in the forefront of the decision process.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>The proposed adaptive management plan for environmental resources seems to be a very difficult thing to put together and implement - but so crucial! Because these resources cut across so many political boundaries - city, county and agencies there needs to be a way to look at these resources in a way that transcends these divisions while also respecting them at the same time. Perhaps these environmental resources should be cast more as 'ecosystem services' - those services that ecosystems provide for human well-being (but overlap for after living things too). This would include both economy and environmental factors and help us understand where the tradeoffs lie, but also may be easier to communicate their status, value, and future trajectory to a wider audience - non-scientists, policy makers, business developers, etc.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>I would like a say in how the ski resorts develop and what kind of development they have, (e.g. condos, restaurants, etc., environmental impact of development). I oppose connecting the ski areas above the ground I would live all development to consider environmental impacts. Trail expansion - have you considered expanding trail network around the Bonneville Shoreline Trail? I like connecting transit to trails. I like transit, although it has to be fast or people will drive. Trax on Foothill would be great! I oppose expansion of solitude into Silver Fork - please preserve backcountry skiing. Equitable access is very important. I really like the proposed expansion of env. protection, could go bigger. I also really like the proposal to expand and improve trails. I like the train up the canyons, particularly Parley's Canyon to Park City. I also think this is a great way to reduce car traffic, I am curious about the environmental costs associated with more cars (as pop. increases) vs. installing trains. Have you considered only train (where the road is) in Little Cottonwood? This would reduce most of the environmental costs associated with more cars.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>I hope that Grizzly Gulch will not be developed for resort skiing so much of the moderate angle slopes at the head of the canyons is reserved for resort skiing. I appreciate that part of the Mountain Accord goals is to protect the natural environmental of the Wasatch. Thank you for your efforts.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>I support the building of the trains because they are efficient, they reduce the use of cars up the canyons, and it doesn't even effect much land area. I think the trains will benefit the community. If you drive up the canyons in the winter the sides of the roads are lined with cars that belong with skiers, but with transits constantly bringing people up the canyon, then the pollution would be reduced monumentally as well as alleviating the skinny canyon roads of congestion.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>Parking is currently an issue for all Wasatch front canyons and increased population will only make it worse. The current bus while useful is very expensive (\$9.00 RT). Increased service and less expensive options would be helpful whether it be bus, train or ? Please place strong emphasis on winter and wildlife and environment when finalizing decisions. I'm less in favor of developing things to encourage visitors and more interested in providing for locals quality of life, especially as higher density congestion becomes more prominent in the valley.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>On resort expansion: Any summer and winter user knows that resorts take a lot away from a backcountry developing. I was glad that I didn't see any mention of the Grizzly Gulch/Honeycomb Lift. I hope it stays like that! Development on (T) should be avoided. Solitude's potential development is troubling because this skiable terrain they are after is in Silver Fork NOT Honeycomb. This expansion is thus much bigger than what's on the map. On Transportation: Billion dollar tunnels and trains make no sense for serious work is done with bussing. Much of this bussing problems could be solved tomorrow with real effort. Note. I mean this Cottonwood here. A train would have an enormous environmental effect and would do harm serious issues with access and in my opinion would be useless and people to people now in the canyon. Questions - No one has talked about solutions to limit traffic in the canyons. I think a conversation about fees or car restrictions is worth the expense. A better ail to tourism would be a danger to Utah's reputation as a wild place. That is why people choose Colorado instead of Utah! Finally: DO NOT make decisions based on marketing from ski resorts! One Wasatch is all marketing and no substance! It's worthless to anyone!</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>I am against this proposal / any proposal that includes developing more of the Wasatch. Resorts can survive in the foot print they operate in.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>Does the expansion of the ski area @ solitude include a ski lift into the Silverfork community?</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>The environment is very important to the tourism in the Wasatch. Recreation is also very important to me. I like those trails (often with my dogs) and fish those streams and lakes. I think that connection from Alta to Brighton is a terrible idea. Those are beautiful Alpine cirques and connection ruins these pristine forests and ecosystems. Light Rail is too expensive and widening the canyons roads will be impossible without destroying beautiful canyons. Stop expanding and connecting ski resorts!</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>I think we shouldn't have a rail road system or train system on the mountain face. I would like to keep the near transportation not as noticeable or out of the way of the mountains' beauty. The mountains mean a lot to me and I would hate to see them destroyed. A cable car going up would be nice. We could just have it go over the mountain. It would also be a good way to see the mountain from a higher view. Thank you for reading my suggestion. Please consider it.</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<p>Ok, where to start? I believe in simple solutions before complex ones. I have tried to use the bus system to go up Little Cottonwood. It is inconsistent and frequently full. 1) For public transportation to work it has to be reliable. Lets start with doubling the buses run and see what happens. And how about some security so my car doesn't get broken in to? Rules #2: People are going to seek the path of least resistance. So what happens when you put in your cof rail up LCC? Do they start parking, carting all their stuff to the rail, dealing w/ planning &amp; inconvenience? No, they drive up BCC and take a chair to LCC with the new connector. Now there are traffic jams up BCC. 2) The cog mail isn't really fixing the problem, it pushes traffic to the next canyon. Lets talk about economic development. The connection between Park City/Solitude/Brighton/Alta only leads to economic development from a skier standpoint for Alta &amp; Snowbird. (Resorts consistently rated top 10 ski mags) now everyone can go there! Hey, what about the other resorts? Most people I know avoid LCC because of the "rad snake" of traffic - a selling point for Solitude and Brighton that hurts their numbers... but here's their real estate. With more skiers than ever in LCC, of course Snowbird and Alta will need more lifts to maintain the "skier experience" 3) This is about real estate development, not creating jobs for the large majority of people that live here. Has anyone seriously looked at the costs and maintenance nd widening of tunnel and cog concepts? 4) Who is paying for this? How many does it really benefit. My proposed solutions: Option 1: The worst of the traffic is in the winter, on powder days, or on holidays. I suggest adding parking in Sandy/Granite area. On these days only residents and buses can go up the canyon from 7 to 10. Now you want powder, you ride the bus. This also has economic benefit because shops will benefit while people wait for parking and wait to go home, more jobs! And a more people buying stuff at the resorts. Otherwise, on less crowded days it is business as usual. This would be so cheap and easy to implement for a test period of a month, this solves the problem of crowds on the way down too. Option 2: Why do anything? The traffic is at nature deterring to push people to other canyons. Won't Solitude and Brighton benefit as people tired of waiting in traffic? What is really driving these decisions recreationally? I don't see a traffic jam for climbing, biking on anything bus skiing?</p>	Salt Lake City	2/25/2015
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What do you think about resort connectivity? Awesome! That could be really amazing.</li> <li>• Would you like to see improved, year-round public transportation? Depends on what that type of public transportation would be and the quality, frequency and flexibility. If it's not done right, then I would prefer to drive my own vehicle.</li> <li>• Improved bus services? I don't / won't use a bus.</li> <li>• Mountain rail? That would be really interesting!</li> <li>• No improvements at all? Improvements are needed, doing nothing would be a bad idea. Especially with the momentum with Vail Resorts - now's the time to really improve the entire area and elevate the quality, and experience. B</li> </ul>	San Diego, CA	3/13/2015
<p>Dear Mountain Accord,</p> <p>I write to oppose a rail system up Little Cottonwood Canyon. I first came to Alta in 1978 and worked in the Canyon various times up to 1983. I have visited LCC nearly every year since then to ski and enjoy Alta's incredible beauty and unique small-town character. I have reviewed the Mountain Accord specifics for a proposed rail system up LCC.</p> <p>While I can appreciate the need for a long-term plan to deal with the traffic, road and congestion problems, I believe that any decision should address the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the scope of the problem in LCC? E.g. how many visitors cannot access the Canyon now because of poor bus service, lack of parking, traffic delays, avalanche risk or other reasons?</li> <li>2. Are the environmental costs worth that?</li> <li>3. Is the financial undertaking worth that?</li> <li>4. Is the permanent change to LCC worth that?</li> <li>5. Who benefits in LCC from rail service?</li> </ol> <p>In my opinion, Alta is STILL like no other place because the community has worked really hard to NOT change it. The Central Wasatch has other canyons and resorts that are more amenable to increased access and additional development.</p> <p>I urge Alta's Town Council to support the Bus Rapid Transit as the best way to preserve LCC for future generations.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	San Francisco, CA	3/1/2015

<p>My strongest comment about plans for the Wasatch ski areas is to Keep Alta Snowboard Free.</p> <p>I have skied exclusively at Alta for 25 years, venturing one time each to Brighton, Solitude, Park City, Powder Mountain, Snow Basin and Snowbird. None of them compare, all of them have been open to snowboarding for years.</p> <p>Alta is a skiers' mountain. Traversing and hiking is how skiers get to some of the best terrain at Alta. But the excellent lift-served runs are equally sensitive to the difference between ski technique versus snowboard technique.</p> <p>Skiers live by the Skier Code, something that seems foreign, to these many years since development of snowboarding as a sport, to the snowboarding community.</p> <p>The fall line is sacrosanct in powder country. Preservation of lines is the rule. Unfortunately, the wave-like beauty of a highly skilled snowboarder on a run is counter-intuitive to the concept of skiing narrow lines to preserve the snow for others. More unfortunately, the bulldozer technique of an unskilled snowboarder ruins lines all over a mountain. Those who practice that poor technique end up in places they should not venture by lift. When lifts get them to starting points for hike-to terrain they do not get better, they just extend the reach of their terrain-ruining poor technique.</p> <p>By examination of the sheer numbers of areas that permit snowboarding versus those that are maintained exclusively for skiers it is clear that there is no need to open Alta to snowboarders.</p> <p>Most skiers are not so naive to think they can reclaim areas for exclusive use of skiing. But we have every reasonable expectation that the only skier-only area will remain so.</p> <p>Even one-ride access to move into Brighton and Snowbird is unwarranted. It would end up as a bell once rung. It cannot be unring.</p>	San Francisco, CA	3/13/2015
<p>I am an out of town tourist. I come to Utah about 1 time per year to ski for 4 days. Everything about the trip is great! Its easier for me to ski in Utah than the Lake Tahoe resorts in my home state! I use SLC, airport to condo / hotel shuttles and the park city bus system when I stay there. or just at the base of Alta if I go there.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What do you think about resort connectivity?</li> <li>o This is a great idea, just a few lifts to ski all that distance. I would do it!</li> <li>• Would you like to see improved, year-round public transportation?</li> <li>o Yes.</li> <li>• Improved bus services?</li> <li>o Yes, this would be interesting if there were buses from the airport directly to the resort areas that leave every hour or 30 mins? Maybe there are? I dont know.</li> <li>• Mountain rail?</li> <li>o no comment, I dont see a clear plan for on the one accord website.</li> <li>• No improvements at all?</li> <li>o doing nothing would also be fine.</li> </ul>	San Jose, CA	3/13/2015
<p>Thank you for asking for public feedback. In a nutshell, here is my response to the development/protection blueprint proposed by the Mountain Accord: protect the watershed at all costs, no trains, no tunnels and manage the resort expansion. If Salt Lake City's population does grow at the projected rate, protecting the watershed will be of utmost importance. People cannot live in the desert – even the high desert – without water. Putting aside the fact that Salt Lake Valley residents must start conserving water (especially in view of reduced snowfall in the face of our changing climate), keeping the Wasatch Mountains' snowpack clear and clean is crucial. The best way to protect the watershed is not to develop the Cottonwood Canyons any further. I realize that is not possible but limiting the new resort development to the smallest possible footprint is important. The Salt Lake Valley's residents need all the snowpack they can get. Putting light rail up Little Cottonwood Canyon is a terrible idea. The expense alone would be preposterous: from an archived Salt Lake Tribune article from December 2012, the TRAX expansion from Sandy to Draper was a \$194 million project – and that was for only 3.8 miles in a straight, flat line. A train up Little Cottonwood Canyon would at most be used five months out of the year during ski season, which is hardly worth the expense and the destruction to habitat and watershed. A better, cheaper and much less intrusive solution? Double the number of ski buses so that people don't have to wait for rides up and down the canyons (and have those ski buses run on natural gas to keep the air pollution down). Then, in the summertime when the tourists go away and ridership drops off, the buses can be redirected elsewhere. The major reason I don't tend to use the ski buses? I don't want to have to wait. Many more buses, marketed well to both tourists and locals so that people can understand the ease and flexibility of use, would change my habits for sure. Tunnels between the Cottonwood canyons and through to Park City are another terrible idea. Tunnels through the Wasatch Mountains would be destructive and disruptive. There is so little backcountry and wild habitat left in the canyons, what little is left should be protected. Moose, deer, pikas, mountain goats, marmots, rabbits, mountain lions, coyotes and a host of other critters call the Wasatch their home. We need to protect their habitat - they cannot protect themselves. And with lift prices ever creeping up and shutting out the majority of middle-class Utahns, the Cottonwoods backcountry is the only place locals can go without breaking the bank. When I moved to SLC from Maine years ago, people asked me if I missed the ocean. I didn't (and don't) because of the Wasatch Mountains right here in my backyard. Coming from the East Coast where there is scarcely any public land left, where almost everything is privately owned and inaccessible to the general public, it continually amazes me that so many native Utahns do not understand what a gift it is to have so much public land available in the state, especially the wild beauty of the Wasatch so close to the city. In Maine, you can't get to the ocean unless you go to a state park beach because the coastline has been snatched up by private landowners. In Utah, Forest Service and BLM land is available to everyone. There is so little wilderness left in this country, what there is should be protected. As a Utah resident, as a steward of the Wasatch Mountains, it is our duty to protect this endangered natural resource as much as possible, to protect the land, the water and the animals, and to keep it available for future generations to enjoy, as unspoiled as possible. Please do the right thing. Protect the Wasatch. Thank you.</p>	Sandy	2/19/2015
<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I have reviewed the blueprints for this proposed project and I appreciate the planning that has gone into it. As a resident of Sandy and a frequent user of Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons, I have great concerns about certain elements of the blueprint. My chief objection is the plan to develop mass transit in Little Cottonwood Canyon. This will most certainly cause irreversible, long-term damage to the river corridor, watershed integrity and aesthetics. It strikes me that an unstated, though likely major benefit of such a system will be to the resort owners whose employees can have their travel to the resorts delayed significantly by heavy snow and avalanches. To most others, it is more of a temporary inconvenience, and in my opinion and those of many, many others I have spoken to, not worth the environmental degradation it is certain to cause. This component of the plan, above any other, must not be allowed to happen. Should it be approved, I, as an avid skier of these resorts, will resolve to never patronize any of them ever again. I will engage in other activities. Many others I know are committed to the same course of action.</p> <p>I am also opposed to the suggestion that exorbitant parking fees will be charged to discourage driving up the canyon and encourage mass transit use. Rather, bus services in the canyons should be increased as necessary and parking areas expanded judiciously. If fees are unavoidable, they should be reasonable so that middle class families can still enjoy the canyons without being unduly burdened.</p> <p>Please do not include light rail in Little Cottonwood Canyon as a component of this plan. It will be a disaster to those who love the canyon. When it snows, folks can wait until later in the day or go another day. It's not a big deal. Ruining the canyon is a big deal. I will be contacting my local legislators to let them know my feelings about this as well.</p>	Sandy	2/28/2015
<p>I commend the many people who have given hours of work attempting to solve the problems that the future holds concerning our Wasatch Mountains. Solutions are not easily found because these unique mountains, so close to a huge and growing population, exemplify so many diverse interests. Understandably, compromises will have to be made. Hopefully the outcome will please everyone just a little.</p> <p>The work of the Cottonwood Canyon Task Force is to be particularly praised. Their suggestions are true compromises and are well balanced, so that no one wins, no one loses, but the mountains gain in the end because everyone cared.</p> <p>On one hand, back-country recreationists, environmentalists, lovers of wild land, and water protection advocates benefit if 2,150 acres of ski-owned land is permanently protected against development of any kind. These acres include Mt. Superior, Flagstaff, Emma Ridge, Grizzly Gulch, White Pine, Guardsman Pass, Cardiff Fork, and Hidden Canyon. Add to this list of areas to be protected Mt. Wolverine, Mt. Tuscarora, and Catherine Pass, land so precious to the maintenance of wild ecosystems and to the watershed.</p> <p>On the other hand, ski resorts will gain a mountain rail system, 288 acres for base-area management, added water for snowmaking (contingent on there being "added" water in the face of the predicted 50 year drought), and small boundary expansions totaling 210 acres.</p> <p>These suggestions are reasonable and sane. I urge Mountain Accord to embrace them.</p>	Sandy	3/6/2015
<p>I have spent some summers working in the town of Zermatt Switzerland that is serviced by a service road limited to service trucks and owners of property, and a train for the general public &amp; tourists. No vehicles are allowed in the town of Zermatt. I believe owners (with a permit) are allowed to bring their cars up to a parking lot that is quite close to Zermatt and park in the outer vicinity of Zermatt and jump on the train's last stop before it reaches Zermatt. The train rarely has closure as it is under avalanche protection tunnels and can go up and down the canyon in all conditions including avalanche danger. I have always thought it was a brilliant concept for the Cottonwood Canyons, perhaps looking at what Zermatt has that works could be considered?</p> <p>I think the Cottonwood Canyons are the only canyons that should be connected by train, they have similar ecological concerns, similar limitations, similar goals re: keeping our drinking water pure and the canyons pristine for the future. I think we should only connect Big Cottonwood Canyon to Little Cottonwood Canyon with a circular train that could start the circle from the bottom of Big Cottonwood (station &amp; parking there) traveling up to Brighton/Solitude (station there) through a tunnel to Snowbird/Alta (station there) and down Little Cottonwood Canyon (station &amp; parking there) back to the base of Big Cottonwood.</p> <p>I think it's a really bad idea to connect the pristine ecosystems in the Cottonwoods to Park City - this should not be done. Park City (which is indeed a city and not a little mountain town) needs a higher speed train up to it from Salt Lake City for commuters with big commuter capacity and huge parking access at the base of Parley's Canyon.</p> <p>I heard that 40% of the water for Salt Lake City comes from the Cottonwoods, and someday that might be our most treasured commodity on the planet - water. Please don't even chance jeopardize our water supply by creating an inappropriate canyon development through a direct train tunnel between the Cottonwoods and Park City. The Cottonwood Canyons already have too much exposure from Salt Lake City to open them up to Park City as well.</p> <p>I would however LOVE to see Park City and the Cottonwood Canyons attached via chairlift, this would bring only lovers of the mountains and people with good intent to enjoy the canyons via Park City or vice versa. It would be an amazing tourist attraction and unique in the United States.</p>	Sandy	3/8/2015
<p>The Mountain Accord Project represents an impressive effort to protect a magnificent resource. I wholeheartedly support this effort. I have been a longtime supporter of natural conservation efforts across the country and I strive to leave no trace from my personal activities in the mountains save tracks in the snow. My family and I enjoy minimal impact sports in the Wasatch to include backcountry skiing, hiking, mountain biking, and paragliding. As the Mountain Accord is developed I am particularly concerned that paragliding, speedflying, and hang gliding must be included. These are activities that have been performed in, and over, the Wasatch for decades. They have less impact than other human powered sports such as hiking, skiing, and certainly less than mountain biking, as they occur almost entirely in the air. They are silently powered only by wind and gravity. The gear for paragliding and speedflying is lightweight and easily carried in a backpack so they do not introduce any more stress on transportation into the mountains than does hiking with a small or medium backpack. These are customary uses of the Wasatch that must be preserved as this new plan is developed.</p> <p>Thank you for working to preserve our treasure.</p>	Sandy	3/12/2015
<p>Thanks for the opportunity to comment. The rail system seems like a viable plan long term; however, Grizzly Gulch should be protected and still accessible as part of the plan. The protection seems to be stated, but accessibility is not so explicit if the plan is to implement transportation through that area.</p>	Sandy	3/12/2015
<p>I strongly support linking the seven SLC area resorts together. The Espace Killy in France is an awesome experience. We have a unique opportunity in the greater SLC area to rival or surpass that experience. I also strongly support a rail loop around the seven resorts providing convenient, high speed transportation. I have used the trains in the Chamonix area of France and find them convenient without detracting from the gloriously scenic area. Similarly, there are trains in the Portillo area of Chile. Again, I did not feel they detracted from the scenery or the experience. Living less than a quarter mile away from the LLC Park and Ride, I would frequently take the bus were it not for the large block of time mid day when no service exists. Because of this, I drive nearly daily up to Snowbird and back. Given the current schedule, it is not possible to get on the mountain for the 9am opening taking the earliest available bus from the LLC Park and Ride and I refuse to drive down the canyon to stops offering earlier service when the LLC Park and Ride is with in easy walking distance. Unless and until continuous service is offered throughout the day from the LLC lot commencing no later than 7:15am until at least 5pm with wait times no more than 20 minutes, bus transportation is not a viable alternative to private auto transportation.</p> <p>I know and understand that my support for linking the seven resorts as well as my support for rail transportation is at considerable variance with many of my neighbors in the Granite area. Nonetheless, regardless of what some self appointed spokespersons from the area would have decision makers believe, not all of us are opposed to these two critical initiatives.</p>	Sandy	3/13/2015
<p>To Whom it may Concern,</p> <p>I am writing as a concerned Sandy citizen about what is being proposed for transportation going up Little Cottonwood Canyon.</p> <p>I am strongly against any train or expanded lanes. I feel this will damage more our environment and take away from the beauty of the canyons. If you need to lessen the traffic going up the canyons. Just have the Ski Resorts buss up their employees. And provide more parking at the bottom of the canyons. I believe there are better solutions then spending millions on a rail system that will effect not only the landscape of the canyon but many peoples homes and cabins.</p>	Sandy	3/14/2015



<p>Hello Mountain Accord...</p> <p>I am a frequent visitor to the Utah and recreate in the Wasatch every-time I visit. My trips are usually 3 to 5 times a year, and I spend a total of about 9 - 15 days in the backcountry in all seasons per year on average.</p> <p>As such I am familiar with Mountain Accord and these are my comments regarding the "blueprint" recently put forth by the Executive Board.</p> <p>Transportation The bus system option far out weights the train system. Please keep in mind that much of what is cited(photos and otherwise) has to do with the busiest weekends, and not the average day.</p> <p>Increased amount of parking at the mouth of each canyon is critical to make a bus system work.</p> <p>Please charge a per vehicle fee to go up the canyons to help montage the system and better incentivize the bus system.</p> <p>Make the bus free!</p> <p>The Bus needs both Snowbird and Multiple Alta express buses (ones that do not stop at Snowbird).</p> <p>Please add the snow sheds. This helps everybody.</p> <p>The Tunnels would be a huge mistake costing huge amounts of money and taking many resources and there are no significant problems the tunnels would solve.</p> <p>Mill Creek Canyon needs a year round bis shuttle.</p> <p>I do support a light rail or trail system from Salt Lake to Park City. That is the only one that makes sense.</p> <p>Recreation I support creating a trails network in the higher country of the two canyons.</p> <p>We need improved road cycling facilities (wider shoulders, exclusive bike lanes, disconnected paved bike paths).</p>	Seattle	3/9/2015
<p>Why build a tunnel from Big to Little Cottonwood? How many skiers are able to ski both venues in one day? How much disruption of the canyons would be involved in building such a tunnel and would it be a toll road or paid by public funds? Scheduled, and perhaps even repaired such as in Zion Nat. Park public transportation for non-residents would cut down on traffic in both canyons.</p> <p>The expansion into Grizzly Gulch is not necessary, and I do not support it. You will be expanding dangerous side-country access, and there will be an increase in avalanche deaths. It is also an area of world class moderate backcountry that people prefer to experience in its pristine condition. Please leave Grizzly alone!</p>	Silver Fork	2/4/2015
<p>Any development up the canyon is not a good thing. The developers will not stop. A line needs to be drawn, or the Wasatch will disappear/be screwed. We as a society need to tell developers, enough is enough, focus on development in the valley, not in the canyons. I believe this meeting is a bit of a farce. A sort of "show" to please the community. I am not please with the so called proposal and will certainly not be pleased until the plan revolves around the mountains/wilderness, not how to chop it up for a quick and easy profit.</p> <p>First limit cars going up the canyons. This can be done immediately with buses an then replaced with monorail or trains-well connected with existing public transit. Then consider links to Park City. Limit water consumption for snow making to the absolute minimum.</p> <p>Preserve existing ecosystems-consider and minimize the affect on wildlife at all steps.</p>	SLC	2/25/2015
<p>I don't like the idea of connecting the canyons. Make public transportation into canyons guide, efficient with protected stops. Expand trail usage in Millcreek. Charge road/mountain bikers a fee if not in a car. They use roads and trails too. User fee for all canyons. Have monthly/yearly passes like Millcreek already has. Like protecting backcountry areas from more development.</p>	SLC	2/25/2015
<p>I appreciate the Mt. Accord's efforts at bringing interested stakeholders together. Concerns: I don't like the idea of connecting Big Cottonwood, Little Cottonwood &amp; Park City with roads. I'm open to a rail transit if small, low impact and if it allows non-motorized along side or parallel. Land exchange sounds like a good idea, especially to protect backcountry for skiers and hikers. Our water needs our priority. Economic issues or push for expanding economic growth and tourism is worrisome. Protect the character, work hard to not exploit for monetary gain. Utah's tourism is and will remain competitive without these over-the-top "One Wasatch" type proposals. I think we needed more information about who the "players" are in the Mountain Accord. Bottom line-Protect our Wasatch.</p>	SLC	2/25/2015
<p>Access to recreation areas in Little Cottonwood Canyon is currently at best clumsy. But we do not need a train in the Canyon. This would be expensive and damaging to environmentally sensitive areas; destructive to the water shed; potential harm to wildlife. Little Cottonwood Canyon could be better served with more buses and buses running more frequently. Buses should run with Natural Gas. Utah has a lot of gas. In the winter runs frequently you cannot ride the bus as the buses fill too quickly. Widening the road will cut off many access points for people who hike, bike and climb. Many more Utahns participate in biking, hiking and climbing than skiing. Skiing is financially out of reach for most Utahns</p>	SLC	2/25/2015
<p>Please expansion base ski ok like land swap. I homes back side of Snowbird. Congestion pricing-charge to go up canyon. Please more buses. Thank you for your work. Will comment more</p>	SLC	2/25/2015
<p>Already too many people in the Wasatch. How would accommodating even more people help to "preserve" lands? A train will not help preserve either. Maybe increase bus services up and down the canyon first. Just a thought as they are basically already serving no purpose running the current schedule</p> <p>There should be no transportation interconnect via roads, tunnels or lifts between SLC side of Wasatch and PC side. The industrial development here will wreck the central Wasatch. Other transportation alternatives can be pursued but keep those ridgelines free of towers-leave it natural. Ski Resort Boundaries should be limited and not expanded, their activity effects citizens and wildlife year round, in all four seasons. Open houses limited benefit. I'm upset, how to share that?</p>	SLC	2/25/2015
<p>By turning over the public lands behind Snowbird and giving more lands around the front of Alta and Brighton it will directly effect the "preservation" of the Wasatch. Opening up the back of Snowbird for them to further expand their lifts and resort, surely will result in more safety control. This means, more "bombs" in the wilderness (directly affects animals and wildlife) dynamite not to mention how much the resorts already abuse the land. Expanding and developing the canyons is already why there is traffic issues and parking issues in the canyon. If you want to truly preserve it, reduce the resorts and the liftes lands that the resorts reside on.</p> <p>The transit portion needs to include the issue of parking at the mouth of the canyons. This is the largest limiting factor of the public transit today. Parking is extremely limited making it really difficult to park at the mouth and take transit. If the parking at the mouth is resolved people won't use any public transit up the canyons if they own a car.</p>	SLC	2/25/2015
<p>I agree with transportation to extend transit service. I agree with improving bicycle and pedestrian access. I agree preserve key backcountry terrain which should be ALL of it. Improve trails for erosion. Preserve OUR water-it is drying up. People come to Utah for many reasons- we need to be reaching out to locals, tourists, learn about our resorts and backcountry through magazine articles. They come for the charm. I feel Utah has bigger problems-homelessness, transportation, roads, water, put energies into hat we have that is</p> <p>Let's lock in the environmental improvements such as land exchanges. Let's lock in the abandonment of One Wasatch, linking all 7 ski resorts. Then, we can wait a few decades for the LC tram to take shape. By then the problem of restricting access to Central Wasatch will have had to be solved. Draw lots, sign up, days or even months in advance. There has to be a limit. If the train is slow enough, that will solve the population problem.</p>	SLC	2/25/2015
<p>Stop ski resort expansion. Stop it. The resorts are all big enough. Re transit- Best vision is tunnel from Big Cottonwood to Heber, tunnel from Brighton to Alta/Snowbird, or similar. Gas powered shuttle buses are main transit in Cottonwood Canyon residents have a pass for a personal vehicle, one/ household. You must pay to play or ride your bike/hike in for free? Handicapped persons ride free or discounted. Users who don't want to pay don't love these canyons enough. Protect our watersheds, our view sheds, no expanded over-snow transit, to connect canyons in the plan, please. We are not the Alps. Train up Parley's is a must-it was done before, it can be done again.</p>	SLC	2/25/2015
<p>Can we afford a train? Wouldn't expanded bus service, show sheds for avalanche control and auto tolls to reduce use and encourage mass transit be more affordable? Do not concede any backcountry to ski area expansion. The Wasatch is too small. Trading privately held land for ski area base expansion is reasonable if no additional parking or ski lifts are part of the deal. A tunnel from summit country would place too much pressure on little Cottonwood and would additionally have potentially negative impacts on watershed. I don't believe watershed can handle resort expansion and subsequent snow machine efforts etc</p>	SLC	2/25/2015
<p>Recreation Trail Network: Nowhere in the Mountain Accord blueprint or supporting materials can I find a definition of an "Enhanced Regional" Trail Network (in contrast to a regular old trail network), nor a description of the trails or rights-of-way to be included. For example, is the line on the map going up Millcreek Canyon a new trail or an extension of the pipeline trail. Also, why isn't the Parley's Canyon trail shown as contiguous, gaps near Parley's Summit. I thought the e plan for that trail was already mature. I talked to Reid about the map and he said sometimes existing trail is shown on the "Recreation Trail" Network map and sometimes existing trail is excluded. This is very confusing. The map, all of the maps really, need a better technical explanation of what is being depicted.</p>	SLC	2/25/2015
<p>Environment: Preserve land and water resources. Encourage land swaps to reduce fragmentation. More land to USFS to enforce more environmental regulation. Recreation: Restrict ski resort expansion. Preserve backcountry areas. Charge \$\$ to access tri-canyons. Transportation: Encourage diverse transit options. Reduce reliance on cars. Don't link the ski area (P.C. + Alta + Brighton) through any type of transportation modes i.e. trains, ski link. Preserve unique character of each individual ski resort.</p>	So. Salt Lake	2/25/2015
<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback. As an outdoor enthusiast, I love the Cottonwood Canyons. I'm very conservative politically and I am very much in favor of protecting these canyons from development and environmental degradation.</p>	South Jordan	2/26/2015
<p>I'm not concerned about having the resorts connected. I personally prefer they weren't. I like the local character of the Cottonwood Canyon resorts and would like to keep it that way. Plus there's no way to implement the 'One Wasatch' concept and not invite massive development.</p> <p>As far as transit goes, a tunnel connecting Alta, Brighton, and Park City sounds cool, but outrageously expensive to the point of 'why bother' trying. I would not support tax increases or bond initiatives to fund any such project. Focus on year-round bus service in the Cottonwood Canyons with maybe a modest entrance fee for cars to encourage mass transit usage.</p>	South Jordan	3/11/2015
<p>I am totally opposed to putting tracks up into our canyons. As a taxpayer in Salt Lake County, we need to take care of our roads within the valley and not be spending the astronomical amount needed to put a train up our beautiful canyons. There is true grid-lock travelling east and west and that needs to be addressed. Putting a train up into the canyons just to please a few wealthy citizens it just plain wrong. Thank you for letting me speak my piece.</p> <p>To Whom it may concern,</p>	South Jordan	3/15/2015
<p>I have attended an open house and the recreational Q&amp;A. I have not seen any literature or discussion regarding continued equestrian access in the mountain accord area outside of watershed. Currently there are several areas that allow equestrian access, for example, Millcreek and The Great Western Trail. I am voicing my opinion that I would like to see continued future access for equestrians on these trails, and on the new trail networks that are proposed. Also, I am asking that consideration be made that the future parking area's have designated horse trailer parking for us. One of the biggest complaints I hear from equestrians is the limited parking for Millcreek for horse trailers. I have been up there several times, and I almost always get a note stating I take up too much room.</p>	South Orleans, MA	3/14/2015
<p>I will qualify my comments we with this description of my perspective- I live on the east coast of the U.S. and ski very frequently in the western mountains. My trips to the western mountains often cover the better part of an entire season. I follow land development issues affecting the area casually.</p> <p>I would recommend that everyone's highest priority be to protect the sources of fresh water in the Wasatch. This certainly implies active resistance to what I call real estate-centric development of ski areas. I have watched the population of the area explode over the past 25-30 years, and would expect that growth to continue.</p> <p>Where possible fund the transfer of private land into public ownership. I guess I am recommending a strategy of starve the (development) beast. The weasels will get in. No sense leaving food out for them.</p> <p>Development of more and better public transport into the mountains is double edged sword. Slowing the intrusion of motor vehicle traffic is a worthy goal, but solid transport infrastructure is a proven entrée for development. Good luck</p>	South Salt Lake	3/14/2015
<p>My kudos to the diverse stakeholders who have been hard at work on the Central Wasatch Blueprint. I think the Blueprint is to be commended in successfully achieving a balance of often divergent interests in a way that will holistically protect the wildness, beauty, character, and accessibility of the Central Wasatch into the future.</p> <p>I think enhanced protection for the eastern portion of the Central Wasatch is of critical importance as surrounding communities continue to grow in population and pressures on the range increase. After a careful review of relevant Federal Lands designations, I think that expanding some of the wilderness areas and designating the eastern portion of the Central Wasatch as a National Conservation Area would be most appropriate, and continue to serve a large and multi-faceted user group, while maintaining the integrity of the mountain range.</p> <p>Also, just a little plug for a bike corridor along I-80 through Parley's Canyon. I think a lot of bike commuters (myself included) would enjoy a safe way to bicycle through the canyon. Currently, attempting to bike commute between SLC and Park City is a good way to cash in on your life insurance policy. Keep up the good work</p>	South Salt Lake	2/25/2015
<p>Raise my taxes, charge me to drive up the canyon, raise ticket prices, season pass prices but do not implement proposed plan. Tourism revenue is not the answer to Utah's economy.</p>	South Weber	2/26/2015
<p>I have loved skiing all of Utah's resorts over the past 12 years since moving here in 2003. Utah is simply spectacular with it's amazing snow and its quick accessibility. Truly we have the best skiing in the world in our own backyard.</p> <p>One of our development is inevitable, and needed. I support connecting the Cottonwood and Park City resorts. I think it makes good sense. While I do have concerns on how Utah will handle the huge increase in population over the next few decades, I think better and more frequent public transportation, including ski buses to the resorts, and well as Wasatch One, will aid our growth and not make it worse. The Utah resorts all do a magnificent job being both destination resorts for world travelers [and us locals] as well as showing sensitivity to the environment. I support sensible growth.</p> <p>Ski on!</p>	South Weber	2/26/2015

<p>I am a regular visitor to SLC and would encourage visionary thinking to protect the existing resorts and the lands around them, connect the resorts where feasible, and concentrate development and improvements into the current base areas and a slightly enlarged footprint where it makes sense.</p> <p>In my mind, the biggest threat to the "whole" is to allow seven separate resorts act alone in each trying to get one step up on their neighbor. If they all work together to improve access, transportation, and environmental stewardship everyone will win in the end.</p> <p>Finally, I would also encourage a transit line (either bus or train or both) that would encourage getting cars off the roads to the resorts.</p>	Spokane, WA	3/2/2015
<p>Greetings,</p> <p>Who am I: Washington state resident who makes annual trips to Salt Lake City, Utah for work and recreation. I am a lift service and a backcountry user.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I would like to see automobile traffic removed from big &amp; little cottonwood canyon and simply rely on transit. Reduce the number of drop-off points in the area &amp; call it good.</li> <li>2. Transit can create Sprawl just as quickly as automobile based development. I disagree with addition of any transit or service to Park City other than through the overly developed I-80 corridor.</li> <li>3. I would like to city (Ogden, SLC, Park City) growth boundaries and land use policies and land use plans evaluated in the EIS Scope</li> <li>4. I would like to see the option for resorts to expand to connect with each other via tunnels, ski runs or other means. No surface lifts!</li> <li>5. I would like to see more recreation enclosures built into the plan, including European style, stand alone (not in a resort), ridge line cafe's/hostels. Bring on the Refugio!</li> <li>6. I would like to see less pressure from development on the east side of the Wasatch Front (Park City &amp; Snow Basin)</li> <li>7. Increasing bus service and not closing or adding a toll to roads for auto service is short sighted. We must reduce traffic on high use areas, Closure or tolls for peak time period use will achieve this goal.</li> </ol> <p>Thank You</p>	Spokane, WA	3/4/2015
<p>The Blueprint seems like a good start towards realistic planning for future growth in the Wasatch Front and Back. One aspect I want to focus on will be the transit issues in Little Cottonwood Canyon. Use of the already existing road with money and resources directed to it's improvement along with an improved bus service should be the focus. The tunnel connecting Alta to Brighton, etc. seems like a huge waste of funds, damaging to the Canyon environment and unnecessary. Limiting/controlling travel-especially day-use private vehicles- in the Canyon should be an acceptable way to handle crowds. A light-rail system, built along the existing roadway, could be effective in handling large numbers of visitors, I suppose. But not to continue into other canyons. Little Cottonwood Canyon needs to be protected from human over-use. It may be that visitor numbers need to be controlled. We may need to realize that there's a limit to carrying capacity in these smaller, fragile places.</p> <p>Thankyou</p>	Springdale, UT	3/13/2015
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I would welcome a connectivity of some of the proposed resorts. Like Park City connected with Canyons, Brighton with Solitude, etc. This model has successfully been implemented in European ski resorts.</li> <li>• I am worried, though, about the possible price increase for tickets. Pricing is already very steep.</li> <li>• Ensure that locals receive significantly discounted pricing.</li> <li>• Connectivity between far apart resorts does not make much sense – like Park City and Brighton, etc. It only increases transportation problems. It does not add convenience at all. Two connected ski resorts are already large enough to allow spend several days in one resort and hit a different slope every run. I don't know much about the local details, but I would come back year after year if I could access so many different mountains from one "home base". Usually we just flip a coin to decide where to ski when we come up from Florida. Half of the time we get the wrong weather.</li> </ul> <p>The reason we move around is for variety. It would be ideal if we could find lodging at one resort and then ski on different mountains every day without driving. Extending transportation options would be a bonus!</p>	Springville	3/13/2015
<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am a hut owner in the San Juan Mountains of southwestern Colorado that I rent out to many backcountry skiers. My hut is called The High Camp Hut, www.highcamphut.com. I understand the importance to protect areas for backcountry skiers. Many of my guests comment how nice it is to get away from all the social media and all that electronics bring to our busy lives!</p> <p>There are many benefits found for the person who climbs up a ridge under their own power and enjoys the view and ski down. I hope that you will support backcountry experiences and keep Grizzly Gulch and the entire Flagstaff Mt. Superior Ridgeline as key backcountry zones. It is important to ensure a balance of resort and backcountry experiences into the future. It is often ignored how much backcountry skiers spend on gear... They often support local shops that hire local employees. Backcountry skiers need to have areas to go into the future in order to keep this economic benefit viable!</p> <p>The more people enjoy this experience the more likely they will also want to visit my hut!!!</p> <p>Thanks for your consideration</p> <p>Dear Alta Resident,</p>	Telluride, CO	3/12/2015
<p>Many thanks to those who attended the Mountain Accord meeting in Alta on February 23, and who have shared comments with us. Please help us reach a wider audience by forwarding this email to those who were unable to attend, or anyone else you think would be interested. We hope that Alta Town leaders and Mountain Accord staff heard us. Don't stop now. We must ALL provide written comment and do so by March 16th.</p> <p>It is imperative that you visit <a href="http://mountainaccord.com/get-involved/">http://mountainaccord.com/get-involved/</a> to review the Blueprint. Please tell them what you support and why by March 16 - be thoughtful and constructive, explaining your opinions. The form on the Mountain Accord website is over simplified and confusing so we encourage you to submit your comments directly via email to <a href="mailto:comment@mountainaccord.com">comment@mountainaccord.com</a>. The Alta Town Council Members and Mayor Pollard have expressed on multiple occasions that they want to hear from you, so use this opportunity to communicate with them, as well as Salt Lake City Mayor Ralph Becker, Salt Lake County Mayor Ben McAdams, Sandy Mayor Tom Dolan and Cathy Kahlow and Dave Whittekiend of the USFS. All their emails are below to copy and paste or you can reply all to this email.</p> <p>To: <a href="mailto:comment@mountainaccord.com">comment@mountainaccord.com</a>  cc: <a href="mailto:tjp@townofalta.com">tjp@townofalta.com</a>; <a href="mailto:elisedmorgan@gmail.com">elisedmorgan@gmail.com</a>; <a href="mailto:harrissondak@townofalta.com">harrissondak@townofalta.com</a>; <a href="mailto:pmoxley@djplaw.com">pmoxley@djplaw.com</a>; <a href="mailto:cliffouryaltahut@gmail.com">cliffouryaltahut@gmail.com</a>; <a href="mailto:mayor@slco.org">mayor@slco.org</a>; <a href="mailto:mayor@slc.com">mayor@slc.com</a>; <a href="mailto:smcconkey@sandy.utah.gov">smcconkey@sandy.utah.gov</a>; <a href="mailto:dwhittekiend@fs.fed.us">dwhittekiend@fs.fed.us</a>; <a href="mailto:ckahlow@fs.fed.us">ckahlow@fs.fed.us</a>; <a href="mailto:jen@friendsofalta.org">jen@friendsofalta.org</a></p> <p>FOA believes that watershed, wildlife and open space are the foundation of our unique end of canyon experience. They are why people come to Alta, our identity. We acknowledge the need for a solution to the sometimes difficult transportation situation. We are FOR a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system coming up the canyon that incentivizes use. Our reasons are listed below but are summarized as the BRT being more flexible, less destructive to the environment and less costly. With regard to interconnect via Alta, we have great concerns about a tunnel. Adverse impacts on the underground stream flow, aquifers and other cumulative impacts to our community and environment would need to be VERY carefully studied. There is still a great deal of information needed on the Blueprint, however we encourage you to include your opinions on a tunnel with your comments. Specifically, some of our reasons FOR supporting the BRT option:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Retains more of the environmental and character aspects of our end of canyon location.</li> <li>2. The BRT, while no costs have been estimated, will surely be less costly than the train up LLC.</li> </ol>	Town of Alta	3/4/2015
<p>Dear Sir / Madam</p> <p>Please find attached above a consultation response on some aspects of Mountain Accord concepts in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The need to build Utah's tourist appeal to international destination tourists – particularly for wintersports;</li> <li>• The benefits of both a ski lift link AND a rail tunnel link between the eastern ends of Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons;</li> <li>• The need to consider carefully the extent to which different forms of transport (mountain rail / gondola or enhanced buses) could offer benefits in Little Cottonwood Canyon to deal with the peculiarly peaked traffic flows resulting from the proximity of mountains to the major urban population of the Salt Lake Valley.</li> </ul> <p>An acknowledgement of receipt of this response would be appreciated.</p> <p>Background</p> <p>I am a destination marketer and ski journalist based in the UK. Prior to 2000, I skied in mostly in Europe. Since 2000 I have skied almost exclusively in North America, where I have visited more than 100 resorts. Since 2010, I have also been part of the team marketing Utah to potential visitors from Britain. In the UK, I have been involved, for almost thirty years, in the planning, design and management of community sports facilities, with a particular specialism in demand management. However these are personal thoughts developed from regular visits to Utah's ski resorts since the Olympic year of 2002. They are focused on the Cottonwood Canyons but also make some general observations about the "One Wasatch" concept in relation to international visitors.</p> <p>Who is likely to participate in this public consultation?</p> <p>This is a question for Mountain Accord to consider. What proportion of respondents to your public consultation have come from outside Utah? What proportion of them have never visited Utah but might do so if Utah offered tourism product which appealed to them? It is entirely appropriate that views of local Utahns are given most weight; after all, local people are the ones affected year round by decisions made to promote winter and year round visitation. But it is worth bearing in mind what motivates tourist demand coming from varying distances, and whether Utah is willing and able to satisfy such needs.</p> <p>Dominant position of the European Alps in Skiing and Snowboarding</p> <p>From a database maintained by UK statistician Patrick Thorne, there are about 5,500 outdoor ski areas worldwide which have at least one lift. Of these, 3,950 (72%) are in Europe and 830 (15%) are in North America, about 630 (11%) in Asia and fewer than 100 (&lt;2%) south of the Equator.</p> <p>For several years, Lauren Vanat has produced an "International Report on Snow &amp; Mountain Tourism". The most recent version from April 2014 emphasises the dominant position of the European Alps in ski and snowboard tourism.</p> <p>"The Alps is the most internationally visited ski destination, attracting most of the inbound skier travel. Even though it hosts 45% of skier visits, it only produces 17% of the skiers. No other region has such a high proportion of foreign visitors. Typically for America, its share of worldwide skier visits roughly matches its share of skiers."</p> <p>Significance for Utah</p> <p>Long distance destination skiers are usually attracted to the larger resorts. Whilst Utah has a unique selling proposition in terms of the Greatest Snow on Earth, this has not yet translated into a large inter-continental destination market. Part of the reason for this lies in the lack of direct flights to Salt Lake City from the major skier exporting countries, particularly Germany and Britain. However another reason is the lack of connected resorts in Utah which European skiers are used to experiencing. France led the way in linking up mega ski circuits in the period 1970-2000. In the last 20 years, Austria has begun to compete with this, creating ski lifts where previously buses were the only way to connect between areas. Austria is now reaping the benefits of this investment.</p> <p>In contrast, Switzerland, which has always had a reputation for high service standards, has seen a fall from 30 million skier visits at the millennium to about 25 million, largely as a result of having fewer connected areas, and being perceived as expensive. Utah has an opportunity, starting with the unification of Park City Mountain Resort and Canyons to transform its position in the destination skier market. The degree to which this is realised will depend not only on this connection, but the extent to which "One Wasatch" is delivered. No other North American ski region has resorts so close together to be able to create an entity approaching 20,000 skiable acres to rival the mega resorts of France and Austria.</p> <p>However, there is likely to be ambivalence amongst Utahn skiers and snowboarders about the desirability of sharing their slopes with additional destination visitors – "no friends on a powder day". From the perspective of economic development, inter-continental skiers and riders are likely to come for more than a week. That means they will be present at least five days, Monday to Friday, when the resorts need additional custom. Destination visitors also spend more in hotels, restaurants, on equipment hire and purchase of local transport than locals do. They are an important part of Utah's economy and could be even more so in the future.</p> <p>So even though very few such destination visitors are likely to participate in this consultation, please do not forget them and their likely needs if they are ever to add the Greatest Snow on Earth to their "bucket list".</p> <p>Cottonwood Canyons</p> <p>If the four Cottonwood Canyons resorts were connected, they would create a combined area of 7,000 skiable acres, almost as large as the new Park City / Canyons. These four resorts are also the heartland of Utah's mountain area averaging 500+ annual inches of snow</p> <p>Resorts on the Park City side of the Wasatch have the high mileage groomed trails to attract international skiers; the four Salt Lake resorts have the quantity of snow which helps create the unique selling proposition. Neither of these separately will generate as much repeat international business compared to what can be achieved if visitors experience both sides of the Wasatch.</p> <p>The "One Wasatch" concept postulates a link via Twin Lakes Pass via chairlift. This is necessary to create the experience of a unified four resorts. But it is not sufficient. Twin Lakes Pass is one of the snowiest watersheds on the planet. It is inevitable that there will be times of lift closures during the skiing day. Visitors, local and destination, will find themselves caught in the "wrong canyon". As in Europe, this will be highly popular with local taxi drivers, but not anyone else.</p>	United Kingdom	3/9/2015

<p>Access Gondola up Little Cottonwood Canyon</p> <p>There are obvious difficulties in sustaining service past almost 50 avalanche tracks. Siting the gondola line on the south side of the Canyon may mitigate this to some extent compared the avalanche threats to the road.</p> <p>However, even allowing for the fact that a ropeway would not twist as much as the road, the distance from the jaws of the Canyon to Alta is about 9 miles (14.5 km). Most modern gondolas travel at between 6 and 7.5 metres per second once they have left terminals. Even at the higher speed, a distance of 14.5 km would take over 32 minutes. However, this distance would probably require three ropeways in sequence, like the Olympic Gondola connecting Brides les Bains to the Three Valleys in France. Each station adds to the journey time. There would also need to be a station at Snowbird as well as Alta.</p> <p>In consequence, even if it were to be possible to shorten a lower terminus into the jaws of Little Cottonwood Canyon, the gondola journey time, not allowing for loading and unloading, would probably exceed 40 minutes to Alta and 35 minutes to Snowbird. This is acceptable to locals used to driving up the Canyon?</p> <p>Another critical factor is the location of the base loading station, and any stations up the line where skiers and riders are expecting to alight and start on trail. It is worth studying the access to the Olympic Gondola in France's Three Valleys on "how not to do it". The base area of this gondola in Brides les Bains is wedged at the entrance to a gorge with minimal car parking. Everyone has an uphill walk to the lift. At the top, the lift terminates next to the Olympic ice rink. Skiers and riders have a walk of almost 400 yards to the lifts which go uphill from the entrance of Meribel. All of this takes more time and acts as a disincentive to use the gondola. This gondola is only half the length that a Little Cottonwood Gondola would need to be; and the French one has a 25 minute ride time. Is there enough land right at the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon to cater for perhaps 8,000 vehicles if Alta and Snowbird were to be largely car free? In a car park this size, the journey time from parking the vehicle to walking or being shuttled to the gondola base becomes significant.</p> <p>Finally will the access gondola generate massive lines at peak times to go up in the morning and back at the end of the afternoon? It is important to study capacities for gondolas. For example, Whistler – Blackcomb's Peak to Peak Gondola has an hourly capacity of 4,100 passengers. However, as this is between two mountains, there is substantial traffic going in both directions simultaneously. With an access gondola this would not be the case. Nearly all the traffic will want to go up in the early morning and back in the evening. The new Penkenbahn lift at Mayrhofen in Austria claims a peak capacity of 3,840 per hour, but this relies on 8 standing passengers per cabin for a ride which will take less than 9 minutes. Without standing passengers, the capacity will be 2,880 persons per hour. The capacity of the Olympic gondola at Meribel, is about 2,700 per hour along the three connected ropeways.</p> <p>The two gondolas developed for Sochi are the cutting edge of 35 technology. Sochi also has the longest lift with 35 – but still only 5.5 kilometers (barely 40% of what would be needed at Little Cottonwood).</p> <p>I would suggest that Mountain Accord arranges to study modern examples of access gondolas to see how much of the peak weekend traffic in Little Cottonwood could be accommodated by this method. If the gondola is a merely an option alongside driving up to the resorts, it is likely to be underutilised – even with a heavy pricing incentive not to drive.</p> <p>Mountain Railway Option</p> <p>I am unable to get my head around how any form of mountain railway could transport 10,000 people, nine miles from the base of Little Cottonwood Canyon to Alta / Snowbird in a time window of under two hours. Whilst cable railways (funiculars) are capable of track speeds of 12 to 14 metres per second, they are for much shorter distances. Some of the quoted higher passenger capacities per hour for funiculars seem to be on short urban lines such as the 600 yards Kabatay-Taksim Funicular in Istanbul.</p> <p>For an example of a longer journey from urban to alpine, the Hungerburgbahn goes from central Innsbruck in Austria on the first stage of the Nordkette range journey. This funicular may have a line speed of up to 10 metres per second, but the maximum transport capacity is only 1,200 passengers per hour. And it is just over a mile in length.</p> <p>Track speeds on other forms of mountain railway are much slower, particular if gradients require "rack and pinion" or some of the steep grade technology to prevent slippage on the track.</p> <p>Some form of mountain railway, could obviously be better protected from avalanche danger, although the cost of constructing most of the line in avalanche sheds would be high and may be unsightly. ☹</p>	United Kingdom	
<p>As a European who skis in Utah every 2 to 3 years I have always found it strange that there is no connection between the resorts. The proposals I have seen to connect the resorts are, in my opinion, extremely exciting and practical. They seem to have a relatively low environmental impact and would make One Wasatch the envy of the skiing World.</p> <p>Looking forward to doing some field study this April!</p> <p>I am a life long skier who moved to Utah in 1972 for the incredible access to world class skiing from an urban environment. Like so many others I know, resort skiing has lost much of it's allure. My anecdotal evidence is supported by the flat numbers reported by the ski industry it's self. Crowds, commercialization, ticket prices, all contribute to making skiing in the resorts less attractive and Nordic and backcountry skiing a more satisfying option.</p> <p>I appreciate and support the goals of Mountain Accord and want to make sure that dispersed recreational use gets the attention that the ski resorts and ski Utah seem to be demanding. Transportation alternatives are a great key to mitigating the effect population growth will have on the central mountains.</p> <p>Back in the 60's folk singer Joni Mitchell sang a song call Big Yellow Taxi and one of the famous lines was "pave paradise put up a parking lot."</p> <p>That's exactly what the Accord is going to do. In for smart transportation, but talk of trains and tunnels connecting ski mountains is going to ruin what makes these places unique. And by the way who's to pay for it all?</p> <p>Alta for instance is unique cause of it's geological nature. Now you going to crowd the place with more than it can handle. And a tunnel? Your gonna ruin it for what makes it special. For what it's not and is.</p> <p>Please don't "pave paradise to just put up a parking lot." I grew up in suburbia NJ and love Alta for it's serenity. I ski Alta to get away from happened to Park City. If I want congestion, will just go back to NJ.</p> <p>Stop the madness! Leave it alone.</p> <p>I deeply regret state government continuing plans, programs, work to bring econic and therefore population growth to Utah e.g. California: a fine piece of this continent spoiled by overcrowding.</p> <p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I love skiing Utah and had been skiing in Utah several times on various resorts (Snowbird, Alta, Brighton, Solitude, Park City, etc) but haven't been back in over 10 years and the main reason is that flying into Salt Lake city was and is very expensive for the last 10 years as compared to Denver for example. So for the last 10 years or so, our group of about 10 skiers and snowboarders have made our twice annual skiing trips out west to Denver instead. We're talking about 50% more cost flying into Salt Lake city as to Denver and San Francisco (Lake Tahoe). I don't know if Denver airport authority or Denver city has subsidized somewhat the flying into Denver who but flying into Salt Lake city cost is just out of hand. Thank you.</p>	United Kingdom	3/13/2015
<p>I appreciate and support the goals of Mountain Accord and want to make sure that dispersed recreational use gets the attention that the ski resorts and ski Utah seem to be demanding. Transportation alternatives are a great key to mitigating the effect population growth will have on the central mountains.</p> <p>Back in the 60's folk singer Joni Mitchell sang a song call Big Yellow Taxi and one of the famous lines was "pave paradise put up a parking lot."</p> <p>That's exactly what the Accord is going to do. In for smart transportation, but talk of trains and tunnels connecting ski mountains is going to ruin what makes these places unique. And by the way who's to pay for it all?</p> <p>Alta for instance is unique cause of it's geological nature. Now you going to crowd the place with more than it can handle. And a tunnel? Your gonna ruin it for what makes it special. For what it's not and is.</p> <p>Please don't "pave paradise to just put up a parking lot." I grew up in suburbia NJ and love Alta for it's serenity. I ski Alta to get away from happened to Park City. If I want congestion, will just go back to NJ.</p> <p>Stop the madness! Leave it alone.</p> <p>I deeply regret state government continuing plans, programs, work to bring econic and therefore population growth to Utah e.g. California: a fine piece of this continent spoiled by overcrowding.</p> <p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I love skiing Utah and had been skiing in Utah several times on various resorts (Snowbird, Alta, Brighton, Solitude, Park City, etc) but haven't been back in over 10 years and the main reason is that flying into Salt Lake city was and is very expensive for the last 10 years as compared to Denver for example. So for the last 10 years or so, our group of about 10 skiers and snowboarders have made our twice annual skiing trips out west to Denver instead. We're talking about 50% more cost flying into Salt Lake city as to Denver and San Francisco (Lake Tahoe). I don't know if Denver airport authority or Denver city has subsidized somewhat the flying into Denver who but flying into Salt Lake city cost is just out of hand. Thank you.</p>	Utah	3/15/2015
<p>I appreciate and support the goals of Mountain Accord and want to make sure that dispersed recreational use gets the attention that the ski resorts and ski Utah seem to be demanding. Transportation alternatives are a great key to mitigating the effect population growth will have on the central mountains.</p> <p>Back in the 60's folk singer Joni Mitchell sang a song call Big Yellow Taxi and one of the famous lines was "pave paradise put up a parking lot."</p> <p>That's exactly what the Accord is going to do. In for smart transportation, but talk of trains and tunnels connecting ski mountains is going to ruin what makes these places unique. And by the way who's to pay for it all?</p> <p>Alta for instance is unique cause of it's geological nature. Now you going to crowd the place with more than it can handle. And a tunnel? Your gonna ruin it for what makes it special. For what it's not and is.</p> <p>Please don't "pave paradise to just put up a parking lot." I grew up in suburbia NJ and love Alta for it's serenity. I ski Alta to get away from happened to Park City. If I want congestion, will just go back to NJ.</p> <p>Stop the madness! Leave it alone.</p> <p>I deeply regret state government continuing plans, programs, work to bring econic and therefore population growth to Utah e.g. California: a fine piece of this continent spoiled by overcrowding.</p> <p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I love skiing Utah and had been skiing in Utah several times on various resorts (Snowbird, Alta, Brighton, Solitude, Park City, etc) but haven't been back in over 10 years and the main reason is that flying into Salt Lake city was and is very expensive for the last 10 years as compared to Denver for example. So for the last 10 years or so, our group of about 10 skiers and snowboarders have made our twice annual skiing trips out west to Denver instead. We're talking about 50% more cost flying into Salt Lake city as to Denver and San Francisco (Lake Tahoe). I don't know if Denver airport authority or Denver city has subsidized somewhat the flying into Denver who but flying into Salt Lake city cost is just out of hand. Thank you.</p>	Wakefield, RI	3/6/2015
<p>The Mountain Accord as written includes a land swap where mountainside lands owned by the Alta Ski Lift Company, mostly in the Emma area, will be exchanged for Forest Service lands in the Alta base area. There are several significant problems with this. o The swap may include all the public parking in Alta. If the deal goes through all users of the surrounding National Forest land would be required to park on land and in lots owned by a private owner. It is not a stretch to imagine that before long this parking could either be restricted (in winter to those purchasing Alta lift tickets for example) and/or require a parking payment, summer and winter, to park and access the surrounding public lands. It is a really bad idea to limit public access to public lands which could be a consequence of the land swap as currently drafted. o The swap sets the stage for the possibility that a private owner could charge a "backcountry fee" for visitors who wish to use the town of Alta as a starting point for their ski tour, hike or climb. For that matter the private owner would be in a position to charge a "viewing fee" for those who just want to be up in Alta to soak up the scenery. The exchange would open up significant parts of the Alta base for further development. The various consultants involved in the project believe that land is not useful unless it holds a town square, retail areas, food and other concessions, and even office space. Many visitors to Alta are not there to shop or for robust night life. They are there specifically because Alta is not cluttered with those things. This is evident most every weekend in the summer. The parking lots are full but the one restaurant that is open in the summers almost always has seats available. But the trails are busy. In the summer visitors to Alta are there to enjoy the wonderful outdoor environment with their friends and family. They are not there to shop and eat. o The consultants and the moneyed interests pushing the vision of expanded development in the Alta base area have no idea what we value in Alta. They presume that we, as users, want more shopping, dining and man-made recreation opportunities (one design envisioned by the consultants includes an indoor ice rink). We actually like Alta the way it is: relatively undeveloped with public lands and public access for all. o The Alta Lift Company, at public hearings, has insisted that they have no intention of limiting user access – that the land and access is open to all. This must not be allowed to change with the Mountain Accord. The land swap would make Alta a public town. Owned by a private owner. With orphan businesses stuck within and dependent on the private owner for access and survival. Do we really want to have to pay to enter the town of Alta? o The Grizzly area (Twin Lakes Pass around to Emma) where Alta runs their cat skiing operation is land owned by the ski lift company. They have made no secret of their desire to eventually develop lifts in the area. While this would have a loss to the thousands of hikers, runners and backcountry ski and snowshoers who use the area. o The land swap would increase the value of Alta Ski Lift Company dramatically and make them far more attractive to an acquirer like Vail Resorts, substantially increasing the probability that such a change of ownership would happen. An acquirer like Vail would not hesitate to develop the property as fully as possible as that is their business model. While I certainly cannot fault the Alta Lift Company for working to make the land swap a reality. The net effect, however would be to grant a significant financial windfall to the owners of Alta. Somewhat reminiscent of trading incredibly valuable forest service land adjacent to Snowbird ski resort for some moose-pasture from Earl Holding. I do not think it is appropriate for the Forest Service to trade away low value steep pitched mountain slope asset for the developable land at the Alta Base. Nor do I think it appropriate for the Forest Service to, with a penstroke, irrevocably alter the Alta that the Alta Town Office, Friends of Alta, and thousands of friends and admirers of Alta have fought for decades to protect. The plan for the area also includes building avalanche snow fences in all of the significant side paths above town. This would likely eliminate the building restrictions currently in place due to the danger of these side paths and open up the entire Alta base area to commercial development and possibly significantly taller structures. o There is a middle ground. Currently all of Alta's buildings are on Forest Service land. It would make sense to trade the land under their buildings for the undevelopable parcels up on the mountainside. Perhaps a land buffer around these properties could be included in the swap. But the road through town, the parking, and the currently undeveloped areas should remain public in order to insure access to the surrounding public lands for future generations. As a constituent, and a dedicated Alta skier, I strongly urge you to stop this before permanent damage is done to one of Utah's most spectacular places. One only has to look at the foresight of those individuals who fought for the creation of Yellowstone, Yosemite, the Grand Canyon and all the other national parks in order to appreciate what a priceless legacy that we have been given. Don't be the ones remembered for squandering our incomparable Little Cottonwood Canyon.</p> <p>• Priority #1 The Guardians pass road needs to be improved and open year round. Jackson does this with Teton Pass and it works very well. This would ease Park City traffic as well as allow the travel between areas • What do you think about resort connectivity? Park City, Big and Little cottonwood should be connected via aerial and ground terrain. • Mountain rail? Rail seems great until you look at a per ridership cost as well as the impact this will have on both big and little cottonwood streams. Installing a aerial tram up Heath Rise and Little cottonwood would improve traffic and minimize impact. Trails for car traffic could help fund this.</p> <p>Dear Mountain Accord staff, I called and left a message Tuesday this week and it also talked to someone that night as well. I think it would be cool if we had a train system that went underground as well as buses that would connect the mountains and I think it would be cool if it helped us with an Olympic bid again. Please I hope construction on a transit center and for the trains begins sometime. Please write back? wish I could come to the public meetings but I work on Mondays and Wednesdays and Fridays from 11 a.m. to 6 p.m. at I leatherbus in Tavlorville</p> <p>I like the transportation options presented in the proposal. I would love to see rail access to the mountain areas. I especially like the idea of connecting canyon areas together with tunnels. I think mountain peaks should be free of visible ski lifts. I am waiting to see how these ideas are more fully developed including costs and funding options. I am very interested in maintaining public access to the mountains and balancing that access with good stewardship to protect the mountain environment.</p> <p>I've been following closely the ideas proposed for LCC. I'll make my points brief. Salt Lake City and BCC and LCC. In particular, is my vacation destination since 1994. It's maintained my loyalty for a simple reason, it's not like other ski areas or mountain ranges. It's still beautiful, preserved and not Colorado, Tahoe, Whistler etc... When I started coming I hiked in the summer, resort skied in the winter. As time passed I added back country skiing and continued to hike. You have a precious commodity, one I would hate to see become Vail Colorado. Increased bus and better avalanche diversion are cheaper and better options than tunnels, trains, and ski resort expansion. To my skiing friends, I rave about BCC and LCC. It's the best skier experience in the United States – and I've skied everywhere. There are no resorts or ranges with better snow, easier accessibility, or skiing experience. It's beautiful, unique and caters to those who love to ski both in the resorts and the back country. It pains me to think about what it might become if places like Grizzly Gulch are lost to expansion, or gondolas connect the areas. Seriously, it would be a tragedy. It pains me more when I think about the risk to price tag and risk to owners and taxpayers. If, for some insane reason, you expanded would people come? Is the market of resort skiers increasing? From everything I read, it's showing no growth. The expansion seems like a terrible waste of money, energy, natural resources (the water shed possibly) to destroy what is currently the best skiing destination in the United States. You have something special - don't ruin it! Let LCC and BCC be who they are and make them better at who they are.</p> <p>I think it is a good idea to explore the transportation possibilities and address the current bottlenecks. To date Summit County and UDOT have done a horrible job keeping up with the massive growth (and associated transportation issues) in Western Summit County. As far as the resort expansion and the "One Wasatch" proposal are concerned, I think a solution would be building 2 high speed high capacity gondolas. One gondola from the base of the Jupiter Chair WEST to the Brighton Circle or just West of there. Then another high speed high capacity gondola from near the base of the Millicent chair through Grizzly Gulch to the upper ALTA Parking lot. This would open up the concept of an inter connected group of ski areas without having difficult back country type skiing for the tourists. The resorts could control the times and days these gondolas would open and that would help with the efforts of avalanche control (if it ever snows here again), as well as how to sweep the runs at night. Having people get off the Jupiter chair with a multi area lift ticket pinned to their jacket and no first hand experience navigating that kind of terrain is just a bad idea. Light rail trains cost many more millions per mile than Gondolas. Digging tunnels would be expensive and would also create issues with ground water and the water rights of people in different drainages (this battle was fought 100 years ago with the digging of tunnels for silver in Park City). VAL will help by moving cars out of the two lots at PC and Canyons so they can develop the land there. Having a large transportation terminal out on I-80 should be looked at ASAP. Land is at a premium so the time to buy a big enough piece is now. Maybe the RANCHO on the South Side of the freeway between the Junction and the mall??? lived in PC for 17 years and friends of mine tell me its 30 or 40 minutes now to get into town from the Junction in the winter. Its sad to see the popularity of Park City be its demise.</p> <p>This proposal will kill the town of Alta. Who will stay at the Rustler if they can stay 10 minutes away via train at a cheap Hyatt. The lodges I'm sure barely scrape by as is, there is already little and still vanishing incentive to live in the canyon. Who will want to own a multi million dollar house here on a dead end road with absolutely zero summer activities when they can own a multi million dollar house in Park City and take the train to Alta for their one hike to Crete lake in the summer. We all loved Alta for how out of the way it is, how you cant get there sometimes that feels special. We all loved Alta because it never tried to be anything it wasn't. Its a dead end road, and having a train that will likely only run during peak times to bring you to Park City does nothing for those that chose Alta as their lives. We don't live here to shovel copious amounts of snow once interlock is lifted only as the first trains get here from bone dry Park City and Sandy. The greed of ski resorts needs to stop and did back in the day when they set resort boundaries to begin with. The bus is already not affordable and it runs on an existing layout. It costs more to ride the bus one way up the canyon than to get around Manhattan all day. At least in Manhattan I could ride the subway to places I go to make tons of money to save up for my trip to Park City every year to ski Alta with ease, but only when it snows because that place isn't worth me skiing when it doesn't.</p>	West Jordan	3/11/2015
<p>• Priority #1 The Guardians pass road needs to be improved and open year round. Jackson does this with Teton Pass and it works very well. This would ease Park City traffic as well as allow the travel between areas • What do you think about resort connectivity? Park City, Big and Little cottonwood should be connected via aerial and ground terrain. • Mountain rail? Rail seems great until you look at a per ridership cost as well as the impact this will have on both big and little cottonwood streams. Installing a aerial tram up Heath Rise and Little cottonwood would improve traffic and minimize impact. Trails for car traffic could help fund this.</p> <p>Dear Mountain Accord staff, I called and left a message Tuesday this week and it also talked to someone that night as well. I think it would be cool if we had a train system that went underground as well as buses that would connect the mountains and I think it would be cool if it helped us with an Olympic bid again. Please I hope construction on a transit center and for the trains begins sometime. Please write back? wish I could come to the public meetings but I work on Mondays and Wednesdays and Fridays from 11 a.m. to 6 p.m. at I leatherbus in Tavlorville</p> <p>I like the transportation options presented in the proposal. I would love to see rail access to the mountain areas. I especially like the idea of connecting canyon areas together with tunnels. I think mountain peaks should be free of visible ski lifts. I am waiting to see how these ideas are more fully developed including costs and funding options. I am very interested in maintaining public access to the mountains and balancing that access with good stewardship to protect the mountain environment.</p> <p>I've been following closely the ideas proposed for LCC. I'll make my points brief. Salt Lake City and BCC and LCC. In particular, is my vacation destination since 1994. It's maintained my loyalty for a simple reason, it's not like other ski areas or mountain ranges. It's still beautiful, preserved and not Colorado, Tahoe, Whistler etc... When I started coming I hiked in the summer, resort skied in the winter. As time passed I added back country skiing and continued to hike. You have a precious commodity, one I would hate to see become Vail Colorado. Increased bus and better avalanche diversion are cheaper and better options than tunnels, trains, and ski resort expansion. To my skiing friends, I rave about BCC and LCC. It's the best skier experience in the United States – and I've skied everywhere. There are no resorts or ranges with better snow, easier accessibility, or skiing experience. It's beautiful, unique and caters to those who love to ski both in the resorts and the back country. It pains me to think about what it might become if places like Grizzly Gulch are lost to expansion, or gondolas connect the areas. Seriously, it would be a tragedy. It pains me more when I think about the risk to price tag and risk to owners and taxpayers. If, for some insane reason, you expanded would people come? Is the market of resort skiers increasing? From everything I read, it's showing no growth. The expansion seems like a terrible waste of money, energy, natural resources (the water shed possibly) to destroy what is currently the best skiing destination in the United States. You have something special - don't ruin it! Let LCC and BCC be who they are and make them better at who they are.</p> <p>I think it is a good idea to explore the transportation possibilities and address the current bottlenecks. To date Summit County and UDOT have done a horrible job keeping up with the massive growth (and associated transportation issues) in Western Summit County. As far as the resort expansion and the "One Wasatch" proposal are concerned, I think a solution would be building 2 high speed high capacity gondolas. One gondola from the base of the Jupiter Chair WEST to the Brighton Circle or just West of there. Then another high speed high capacity gondola from near the base of the Millicent chair through Grizzly Gulch to the upper ALTA Parking lot. This would open up the concept of an inter connected group of ski areas without having difficult back country type skiing for the tourists. The resorts could control the times and days these gondolas would open and that would help with the efforts of avalanche control (if it ever snows here again), as well as how to sweep the runs at night. Having people get off the Jupiter chair with a multi area lift ticket pinned to their jacket and no first hand experience navigating that kind of terrain is just a bad idea. Light rail trains cost many more millions per mile than Gondolas. Digging tunnels would be expensive and would also create issues with ground water and the water rights of people in different drainages (this battle was fought 100 years ago with the digging of tunnels for silver in Park City). VAL will help by moving cars out of the two lots at PC and Canyons so they can develop the land there. Having a large transportation terminal out on I-80 should be looked at ASAP. Land is at a premium so the time to buy a big enough piece is now. Maybe the RANCHO on the South Side of the freeway between the Junction and the mall??? lived in PC for 17 years and friends of mine tell me its 30 or 40 minutes now to get into town from the Junction in the winter. Its sad to see the popularity of Park City be its demise.</p> <p>This proposal will kill the town of Alta. Who will stay at the Rustler if they can stay 10 minutes away via train at a cheap Hyatt. The lodges I'm sure barely scrape by as is, there is already little and still vanishing incentive to live in the canyon. Who will want to own a multi million dollar house here on a dead end road with absolutely zero summer activities when they can own a multi million dollar house in Park City and take the train to Alta for their one hike to Crete lake in the summer. We all loved Alta for how out of the way it is, how you cant get there sometimes that feels special. We all loved Alta because it never tried to be anything it wasn't. Its a dead end road, and having a train that will likely only run during peak times to bring you to Park City does nothing for those that chose Alta as their lives. We don't live here to shovel copious amounts of snow once interlock is lifted only as the first trains get here from bone dry Park City and Sandy. The greed of ski resorts needs to stop and did back in the day when they set resort boundaries to begin with. The bus is already not affordable and it runs on an existing layout. It costs more to ride the bus one way up the canyon than to get around Manhattan all day. At least in Manhattan I could ride the subway to places I go to make tons of money to save up for my trip to Park City every year to ski Alta with ease, but only when it snows because that place isn't worth me skiing when it doesn't.</p>	West Valley	2/26/2015
<p>Dear Mountain Accord staff, I called and left a message Tuesday this week and it also talked to someone that night as well. I think it would be cool if we had a train system that went underground as well as buses that would connect the mountains and I think it would be cool if it helped us with an Olympic bid again. Please I hope construction on a transit center and for the trains begins sometime. Please write back? wish I could come to the public meetings but I work on Mondays and Wednesdays and Fridays from 11 a.m. to 6 p.m. at I leatherbus in Tavlorville</p> <p>I like the transportation options presented in the proposal. I would love to see rail access to the mountain areas. I especially like the idea of connecting canyon areas together with tunnels. I think mountain peaks should be free of visible ski lifts. I am waiting to see how these ideas are more fully developed including costs and funding options. I am very interested in maintaining public access to the mountains and balancing that access with good stewardship to protect the mountain environment.</p> <p>I've been following closely the ideas proposed for LCC. I'll make my points brief. Salt Lake City and BCC and LCC. In particular, is my vacation destination since 1994. It's maintained my loyalty for a simple reason, it's not like other ski areas or mountain ranges. It's still beautiful, preserved and not Colorado, Tahoe, Whistler etc... When I started coming I hiked in the summer, resort skied in the winter. As time passed I added back country skiing and continued to hike. You have a precious commodity, one I would hate to see become Vail Colorado. Increased bus and better avalanche diversion are cheaper and better options than tunnels, trains, and ski resort expansion. To my skiing friends, I rave about BCC and LCC. It's the best skier experience in the United States – and I've skied everywhere. There are no resorts or ranges with better snow, easier accessibility, or skiing experience. It's beautiful, unique and caters to those who love to ski both in the resorts and the back country. It pains me to think about what it might become if places like Grizzly Gulch are lost to expansion, or gondolas connect the areas. Seriously, it would be a tragedy. It pains me more when I think about the risk to price tag and risk to owners and taxpayers. If, for some insane reason, you expanded would people come? Is the market of resort skiers increasing? From everything I read, it's showing no growth. The expansion seems like a terrible waste of money, energy, natural resources (the water shed possibly) to destroy what is currently the best skiing destination in the United States. You have something special - don't ruin it! Let LCC and BCC be who they are and make them better at who they are.</p> <p>I think it is a good idea to explore the transportation possibilities and address the current bottlenecks. To date Summit County and UDOT have done a horrible job keeping up with the massive growth (and associated transportation issues) in Western Summit County. As far as the resort expansion and the "One Wasatch" proposal are concerned, I think a solution would be building 2 high speed high capacity gondolas. One gondola from the base of the Jupiter Chair WEST to the Brighton Circle or just West of there. Then another high speed high capacity gondola from near the base of the Millicent chair through Grizzly Gulch to the upper ALTA Parking lot. This would open up the concept of an inter connected group of ski areas without having difficult back country type skiing for the tourists. The resorts could control the times and days these gondolas would open and that would help with the efforts of avalanche control (if it ever snows here again), as well as how to sweep the runs at night. Having people get off the Jupiter chair with a multi area lift ticket pinned to their jacket and no first hand experience navigating that kind of terrain is just a bad idea. Light rail trains cost many more millions per mile than Gondolas. Digging tunnels would be expensive and would also create issues with ground water and the water rights of people in different drainages (this battle was fought 100 years ago with the digging of tunnels for silver in Park City). VAL will help by moving cars out of the two lots at PC and Canyons so they can develop the land there. Having a large transportation terminal out on I-80 should be looked at ASAP. Land is at a premium so the time to buy a big enough piece is now. Maybe the RANCHO on the South Side of the freeway between the Junction and the mall??? lived in PC for 17 years and friends of mine tell me its 30 or 40 minutes now to get into town from the Junction in the winter. Its sad to see the popularity of Park City be its demise.</p> <p>This proposal will kill the town of Alta. Who will stay at the Rustler if they can stay 10 minutes away via train at a cheap Hyatt. The lodges I'm sure barely scrape by as is, there is already little and still vanishing incentive to live in the canyon. Who will want to own a multi million dollar house here on a dead end road with absolutely zero summer activities when they can own a multi million dollar house in Park City and take the train to Alta for their one hike to Crete lake in the summer. We all loved Alta for how out of the way it is, how you cant get there sometimes that feels special. We all loved Alta because it never tried to be anything it wasn't. Its a dead end road, and having a train that will likely only run during peak times to bring you to Park City does nothing for those that chose Alta as their lives. We don't live here to shovel copious amounts of snow once interlock is lifted only as the first trains get here from bone dry Park City and Sandy. The greed of ski resorts needs to stop and did back in the day when they set resort boundaries to begin with. The bus is already not affordable and it runs on an existing layout. It costs more to ride the bus one way up the canyon than to get around Manhattan all day. At least in Manhattan I could ride the subway to places I go to make tons of money to save up for my trip to Park City every year to ski Alta with ease, but only when it snows because that place isn't worth me skiing when it doesn't.</p>	West Valley	3/2/2015
<p>I like the transportation options presented in the proposal. I would love to see rail access to the mountain areas. I especially like the idea of connecting canyon areas together with tunnels. I think mountain peaks should be free of visible ski lifts. I am waiting to see how these ideas are more fully developed including costs and funding options. I am very interested in maintaining public access to the mountains and balancing that access with good stewardship to protect the mountain environment.</p> <p>I've been following closely the ideas proposed for LCC. I'll make my points brief. Salt Lake City and BCC and LCC. In particular, is my vacation destination since 1994. It's maintained my loyalty for a simple reason, it's not like other ski areas or mountain ranges. It's still beautiful, preserved and not Colorado, Tahoe, Whistler etc... When I started coming I hiked in the summer, resort skied in the winter. As time passed I added back country skiing and continued to hike. You have a precious commodity, one I would hate to see become Vail Colorado. Increased bus and better avalanche diversion are cheaper and better options than tunnels, trains, and ski resort expansion. To my skiing friends, I rave about BCC and LCC. It's the best skier experience in the United States – and I've skied everywhere. There are no resorts or ranges with better snow, easier accessibility, or skiing experience. It's beautiful, unique and caters to those who love to ski both in the resorts and the back country. It pains me to think about what it might become if places like Grizzly Gulch are lost to expansion, or gondolas connect the areas. Seriously, it would be a tragedy. It pains me more when I think about the risk to price tag and risk to owners and taxpayers. If, for some insane reason, you expanded would people come? Is the market of resort skiers increasing? From everything I read, it's showing no growth. The expansion seems like a terrible waste of money, energy, natural resources (the water shed possibly) to destroy what is currently the best skiing destination in the United States. You have something special - don't ruin it! Let LCC and BCC be who they are and make them better at who they are.</p> <p>I think it is a good idea to explore the transportation possibilities and address the current bottlenecks. To date Summit County and UDOT have done a horrible job keeping up with the massive growth (and associated transportation issues) in Western Summit County. As far as the resort expansion and the "One Wasatch" proposal are concerned, I think a solution would be building 2 high speed high capacity gondolas. One gondola from the base of the Jupiter Chair WEST to the Brighton Circle or just West of there. Then another high speed high capacity gondola from near the base of the Millicent chair through Grizzly Gulch to the upper ALTA Parking lot. This would open up the concept of an inter connected group of ski areas without having difficult back country type skiing for the tourists. The resorts could control the times and days these gondolas would open and that would help with the efforts of avalanche control (if it ever snows here again), as well as how to sweep the runs at night. Having people get off the Jupiter chair with a multi area lift ticket pinned to their jacket and no first hand experience navigating that kind of terrain is just a bad idea. Light rail trains cost many more millions per mile than Gondolas. Digging tunnels would be expensive and would also create issues with ground water and the water rights of people in different drainages (this battle was fought 100 years ago with the digging of tunnels for silver in Park City). VAL will help by moving cars out of the two lots at PC and Canyons so they can develop the land there. Having a large transportation terminal out on I-80 should be looked at ASAP. Land is at a premium so the time to buy a big enough piece is now. Maybe the RANCHO on the South Side of the freeway between the Junction and the mall??? lived in PC for 17 years and friends of mine tell me its 30 or 40 minutes now to get into town from the Junction in the winter. Its sad to see the popularity of Park City be its demise.</p> <p>This proposal will kill the town of Alta. Who will stay at the Rustler if they can stay 10 minutes away via train at a cheap Hyatt. The lodges I'm sure barely scrape by as is, there is already little and still vanishing incentive to live in the canyon. Who will want to own a multi million dollar house here on a dead end road with absolutely zero summer activities when they can own a multi million dollar house in Park City and take the train to Alta for their one hike to Crete lake in the summer. We all loved Alta for how out of the way it is, how you cant get there sometimes that feels special. We all loved Alta because it never tried to be anything it wasn't. Its a dead end road, and having a train that will likely only run during peak times to bring you to Park City does nothing for those that chose Alta as their lives. We don't live here to shovel copious amounts of snow once interlock is lifted only as the first trains get here from bone dry Park City and Sandy. The greed of ski resorts needs to stop and did back in the day when they set resort boundaries to begin with. The bus is already not affordable and it runs on an existing layout. It costs more to ride the bus one way up the canyon than to get around Manhattan all day. At least in Manhattan I could ride the subway to places I go to make tons of money to save up for my trip to Park City every year to ski Alta with ease, but only when it snows because that place isn't worth me skiing when it doesn't.</p>	Wisconsin	3/11/2015
<p>I think it is a good idea to explore the transportation possibilities and address the current bottlenecks. To date Summit County and UDOT have done a horrible job keeping up with the massive growth (and associated transportation issues) in Western Summit County. As far as the resort expansion and the "One Wasatch" proposal are concerned, I think a solution would be building 2 high speed high capacity gondolas. One gondola from the base of the Jupiter Chair WEST to the Brighton Circle or just West of there. Then another high speed high capacity gondola from near the base of the Millicent chair through Grizzly Gulch to the upper ALTA Parking lot. This would open up the concept of an inter connected group of ski areas without having difficult back country type skiing for the tourists. The resorts could control the times and days these gondolas would open and that would help with the efforts of avalanche control (if it ever snows here again), as well as how to sweep the runs at night. Having people get off the Jupiter chair with a multi area lift ticket pinned to their jacket and no first hand experience navigating that kind of terrain is just a bad idea. Light rail trains cost many more millions per mile than Gondolas. Digging tunnels would be expensive and would also create issues with ground water and the water rights of people in different drainages (this battle was fought 100 years ago with the digging of tunnels for silver in Park City). VAL will help by moving cars out of the two lots at PC and Canyons so they can develop the land there. Having a large transportation terminal out on I-80 should be looked at ASAP. Land is at a premium so the time to buy a big enough piece is now. Maybe the RANCHO on the South Side of the freeway between the Junction and the mall??? lived in PC for 17 years and friends of mine tell me its 30 or 40 minutes now to get into town from the Junction in the winter. Its sad to see the popularity of Park City be its demise.</p> <p>This proposal will kill the town of Alta. Who will stay at the Rustler if they can stay 10 minutes away via train at a cheap Hyatt. The lodges I'm sure barely scrape by as is, there is already little and still vanishing incentive to live in the canyon. Who will want to own a multi million dollar house here on a dead end road with absolutely zero summer activities when they can own a multi million dollar house in Park City and take the train to Alta for their one hike to Crete lake in the summer. We all loved Alta for how out of the way it is, how you cant get there sometimes that feels special. We all loved Alta because it never tried to be anything it wasn't. Its a dead end road, and having a train that will likely only run during peak times to bring you to Park City does nothing for those that chose Alta as their lives. We don't live here to shovel copious amounts of snow once interlock is lifted only as the first trains get here from bone dry Park City and Sandy. The greed of ski resorts needs to stop and did back in the day when they set resort boundaries to begin with. The bus is already not affordable and it runs on an existing layout. It costs more to ride the bus one way up the canyon than to get around Manhattan all day. At least in Manhattan I could ride the subway to places I go to make tons of money to save up for my trip to Park City every year to ski Alta with ease, but only when it snows because that place isn't worth me skiing when it doesn't.</p>	West Valley City	2/4/2015
<p>I've been following closely the ideas proposed for LCC. I'll make my points brief. Salt Lake City and BCC and LCC. In particular, is my vacation destination since 1994. It's maintained my loyalty for a simple reason, it's not like other ski areas or mountain ranges. It's still beautiful, preserved and not Colorado, Tahoe, Whistler etc... When I started coming I hiked in the summer, resort skied in the winter. As time passed I added back country skiing and continued to hike. You have a precious commodity, one I would hate to see become Vail Colorado. Increased bus and better avalanche diversion are cheaper and better options than tunnels, trains, and ski resort expansion. To my skiing friends, I rave about BCC and LCC. It's the best skier experience in the United States – and I've skied everywhere. There are no resorts or ranges with better snow, easier accessibility, or skiing experience. It's beautiful, unique and caters to those who love to ski both in the resorts and the back country. It pains me to think about what it might become if places like Grizzly Gulch are lost to expansion, or gondolas connect the areas. Seriously, it would be a tragedy. It pains me more when I think about the risk to price tag and risk to owners and taxpayers. If, for some insane reason, you expanded would people come? Is the market of resort skiers increasing? From everything I read, it's showing no growth. The expansion seems like a terrible waste of money, energy, natural resources (the water shed possibly) to destroy what is currently the best skiing destination in the United States. You have something special - don't ruin it! Let LCC and BCC be who they are and make them better at who they are.</p> <p>I think it is a good idea to explore the transportation possibilities and address the current bottlenecks. To date Summit County and UDOT have done a horrible job keeping up with the massive growth (and associated transportation issues) in Western Summit County. As far as the resort expansion and the "One Wasatch" proposal are concerned, I think a solution would be building 2 high speed high capacity gondolas. One gondola from the base of the Jupiter Chair WEST to the Brighton Circle or just West of there. Then another high speed high capacity gondola from near the base of the Millicent chair through Grizzly Gulch to the upper ALTA Parking lot. This would open up the concept of an inter connected group of ski areas without having difficult back country type skiing for the tourists. The resorts could control the times and days these gondolas would open and that would help with the efforts of avalanche control (if it ever snows here again), as well as how to sweep the runs at night. Having people get off the Jupiter chair with a multi area lift ticket pinned to their jacket and no first hand experience navigating that kind of terrain is just a bad idea. Light rail trains cost many more millions per mile than Gondolas. Digging tunnels would be expensive and would also create issues with ground water and the water rights of people in different drainages (this battle was fought 100 years ago with the digging of tunnels for silver in Park City). VAL will help by moving cars out of the two lots at PC and Canyons so they can develop the land there. Having a large transportation terminal out on I-80 should be looked at ASAP. Land is at a premium so the time to buy a big enough piece is now. Maybe the RANCHO on the South Side of the freeway between the Junction and the mall??? lived in PC for 17 years and friends of mine tell me its 30 or 40 minutes now to get into town from the Junction in the winter. Its sad to see the popularity of Park City be its demise.</p> <p>This proposal will kill the town of Alta. Who will stay at the Rustler if they can stay 10 minutes away via train at a cheap Hyatt. The lodges I'm sure barely scrape by as is, there is already little and still vanishing incentive to live in the canyon. Who will want to own a multi million dollar house here on a dead end road with absolutely zero summer activities when they can own a multi million dollar house in Park City and take the train to Alta for their one hike to Crete lake in the summer. We all loved Alta for how out of the way it is, how you cant get there sometimes that feels special. We all loved Alta because it never tried to be anything it wasn't. Its a dead end road, and having a train that will likely only run during peak times to bring you to Park City does nothing for those that chose Alta as their lives. We don't live here to shovel copious amounts of snow once interlock is lifted only as the first trains get here from bone dry Park City and Sandy. The greed of ski resorts needs to stop and did back in the day when they set resort boundaries to begin with. The bus is already not affordable and it runs on an existing layout. It costs more to ride the bus one way up the canyon than to get around Manhattan all day. At least in Manhattan I could ride the subway to places I go to make tons of money to save up for my trip to Park City every year to ski Alta with ease, but only when it snows because that place isn't worth me skiing when it doesn't.</p>		2/5/2015

<p>Concerning Proposed Next Steps: Transportation-A light rail system is excessive and makes little sense in terms of addressing the main issues relating to transportation (parking, avalanche corridors). This option should be taken off the table. To address the issue of parking it should be noted that this issue is limited to a few peak seasons and popular weekends. However, generally speaking parking is not an issue. Too many people wanting to spend their money at a resort seems like a resort problem and not a bad one to have. This issue should be left to resorts to solve not passed on to the tax payer. Environment-We need to do everything we can to protect the limited open spaces left. They are our valley's greatest resource both in terms of future economic growth and future water resources. Development outside future resort boundaries should be ended, with exception to possible private/federal land exchanges (e.g., Mary Ellen gulch, lower silver fork, hidden canyon for Grizzly Gulch, South face of Upper LCC, Upper Mill D, White Pine, Catherines Pass, Superior) which all seem to be viable options for future land exchanges. Recreation-it should be noted that when a person chooses to go to Colorado rather than Utah for a winter vacation it's not because we don't have a light rail system. We need to fix our image before we fix anything else. Furthermore, when you look at the growth in the tourism/ski industry the only growth is in the backcountry ski and snowboard sectors. There are a lot of reasons for this but in part riding a resort is unaffordable for most residents. I live and teach at the mouth of LCC, I rarely can afford the cost to go to a resort to teach my kids to ski despite the fact that snowboarding is a huge part of our lives. Ask 30 kids in any random classroom how many have been to Alta and you would be blown away by how few and youth have been up LCC or any of the other major canyons. It's more and more becoming limited to only the most privileged few. Other- It seems from what I can tell reading the proposal that regarding economy and transportation the proposal only benefit the private sector (resorts/developers) while leaving it to the public to front the cost. Build a massive parking area in the gravel pit and increase bus frequency including during popular summer weekends. Limit all future development to currently developed areas. Provide the public with % of results from these surveys and comment opportunities. Put the local residents before cottonwood developers and canadian based developers. If it's not popular scrap it don't let it back hoping to burn people out on the public process.</p> <p>I took the time to fill out the survey online, but wanted to augment it slightly - I'm in favor of the proposed plan, assuming it includes Alta making Grizzly Gulch public land (and it becoming protected). Without that, the plan is essentially a non-starter...</p>	2/5/2015
<p>Likes: 1. P 3 I like that you say the Wasatch Back "rural qualities" WILL disappear. 2. P 6 I like that you say "This WILL result in crowding, resource damage and degraded recreational experiences. 3. Transit incentives and auto disincentives. 4. Year-around bus service in Big Cottonwood - However, both Big and Little would be nice. 5. Mill Creek Shuttle 6. Increase protected public lands. 7. Encourage development patterns that reduce automobile use and achieve desired community character. Concerns: 1. 23 individuals representing a variety of organizations, TWO women. Come-ON, Utah! It would be laughable, except it's a crying shame. 2. 416 Acres in AF canyon to be privatized. 3. 108 units at Alta with culinary water. MORE water for ski resorts to make fake snow. 4. "preserve key back country terrain." Who chooses what is "key"? I think it's all key. 5. P. 9 Transportation. First on the list: High capacity transit in the Little Cottonwood Canyon/ Park City Corridor. (What "corridor" ?? I know you're talking about Grizzly Gulch, but that isn't a corridor unless you plan to develop it. Which clearly, you are.) Last on the list: Bikes and pedestrians. I think your priorities are askew and should be the exact opposite. 6. P. 7 Economy. The language here is sneaky. "World-class transit system to connect the Wasatch Front's powerful and diverse economy to the specialized economies of Park City, Summit, and Wasatch Counties." Sure seems to me like you are leaving the door wide open for a "One Wasatch," "interconnect," or something along those lines. I oppose. I believe a "transit system" along those lines is mis-labeled, unnecessary, environmentally destructive and damning to the quality of life to anyone who wants quiet and solitude in the Wasatch. 7. Similarly biased language: transportation is "auto-oriented" and "offers little choice." We designed it this way! You can't have a city that is totally dependent on cars and canyons that are not. 8. "Tourism market that is competitive now and into the future..." to connect fragmented economic markets. Again, you are laying down the foundation for an inter-connect. I am against the concept because it will destroy back country skiing and solo/quiet experiences in the busy/ over populated Wasatch. Further, it is unnecessary - The backers are pitching this idea as a transportation solution and an opportunity to make the wasatch a world-class skiing destination. In fact, the development would benefit few - mostly tourists - would destroy natural viewpoints, and would impact natural resources greatly with it's accompanying roads, electric, and noise. I will leave the Wasatch if this concept is pursued. You must realize that you are driving locals away with this unhealthy focus on economic growth. 9. Identify key wildlife corridors. Really what that means is "whittle away at wildlife habitat." Instead: more protection across the board. Development should stay at the resorts. Period. Public lands should be expanded in both acreage and in level of protection. 10. We all know that NEPA is just sanctioned development. How will your development ideas impact air quality?</p>	2/5/2015
<p>I fully support the One Wasatch Concept. Creating an experience like none other in North America will better the future of our state.</p>	2/5/2015
<p>Transportation: • Electrify transportation as much as possible  • Install more renewable energy generators or energy storage to power additional electric transportation  • Use hybrid engines and natural gas rather than gasoline when full electrification is not possible  • Use regenerative braking for trains and buses  • Use marketing and outreach to show that using public transit is the better (cooler, safer, less expensive, etc) alternative to driving. There seems to be a cultural idea that driving a car equals freedom (even if you're stuck in traffic) and public transportation is restrictive and for poor people. Using advertising and marketing to show that well-to-do, "average", attractive, or "cool" people use public transit could help change Utah's driving culture.  • Keep the cost of public transit competitive or less expensive than driving. Wallets speak louder than words  • Offer packages for groups of riders or monthly/weekly/daily passes so that public transit is less expensive than driving or car pooling  Economic: • As much as possible, incorporate sustainable designs, such as LEED certified, passive solar heating and cooling, and onsite renewable energy generation into new building constructions or renovations.  • Showcase the simplicity, beauty, and comfort that can come from sustainable designs and practices with new economic development, encouraging residents to incorporate these same practices at home.  Recreational: • Near roads and areas of high-congestion, make the bike lanes visible. If drivers are stuck in traffic during rush hour every day and see bikers racing by on nearby trails, they may consider biking instead of driving  • Make the bike lanes/paths wide and safe. Safety concerns may stop people from cycling or other recreational forms of transportation  Environmental: • Make environmental preservation the goal of the other 3 categories (through the use of renewable energy, sustainable design, recreational or public transport, etc) Overall, this looks like a great plan and a great opportunity for Utah. I fully support your work, and I hope to see this kind of plan extended to other counties on the Wasatch Front. I lived in Provo for many years, and I always wanted to see this kind of plan in Utah County. Currently, I work in the field of distributed renewable generation and energy. Having lived overseas in Japan for nearly ten years on three separate occasions, I would highly recommend exploring the use of trains (and tunnels) to connect our resorts to each other and to SLC International Airport. Aerial lifts are also an attractive option. The convenience, reliability, safety and reduction of individual vehicle traffic are all appealing virtues of this approach.</p>	2/6/2015
<p>All, my wife and I would like to comment on the Mountain Accord recommendation for a train up Little Cottonwood Canyon. As background, we live on the outskirts of Park City, just past Parley's Summit. I have a season pass at Alta and ski there 40 to 50 days a year. I also spend about 10 days a year in the warm weather hiking and biking in Little Cottonwood. I have read the White paper that Mountain Accord has published. In summary, we are strongly opposed to the train recommendation for the following reasons. Usage: any transportation proposal must be evaluated in terms of how many people will use it. We are having a hard time understanding the train usage numbers that Mountain Accord is touting based on the following: 1) Warm Months: for 6 to 7 months a year, we believe there will be minimal, if any, riders on the train. There may be some riders to Alta, during the wildflower season, or Snowbird during October/November, but overall the train will not be used for the majority of the year. 2) Cold Months: Based on my experience over the past several years, I believe that there are only 20 to 30 days a year that there are transportation issues (e.g. full parking lots) in the Canyon. I accept that this can change in the future but I am not sure how dramatically. On a normal day, it takes about 20 minutes to drive from the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon to either Alta or Brighton. Unless the Little Cottonwood Canyon is built as a car ride up Big Cottonwood from the Valley will be much faster and more flexible. An extension to Park City would have similar issues as noted above and could well be a disaster for the town. Capital Cost: the capital cost of a train up Little Cottonwood/Brighton/Park City (Option B) is estimated to be \$2.68 to \$3.18 while a full train system (Option D) is \$4.18 to \$5.18. We would question the accuracy of these estimates - it is very rare that any Government project comes in on time and under budget. As such, we believe actual costs would be much higher. Who pays?: We understand that one of the arguments for a train is that the Federal Government will pay for it. I find this very hypocritical given Utah's antipathy towards Washington and desire for a balanced budget. We are taxpayers and would certainly be opposed to spending our taxes, and burdening our children with more debt, for this project. Environmental Concerns: We understand that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be part of Phase II. It is critical that this EIS be thorough, objective and free of any influence from UTA, ski resorts and developers. Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons are watersheds for the Valley, whose population is forecast to grow dramatically over the next several decades. The EIS should not only address the long term impacts from a train (as well as attendant development in the Canyon) but also construction phase impacts. For example, will construction traffic use the existing road in the Canyons? What will be the impact on roads at the mouth of Little Cottonwood? There are a myriad of questions which must be answered on any large construction project in a watershed. Land Transfer: One of the underlying assumptions in the Mountain Accord process seems to be that the ski resorts will only trade land if a train system is built. We really question this assumption but also completely understand the negotiating position that has been taken by the ski resorts. Why wouldn't you push for a deal where you get a state of the art transportation system, to deliver customers to your business, at no cost to you? However, we believe that the resorts real prize in this deal is land to expand their bases. We think the resorts would do a land exchange if an improved bus system was put in place or even if no transportation improvements were made. It is critical that the Forest Service appraise it's land based on fair market value in order to protect the taxpayer. In summary, we are opposed to a train up Little Cottonwood Canyon for the reasons noted above. We are concerned that the Mountain Accord Process is "fixed" and appears to mimic the Prison Relocation fiasco now unfolding. Just like the prison move from Draper was "pre ordained" (one member of the Relocation Committee was quoted as saying the panel was not established to evaluate whether to move the prison - that decision had been made - but where to move it), it appears that a train recommendation has been dismissive of dissenting views and also been "pre ordained". While we realize that a train benefits UTA, big construction companies/developers and the ski resorts, we do not think it is the right answer for the taxpayer or the water shed. We are supportive of an improved bus system which makes sense on all the points that a train does not. Thanks.</p>	2/10/2015
<p>We are concerned that the Mountain Accord Process is "fixed" and appears to mimic the Prison Relocation fiasco now unfolding. Just like the prison move from Draper was "pre ordained" (one member of the Relocation Committee was quoted as saying the panel was not established to evaluate whether to move the prison - that decision had been made - but where to move it), it appears that a train recommendation has been dismissive of dissenting views and also been "pre ordained". While we realize that a train benefits UTA, big construction companies/developers and the ski resorts, we do not think it is the right answer for the taxpayer or the water shed. We are supportive of an improved bus system which makes sense on all the points that a train does not. Thanks.</p> <p>Some of the ideas in this section have been discussed for years, some are practical, and some are ideological, but not realistic. The canyons are, and have been since Utah was settled, accessible to everyone. Banning or limiting cars in canyons, creating disincentives for cars to go up canyons, charging for parking at the bottom or in the canyons, and charging fees to access the canyons is contrary to allowing access to citizens. These types of transit changes should not be allowed. It is less expensive to drive up BCC or LCC than pay for a round trip bus ticket. It is also important to point out that people live year around in both BCC and LCC. They have every right to access their homes without being charged to go up and down the canyons, or wait for buses (if they show up). The same rights are due to cabin owners up all the canyons as well. Bus transit should be available year around in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons, as well as Millcreek Canyon. Limited stops should be available in all canyons. But, UTA buses and schedules would need to be much more reliable than they are now. The expense of using the UTA buses needs to be significantly decreased. Transit between SLC Airport and Park City should be correlated between UTA and Park City Transit. Quinn Junction, Kimball Junction, Silver Junction, as well as other Summit County areas, are transit issues for Summit County and Park City to correlate. Safety for bicycles and pedestrians in the canyons is more a matter of abiding by the current laws, along with the responsibility, of bikers and pedestrians. Better enforcement of current laws would help keep pedestrians and bicyclists in line. Some of the concepts such as trains, trams, gondolas, lifts, and even a tunnel between Little Cottonwood Canyon, Big Cottonwood Canyon, and Park City need much more research and data before even suggesting it in an EIS. The tunnel concept, for instance, would be very expensive, with questionable need. There are two tunnels under construction right now, one in the State of Washington and one in Switzerland. The Washington tunnel is to be used by automobiles, is two miles long, costing \$2 Billion. The Washington Tunnel was a two year project, now delayed, and is a four year project with a potential cost overrun of another \$1 Billion. The Switzerland tunnel (Gothard Base Tunnel) is 35 miles long, used by trains, and has cost so far of \$10.3 Billion. The Gothard Base Tunnel is a 10 year project and currently on schedule. Tunnels up the canyon are not financially feasible and the need is seriously questionable (It would probably cause more traffic problems than it would fix). The Proposed Next Steps of PB include an EIS. An EIS is supposed to offer different choices in which actions to take and offer data and justification for each option. The four areas in the PB are ideological and do not offer, nor suggest, the options required for an EIS. Pursuing an EIS at this point is premature. There are issues that need to be reevaluated due to admittedly missing data; more realistic data needs to be acquired before an EIS is pursued. Much of the PB Proposed Next Steps deal with transit issues; there needs to be much more clarity in the possibilities of transit options, along with realistic, estimated costs and environmental impact. The Mountain Accord Project is not ready to pursue an EIS at this point, you need to revisit all the areas in the PB and provide more realistic data and information. I do believe that NEPA requires data not currently available in this PB. In summary, the Mountain Accord Project is well intentioned, but not ready to move to the next step, an EIS under NEPA protocols. The membership of the environmental subcommittee needs to be rebalanced and all the issues revisited and reevaluated. The recreation subcommittee needs to address additional issues mentioned above. The economic subcommittee needs to limit its issues to the Central Wasatch Mountains, dropping the urban areas. Additionally, real fiscal costs of pursuing the goals of Mountain Accord need to be provided before moving to the EIS process. The transit subcommittee needs to provide more data and realistic transit concepts, including costs for each concept and how it would be funded. The EIS needs to be postponed until "we the people" have a better, more realistic picture of the Mountain Accord goals and of the costs of the four areas in the Proposed Blueprint. Thank you for listening.</p>	2/10/2015
<p>Let me begin by saying I am a big fan of the Mountain Accord planning process and very much want to see it continue. As far as the transportation elements are concerned:  1. My top priority is to see a dedicated high speed transportation corridor developed up Parley's Canyon from Salt Lake City and the airport and down S.R.224.  2. Rapid bus transit also needs to be developed from Wasatch County to Park City and a dedicated high speed corridor developed on S.R. 248.  3. I can't imagine that trains and tunnels are economically viable either from a capital development standpoint or from an O&amp;M standpoint. I don't think the population density justifies their consideration at this time, but might at some future date once the proper high speed dedicated ROW's are secured. So these ideas should not take priority in the Park City area.  4. I do think that high speed bus rapid transit makes sense at this time and should be pursued in the short and medium term with possible trains at some future date.  5. Tunneling into Park City creates a myriad of land use, traffic and congestion issues and should not be pursued at this time, though the feasibility can be further studied.  6. I favor the One Wasatch proposal to link the resorts over the snow not so much as a transportation solution but as an amenity that helps the Utah Ski industry stay competitive in an increasingly competitive environment. I don't think this proposal creates undue environmental or water degradation issues, but I doubt it will solve many traffic issues.  7. I agree with the majority of recreation, trail and open space issues, though I do not think Grizzly Gulch should be put into wilderness which would make the One Wasatch proposal more difficult to accomplish.  8. Economically, Park City depends on it's unique up-scale brand, it's proximity to the SLC Int'l airport, and it's reliance on destination skiers. I am strongly opposed to anything that negatively impacts or dilutes these attributes. Again, I appreciate the considerable thought and work that has gone into these early phases of the Mountain Accord process and fervently hope that it can continue. Unfortunately I will be out of the country when the next public hearing is held on February 24.  Best of luck.</p>	2/10/2015

<p>Hello. I am a local landscape photographer here in the Wasatch. I enjoy these mountains year round from hiking, backpacking, fly fishing, and backcountry snowboarding. These mountains are my home. They have been all my life. They are the lifeblood of the area for without their water, this place would be an arid desert. Protection and conservation of such a fragile resource should be priority number one. Anything less is just spoiling these amazing wilderness and forest areas for future generations. I find it appalling that inside of three designated wilderness areas, our ski resorts want to develop more land than they already have. This does not serve the purpose of the citizens who call this place home. It only serves the profit motive for these resorts. The Wilderness Act that was adopted by Congress in 1964 was designed to protect these areas, and was defined as a place that man is a visitor, and would not remain. Now these ski resorts are looking to remain based on trying to draw more tourism by these elaborate plans to permanently scar our canyons with more construction. This will not only impact the visual look of our canyons, but will have a huge impact on our watershed. A good business model would be to serve the best interest of the community that you operate in. As of late, the transportation solutions provided i.e. SkiLink, One Wasatch, and the rail proposal for Little Cottonwood Canyon are destructive projects which will permanently scar these canyons. You want a transportation solution? Year round bus service up all three canyons. Off ski season service with buses at 8,9,10 AM, and down buses at 2,3,4,5,6 PM. Expand this service so hikers and recreational users of these canyons have the option to not have to drive their vehicles up any of the Tri-Canyons. As well, it would bring more business to these resorts during the summer season as they would be the only amenities available, creating a larger customer base to these resorts. And the best part, a bus does not cause anymore construction and destruction of our fragile canyon system. I think all these big money ideas are not in the best interest for the citizen of Utah. And I will pledge my whole effort in fighting this kind of corporate development from happening. I do not see smart planning in the works, I only see flashy ideas that even your tourists who come here say they are not in favor of. Do the right thing, and leave our canyons how they are. There is no need to expand our ski resorts.</p>	2/12/2015
<p>Hello, Everything looks ok to me in the blueprints regarding the Cottonwood Canyons land swaps, especially the "private lands in consideration to become public". However, the maps are in low resolution and hard to decipher exactly where these boundaries are. In addition, the most appalling new development (that seems to be attempted to be slid under the radar) is the "Public Lands in Consideration to become Private" in the American Fork basin (Utah County). What exactly does "public" to "private" mean in this specific case, and can we please be pointed in the direction of how to get more information on this?? Thanks</p>	2/12/2015
<p>I'm concerned that dispersed use is thought of as simply access to the popular hiking trail heads. This avoids a "bottom to top" mindset, but still concentrates use in a few areas. To my mind, truly dispersed use allows users to access any place in the canyon that they desire. As a rock climber, one of the key elements I would like to see in any transportation plan that includes a mass transit (bus, shuttle, etc.) is the ability to get off wherever we want, rather than just a few designated stops. There are many climbing locations scattered up and down the canyon, sometimes known only to few users. These may not be correlated with the more popular hiking trailheads, but are nonetheless desirable recreation destinations. A system that only allows boarding at pre-designated stops will lock out users from accessing these sites. An element is the current bus system in Big Cottonwood. The ski routes only stop at the Spruce and Reynolds Flat, so a backcountry user seeking to access any of the other side canyons is unable to use the bus and therefore must drive. The Zion shuttle is another example. It is awesome for getting hikers to the key trailheads, but does not allow for any other access.</p>	2/12/2015
<p>Hello...This is my comment on the Mountain Accord: Most of this has to be swallowed to protect whats there, and that, with a little choking, I can do. HOWEVER... The light rail up Little Cottonwood will destroy the precious hiking trails in there. That doesn't work for many of us, it is big infrastructure and \$\$\$ benefiting only ski areas, and only in winter. It will run empty otherwise or not run at all, while making a very sweet hiking area more industrial year around. Who knows what water quality issues it will create in building. It will be a mess regardless. No light rail to Alta! Thanks.</p>	2/12/2015
<p>To whom it may concern: As we have all followed closely the results of the Mountain Accord, it has come to my attention that grizzly gulch's future isn't secured in the final plan. This is unacceptable for a number of reasons: 1.) Grizzly gulch is only partly owned by Alta, and the other parts are protected public land. Which would have to be crossed, sold, or taken away from the public. 2.) Grizzly gulch already has a high level of Alta slack country traffic, traffic that would be very disappointed with losing their easy access terrain to lifts. In fact, as I skied today in Wolverine Cirque (just past the top of Grizzly) I encounter probably 30 people or more traversing in from alta. Some of them did not have back country at all—a testament to how easy it is to access this terrain already. Also, from the Millcreek lift at Brighton, one can beat the top of twin lakes pass (the top of Grizzly) in less than 20 minutes, or at the top of wolverine in slightly more. From the solitude traverse it is less than 10 minutes to the top of the pass. With the unbelievably easy access you can guess the area is already crowded. In fact as you do the standard exit out of Grizzly there are places that actually have moguls forming this week, a sign of very high traffic, in fact the highest traffic area in the Wasatch that is not in a resort. On the ski out at of Grizzly today I passed an estimated 20 people on the way up, this is just a hint of the actual back country traffic from the resorts. With all this use you would think 'why not just make it inbound then?' Well because even with all that traffic, you can still have pristine wilderness trunks in untracked snow. Something that is literally impossible at a ski resort in Utah in todays world. Add in some rope lines, bomb holes, groomers, slow signs, litigation, and worst of all a lift, and it is all lost. It becomes no different than just another run at Alta. 3.) Skiing today in grizzly gulch I ran into a group of about 6 French-Canadians enjoying great lines in Wolverine and then later off Patsy Marly into grizzly. I asked them why they where working so hard for their turns here when they all had expensive day passes at Alta. Their answers ranged from fresh powder turns, a little real exercise, to experiencing the a little silence amidst the drone of lifts and the blare of the lodge music. Would these people come back to alta after 2 weeks of terrible snow if they didn't have this opportunity? I think not. Others have termed this as 'strangling the golden goose' and I think it applies clearly here. If Alta wants to keep these 6 French-Canadians to return, opening new terrain, or even building a lift on Grizzly is likely to send them somewhere else with better slack country like Snow Basin, White Water, or Fernie. 4.) As the climate continues to change, Very high altitude (which we don't have) is becoming more and more important as we have weeks of record temperatures and little to no snow at lower elevations. In fact TODAY is an excellent example, and like pre and post season months, you literally can't ski safely below about 8500ft without fear of skiing on rocks and dirt or being buried in a wet slab from all aspects. In the wasatch, right now grizzly is the only option for reasonable exits. If you take this away, the last 2 weeks of the season would mean the backcountry is closed and only those who like to, or are rich enough can ski. Sounds a little like take from the poor and give to the rich—and that is exactly what it is. 5.) Grizzly is one of the primary area for people learning to backcountry ski. From the parking lot at the top of LCC to the top of Patsy Marley is only 1800ft in vertical. Starting out, this is a daunting amount. Some cannot even make it to the peak their first few times. Very few other places have the level of safe access and short approach in the Wasatch. This week, their are no other options in the Wasatch that meet this criteria. Because of this very issue, it is also a prime location for doing avalanche classes. At this latitude, the aspect for skiing is very important, so North aspect slopes consistently ski better than any other slope. Grizzly is the only location in the Wasatch with a short approach and access to High altitude North Aspect terrain. 6.) Historically speaking, Grizzly is also the home of the first Natural Gap jump, and represents a revolution in skiing. People come from all over the world to film Gap jumping courses in Grizzly that are hand made with shelves and lots of time. Do a quick youtube search for Chad's gap and you will find literally hundreds of video's about just this one Gap, and many more exist. This entire culture will no longer come to grizzly gulch if a lift is built, and especially if it becomes open terrain, and this specific group of skiers will no longer come to Utah. Another stranded goose, and lost revenue. Finally in a brief summary Every user group will suffer from ANY development up grizzly gulch.</p>	2/12/2015
<p>It is an iconic location representing the backcountry of the Wasatch to the entire world, and without it, that picture will be lost. No longer will Ski Magazines display full page photo's of 'Alta Backcountry' that represents the best free advertising. Alta, Brighton, and even Solitude will suffer from lost revenue from the slack country skiers that no longer have a draw to the iconic and easy access into Grizzly gulch, and twin lakes pass. Finally, and probably most importantly, you are taking prime backcountry terrain from a hug local contingent, and giving it to the rich ski resort owner so they can attempt to boost their dwindling annual skier count when in actuality it will likely cause an initial increase followed by a drop in numbers. With lift tickets breaking the \$100 range, your local contingent is already very small, and after such an expansion, and subsequent increase in ticket prices the locals will find other places, and other hobbies. Please stop the future development of Grizzly now.</p>	
<p>I am in support of the Mountain Accord initiative.</p>	2/13/2015
<p>1. ROCK CLIMBING: There is a rich history of rock climbing in the Cottonwood Canyons dating back decades. The climbers have been active stewards of the area via trail building, trash pickup, and graffiti removal (especially through the efforts the Salt Lake Climbers Association). There are a variety of bouldering/climbing areas that are very close to the roadside low in LCC canyon. Some of the transportation alternatives proposed show a widening of the transportation corridor to allow BRT or Light Rail. This widening construction could very much destroy these popular climbing destinations. I do NOT support these alternatives if they threaten the bouldering in LCC at areas commonly known as The Secret Garden Cabbage Patch 5 Mile None of the proposals seem to try to actively limit private automobile traffic. Instead it's BRT or Light Rail that is proposed that we hope will convince people to choose transit over their car. But they will continue to drive right alongside the train. Instead, people (including me) should be forced out of their car by not allowing cars at certain hours/days and only allowing a frequently run bus system to operate in the canyon on the road lanes that are already present. 2. GRIZZLY GULCH: The backcountry area known as Grizzly Gulch should not be developed by Alta. This one area will give hordes of skiers access to the adjacent drainages by allowing them to traverse along the ridgeline to Silver Fork and Days Fork. ☹</p>	2/14/2015
<p>Mountain Accord, I think that the currently proposed blueprint is a positive step in the right direction, towards preserving the remaining undeveloped, natural areas in the Wasatch for all to enjoy. I do not support the potential for development in Grizzly Gulch. Grizzly Gulch is a priceless backcountry area, allowing skiers, snowboarders, and snowshoers to enjoy easily accessible upper-elevation terrain. Developing this area steals this area from the public and reserves it for people who can afford to ski at the resorts. Keep Grizzly Gulch wild!</p>	2/14/2015
<p>I am both a resort skier (Alta, Snowbird, Solitude) as well as a backcountry user. I largely side with the Wasatch Mountain Alliance's response to the Mountain Accord Blueprint and find my biggest hangup is the lack of protection for the Grizzly Gulch area. I applaud the process and hope there is a way to move meaningfully forward with these important protections for the Wasatch.</p>	2/16/2015
<p>Dear Mountain Accord, Thank you for continuing to send updates to, and to request information so transparently from, the community. After reading through the blueprint, I think it looks great. I would encourage you to develop the ski link route from park city to solitude as soon as possible. Keep Telluride, CO, in mind as an example. Make Salt Lake City an example of what great public transit can offer before it turns into LA. Make it exciting, affordable, accessible. Again, look into what Boulder, CO, did for developing their public transit system- both physically and economically. SLCC is difficult to accommodate for because there are so many major thoroughfares. But, as a recent transplant, I will tell you that because of your progressive recommendations I am more encouraged to stay in the valley and contribute responsibly to the community. Thank you</p>	2/16/2015
<p>What is the status of these other areas of the Cottonwood Canyons: Red Pine, Maybird Gulch, Northern Powder Circuit (used by the Wasatch Powderbird Guides, it is ski drainage acreage on the South side of Big Cottonwood Canyon), Mary Ellen, and drainages South of the South ridgeline of Little Cottonwood Canyon.</p>	2/16/2015
<p>Dear Mountain Accord, I am submitting this comment in response to the proposed plans indicated on your website. I am particularly concerned about the proposed land swap in American Fork Canyon near Tibble Reservoir. This is one of my favorite places to ride my horse, and I am there often multiple times a week all summer long. This beautiful area is also heavily used by hikers, motorcycles, bikes, and picnickers, hunters, fishermen, etc. The proposed land swap, quietly hidden under the rest of the more visible plans, smacks heavily of a land GRAB, in a prime recreational area. Please do NOT approve this land swap, and its potential for a Tibble Fork ski area without SUBSTANTIALLY more public visibility, comment and awareness. It is one thing to approve commercial recreational changes in full view of the public (as in the rest of the plans appear), and quite another thing to have a quiet addendum hidden deep in the bowels of pages and pages of information, skulking around to avoid the light of day. The potential impact of this swap was not clearly delineated, and it warrants full public review before being seriously considered. Please do not approve the land swap in American Fork Canyon at this time.</p>	2/16/2015
<p>Hello, As an avid user of the Wasatch range, I've been watching your work with great interest.</p>	2/17/2015
<p>I own a home in Sugarhouse that we rent out on a short term basis to people coming into town for various reasons. This week I got an inquiry from someone in New York who wants to stay in our house but does not want to rent a car. She will be attending a conference at the convention center and also wants to spend a day or two hiking some of our great trails. The public transportation from Sugarhouse to downtown is great. To the east side, however, it's much less convenient. For residents and non-residents alike, a train across the east side of the valley would be fantastic. From the U to the bottom of Big and Little Cottonwoods (and onto the resorts, for that matter). Ultimately, having a train from Salt Lake to Park City makes a lot of sense to me as well, not only for tourism but for the amount of people who commute between the two cities. For this woman who inquired with me this week about hiking, I ultimately felt I had to suggest to her that she rent a car for her hiking days because I didn't feel comfortable suggesting any of the public transport options to the east side and the Wasatch back. Thanks for the opportunity to provide my input. Thank you for the great work you are doing to create functional, environmentally friendly transportation options and at the same time minimize the impact on our most precious asset - the Wasatch.</p>	
<p>I just wanted to give my general feedback on the proposal being looked at for the Wasatch Mountains in the future... Positives: I like the increased emphasis being placed on public transit options in both the Cottonwood Canyons and Park City-SLC corridor. Personally I think some sort of train system (ideally connected to the city's trax) would revolutionize the overall experience of skiing in Little Cottonwood Canyon and hopefully reduce canyon closure delays as well as eliminate traffic congestion (pollution). I am of the mind that making Little Cottonwood Canyon car-free would benefit both the environment and visitors (it would be wise to create a train schedule that has different schedules - i.e. an Alta express, a Snowbird only, a train that stops along key backcountry points, etc. - I say this because I realize that my own use of the Ski Bus has declined ever since the Alta express bus was done away with). I also like the general concept of interconnecting hiking trails from SLC to Park City. I believe it would be not only possible but beneficial to the summer recreational growth of the area if hiking from downtown SLC (via City Creek/Bonneville Shoreline Trail) to Park City was not only possible (it sort of can be done now with some real creativity) but was a positive hiking experience that lent itself to tourists enjoying the Wasatch in a format similar to hiking in Europe. Personally I think it would be possible to extend this notion in such a way as to interconnect Ogden, SLC, and Park City - this is an area where our community has fallen behind other cities/towns that have the same kind of access to mountains that we enjoy. Negatives: Further ski resort expansion and interconnection. I believe that remaining areas of "wild spaces" in the Wasatch must be preserved. I fear that both the environment and non-resort users will be negatively affected by further development. I am primarily a resort skier; however, I realize that this is a luxury that takes its toll on the environment and we should not be increasing our footprint on the Wasatch. In particular I am troubled by ski area expansion that "reduces" the distance between resorts. Ski lifts have an effect on both the winter and summer feel of a space and increasing the number of lifts turns once wild places into something manufactured and disturbed. Any transportation expansion should be done with the goal of reducing the number of cars in the mountains and some of the potential "road improvements" looked like they would turn the Wasatch range into more of a highway system than preserve the mountain range. The two sides of the Wasatch do not need to be further connected through a mountain highway system.</p>	2/17/2015

<p>I am not in favor of increasing recreational capacity in the central mountains for the following reasons: 1) Global warming is increasingly impacting the length of the ski season in Utah. Creating a large infrastructure to promote additional skier days does not seem like a responsible use of tax payers dollars—given the inevitable decline in skiing. I was a ski instructor at the Alta Ski Area for 12 years (1980-1992)—during that time period our ski season went from mid-November to mid-May to after Thanksgiving to Easter. The shortened ski season made it difficult to earn a living in the industry.</p> <p>2) I do not favor a plan that would impact the Tibble Fork area. This is a widely used recreation area for hunters, bikers, horseback riders, hikers, picnickers and fishermen. The proposed plan will create private land in the Tibble Fork area which would negatively impact too many users. Given that the Tibble Fork area will not be used for skier purposes—rather it is a land swap deal—it doesn't seem ethical to impact so many other recreational users.</p> <p>3) The creation of additional transportation infrastructure is not a responsible use of our mountain areas. It will increase pollution, drive-away wildlife, and impact water shed areas.</p> <p>4) There is currently an interconnect tour that allows advanced skiers to tour from one resort to the next. Why not leave this type of experience in place—rather than open up additional acreage to industrialized skiing.</p> <p>5) Utah already boasts 7 ski areas less than an hour away from a major airport. I don't think the Mountain Accord is a needed development—it's just a group of folks with an idea—and maybe not a great idea.</p> <p>6) It would be more of a selling point to skiers coming from other states and nations if we retained the charm of being in Utah rather than trying to duplicate a European skiing experience.</p>	2/17/2015
<p>page ten of the report lists the collaborators: I see that Park City town of Alta are included, but why isn't Snowbird, Brighton, Solitude, Deer Vellev and Canyons listed as well. Does that mean these resorts do not support the blue print?</p>	2/17/2015
<p>Thank you very much for the work you have put into this process, I appreciate it. I cannot support any plan that is vague about lift alignment for resorts. I cannot support any plan that leaves open the possibility of development into Grizzly Gulch. I would like to see more definition around the transportation plan.</p>	2/17/2015
<p>I like and support the rest of the plan.</p>	
<p>American fork forest lands should not be just sold and traded with reckless abandon. Development of af is near sighted and will not expand the skiing economy long term. The Wasatch already has too much development let's keep it wild</p>	2/18/2015
<p>I think it would be cool if you put a train in the Wasatch Mountains for transportation.</p>	2/17/2015
<p>I certainly don't know all the details about the proposal, but my first impression upon reviewing the information I've read is that it looks like it was written largely by the ski industry. A tunnel connection Brighton and Alta? Another tunnel or a lift connecting the ski resorts on the east and west sides of the Wasatch? More base development at the ski resorts in the Cottonwood Canyons facilitated by a private/public land swap? I thought that all of the Cottonwood Canyons were protected as watershed, so wonder if whatever private lands are up there are already significantly restricted for development. I realize that this is a long range plan, but taking a long range view in consideration of the effects climate change which are already affecting our snow pack and our water supply, shouldn't we consider the long range potential future of Utah's ski industry?</p>	2/18/2015
<p>I am in complete agreement with the response that Wasatch Backcountry Alliance formulated. The link for that response is <a href="http://wasatchbackcountryalliance.org/2015/02/12/wasatch-backcountry-alliance-official-response-mountain-accords-cottonwood-task-force-blueprint/#comment-113">http://wasatchbackcountryalliance.org/2015/02/12/wasatch-backcountry-alliance-official-response-mountain-accords-cottonwood-task-force-blueprint/#comment-113</a> The vagueness of the proposal is concerning in many aspects and expansion into Grizzly Gulch is 100% a deal breaker. I backcountry ski up Grizzly Gulch 10-15 times a winter and to see lifts or trains put up there would be a shame!</p>	2/18/2015
<p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	
<p>I would like to make some comments about the planning for the Wasatch mountains. My biggest concern is that I want to keep the canyons separate from each other. I don't want an interconnect between park city and big or little cottonwood. Park City has experienced enormous growth. The town and resorts are crowded to the point that they are barely enjoyable anymore. I feel that we should be keeping the cottonwoods for locals (as much as possible), instead of selling out to tourism. The idea of a tunnel between big and little cottonwood is ridiculous. What does it accomplish? I feel better transit is needed, especially PC to SLc. More bus usage needs additional valley parking. I don't think a train is cost effective. I am ok with new development at the areas, I hope it won't adversely impact touring areas. An example is Snowbird expanding into American Fork (ok) versus expanding into White Pine (not ok). I realize that SLc is growing and it will change the usage of the canyons. The canyons are being over used on summer weekends, try getting a parking spot at Big water trailhead. I don't know the answer for this.</p>	2/19/2015
<p>Thank you for working on this.</p>	
<p>your preliminary studies are a waste of money, day skiers from the valley do not spend money, to help with traffic the light rail needs to come up from the airport, duh. your plan is never going to happen and you should be ashamed of spending our tax money to realize what is pretty evident to most. Also, our ski resorts are too big to worry about connecting them, the big majority of skiers/boarders are not going to go to more than one resort per day and connecting them is not going to help with the traffic issue we are facing one bit! Stop wasting time and money trying to do the only simple answer is bringing a light rail up from airport</p>	2/20/2015
<p>I believe that chair lift to connect the resorts is the right answer for the following reasons: 1. It would be safer. Over time, the likelihood of bus/train accidents is much higher than using a chairlift. 2. A chairlift interconnect will have less negative impact on the environment than creating a large, complex public transportation system. The impact of ski lifts is minimal. The greenhouse emissions from a transportation network would be high. 3. A chairlift interconnect will cost less to construct than a comprehensive transportation system. 4. A chairlift interconnect would cost less to operate than a comprehensive transportation system. 5. A chairlift interconnect will take less time to construct than a comprehensive transportation system. 6. A chairlift interconnect is a more practical option to make the Utah resorts work as one system. It would be much easier to take a 15 minute chairlift from one resort to another than to take odd skis and take a 45 minute bus, train, etc. To me, I am not sure why any option other than the chairlift interconnect is being considered.</p>	2/21/2015
<p>Hello, Thanks to all who have worked hard to put together a plan of action for protecting our beautiful backyard. I applaud the increase in recreational trails (I hope some of these will be closed to mountain bikes or allow bikes on alternate days only), as well as protection of some of the Wasatch's most revered backcountry.</p>	2/23/2015
<p>I have two primary areas of concern:</p>	
<p>* Regarding the "trade" of protected land for ski area expansion, water for snowmaking, etc. It has been my experience that protected lands do not necessarily stay protected, whereas once an area has been given over to development, that is forever. What guarantee do we have that this trade will result in protected land in perpetuity?</p>	
<p>And can we really afford the extra water for snow making, when NASA projects a protracted SW megadrought in the next 50 years?</p>	
<p>* I am STRONGLY opposed to any type of linkage between the Cottonwood Canyons and/or between the CCs and the Park City area—especially an aerial linkage. We have beautiful ski areas with unique personalities that already have plenty of business. Why the constant need for expansion? Expansion in skier numbers will occur naturally as the population grows, so the resorts will remain profitable. Perhaps a train/tunnel system could work if it were completely shielded from the viewshed. I can't quite picture it, but I see the benefit for folks in Park City to be able to take a train to Solitude and skip the long drive around. But anything that adds more development inside the canyons meets with my total opposition (including "services" as the recreation stops along the light rail system).</p>	
<p>Once again, thanks for all your hard work. There are no easy choices.</p>	
<p>Dear Members of the Mountain Accord Committee, I am a concerned back country skier, and I would like to share with you a suggestion a friend of mine had regarding transportation issues up Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. The plan should accomplish at least three objectives: 1) decrease the number of cars going up the canyons, 2) increase public transportation use, 3) use what we already have in a creative manner to avoid excessive expense. The idea involves structuring how the canyon roads are used. Currently they are used as a normal two lane road is used, one way up and one way down. If the hours were restricted for normal two lane road use, then there can be two lanes for more buses to go up the canyon in the morning or down the canyon at the end of the day between identified "rush hour" times. What I envision is having more buses to go directly to specific destinations, decreasing the longer time it currently takes riders to arrive at their destinations. I also envision many more buses so that one can just arrive at a bus stop and know a bus will arrive within 10 minutes between certain hours in the morning and late afternoon. As a back country skier, it would be important to have buses that will stop on demand at popular tour departure locations as well. Restricting the use of cars by the public during prime times will force skiers to use the buses. If implemented well complaints should be minimal. I appreciate the fact that there is more to consider such as parking for the bus riders, and purchasing more buses for use during prime times.</p>	2/23/2015
<p>I am very pleased to see in the plan the purchase of land to increase the protection of land from further development. The proximity to undeveloped nature is a selling point that should never be forgotten. Development can happen, but it should be within the scope of what is already developed, that is improving on what a resort already has rather than acquiring additional land. Increasing a skier's experience can happen by considering how the terrain is managed, what is or is not offered before, during, or after skiing, creating events and programs. Land expansion is only finite but creative use of what one has is infinite. ☺</p>	
<p>Hello Mountain Accord: DAVE is the best alternative.</p>	
<p>Hi I attended the meeting yesterday which was very informative I had a follow up comment about the answer to my question about why connect alta to park city. The speaker cited the number of people who commute for work from park city to slc and from slc to park city as a reason to connect sandy to park city. Yet when asked about the time it would take to travel on the proposed trains it would take over an hour from park city to slc via alta. Driving is faster so using the I-80 makes more sense. You also said a train on route 80 would not be cost effective because it is too slow. There seems to be some disconnect in this reasoning. Using the wasatch as a transportation corridor between park city and sandy is not well conceived. I think ski utah might be the only parties interested in this scenario. There are monorails that can be placed in medians that can travel 50 miles/ hr. Mass transit on I-80 is the only way to connect slc to park city. Perhaps each transportation goal should be expressed as average time to travel from a to b and capacity/ hr. Then design to mechanism once people are on board. Expressing transportation options as bus vs train vs lifts is not helpful at this time it is the cart before the horse. I still would like to understand the real interests in connecting park city to alta—who wants it and why?</p>	2/24/2015
<p>I support the current blueprint of mountain connection in conjunction with transportation solutions.</p>	2/24/2015
<p>I support increased public transportation and feel that the plans I've seen strike a good balance between environmental and economic considerations.</p>	2/24/2015
<p>I support mass transit solutions in general. Not entirely sure about the tunnel element, but I trust two years of research. Thank you for all you are doing!</p>	2/24/2015
<p>To whom it may concern, When the Mountain Accord blueprint was first released, I was cautiously optimistic about its vision and goals. The increase in users projected for the central Wasatch is going to require major changes in infrastructure, and I appreciate any public planning to get ahead of the problem(s). However, as a frequent backcountry skier, I find the current blueprint too skewed toward the interests of the four ski resorts in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. After several years of low snowfall and higher rain/snow lines, it is clear that the backcountry skiing between Cardiff, Days, and Silver Forks, as well as Grizzly Gulch and Catherine's Pass, and the White Pine drainage in LCC, will be the most reliable touring terrain for seasons to come. In those areas, Solitude's proposed lift would jeopardize the backcountry character of Silver Fork, and Alta's refusal to preserve Grizzly Gulch would compromise both it and the Catherine's Pass area. As someone who moved to Salt Lake in large part because of the world class, best-in-the-US terrain here, I can attest what a draw it is both for tourists and new residents. Compromising that draw in order to marginally increase the square acreage of the resorts would be a hugely short-sighted decision. Additionally, as a Utah taxpayer, I find the idea of supporting infrastructure that would almost exclusively benefit the Park City and Cottonwoods resorts problematic. The proposed train would be of no real value to dispersed users (backcountry skiers, hikers, climbers, alpinists, etc.) Since its main beneficiaries would be Alta, Snowbird (and possibly the other resorts, if a tunnel is built connecting the canyons), they should be expected to bear the bulk of the costs associated with its production. In Utah, of all states, I would hope that enormous public subsidies for private enterprise would be treated with skepticism.</p>	2/24/2015
<p>While the Wasatch ski resorts have traditionally (and rightfully) been a key constituency in economic and environmental planning for this region, it seems that their short-term interests are over-represented in this current blueprint. Please reconsider and revise it.</p>	
<p>Hello! I would like to see the resorts lift connected, but not by train. Let's put the connecting lifts in and use the existing infrastructure and our skis to get around! A train system that includes tunnels will be much more "impactful" than a lift system. Why connect all the resorts and then use a train to move from one to the other? My thought is that I can leave the house, begin my ride from the Waldorf Lift, and ski all the interconnected resorts at my leisure.</p>	2/24/2015
<p>Hello,</p>	2/24/2015
<p>Overall, I like what I see in the Mountain Accord proposal. But one thing I am concerned about is Grizzly Gulch. I see that as part of the areas in the upper Cottonwood Canyons to be preserved for backcountry protection, Grizzly Gulch is marked as "under consideration." This is a non-starter for me. Grizzly Gulch is among the most heavily-used backcountry access points in the Wasatch and if it falls victim to skier resort expansion or some sort of One Wasatch lift link to Solitude or Brighton, then we can say goodbye to enjoying true backcountry experiences in Wolverine Cirque, Twin Lakes Pass, Emma Ridge, and all the side-canyons that spill forth from these ridges. Also, Grizzly Gulch is perhaps the very best place in the Wasatch for people and children to learn how to backcountry ski. The route from Alta to Twin Lakes Pass is safe, low-angle, and a perfect tour to teach beginners how to use backcountry equipment. If we lose this key piece of backcountry terrain, then the dispersed user experience in the Wasatch will be greatly diminished. I urge all parties involved to place Grizzly Gulch under protection from ski resort expansion.</p>	
<p>Thank You.</p>	

<p>Hello,</p> <p>After attending a Mountain accord meeting and reviewing the blueprint presented to the public, I have some comments. I'm pretty happy to see discussions taking place about the future of the Wasatch, but there is one major problem I see in this blueprint:</p> <p>We cannot allow a lift up Grizzly Gulch or Tuscaraora. These areas are vital to the Wasatch backcountry, and without that space open to the public, backcountry users will be severely limited to where we can recreate. The backcountry is already crowded enough- if you build a lift right in the middle of one of our most-used backcountry areas, a dagger would be thrust into the heart of our backcountry. These interconnect lifts benefit few and take away from many.</p> <p>I am an Alta and Brighton season pass holder. I love these resorts and think they are some of the best in the world. A huge part of what makes them the best is the adjacent backcountry. If you take that away and connect everything with lifts (or tunnels spoiling a good thing. The central Wasatch is such a small area - we need to maintain the delicate balance of resort and backcountry.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read my comments and for arranging this whole process.</p>	<p>2/24/2015</p>
<p>I have thought seriously about this issue as a homeowner in the area. Park City has many homes sitting empty for people who visit once or twice a year. Lets make more efficient use of these homes versus use open land to build more hotels and homes. A train does not make economic sense for the relatively small number of people going up the mountain, nor does gondola links. Look at the cost expended to build the train to the airport. Protect the land for middle class Utahians and future generations, not the small number of tourists coming to visit for one week and then leaving.</p> <p>The best part of Utah are the mountains, please leave them pristine as they are. We do not need transportation up them or between them. This whole thing appears to be a way for Park City residents to easily access the Wasatch.</p>	<p>2/24/2015</p>
<p>After attending the meeting at Cottonwood High School I walked away thinking about the comments made by Carl Fischer from Save Our Canyons. A lot of this planning does seem to assume that we want all our resorts connected. I don't want that. I like the character of our individual resorts and I don't want them all melded together into a mega resort.</p> <p>The train seems to be an absurdly expensive solution. In a few decades time we may have self driven electric cars that are more efficient for moving people.</p> <p>Where was the idea discussed that offered more buses more frequently? Why is that not the solution? Why can't we have more buses dedicated to just going up and down the canyon? I can understand why the resorts don't want to subsidize them but why can't the riders? The schedule now for the buses is inconvenient for the mid day skiers and jam packed for the full day skiers. I liked the idea of a dedicated bus lane.</p> <p>Thinking a lot about this</p>	<p>2/24/2015</p>
<p>Hi there - I want to vocalize my support for better transportation options into the Central Wasatch options. A train up LCC makes sense. No need for all of those single-driver trips up and down the canyon all year. I'm in support of transportation solutions that better serve our community NOT tomorrow, not five years, not ten years, but 15, 20, 50 years and more into the future.</p>	<p>2/24/2015</p>
<p>There is enough pollution and traffic to make this decision a bad one. Why not help fix rather than destroy and build. Recycle in SLC is nothing like the East and what a shame that is. Look around at your beauty. Don't make this terrible decision</p>	<p>2/24/2015</p>
<p>Here are my comments on what I see: • People need to put on their big boy pants and realize they aren't going to get everything they want. That includes the ski areas and the environmental groups</p> <p>• Yeah its going to cost a ton of money but build the tunnels and trains!!! The ski areas want a european style whatever for marketing purposes to put Utah on the map? Well tunnels and trains do that AND actually get people between the ski areas far more easily and efficiently than any other option including really stupid, ugly, slow, and marginally-functional-from-9-4pm-120-days-a-year gondolas. Picture a group of friends carrying skis and boards on Main St. in Park City, they just had breakfast, now they walk into a building, thru some turnstiles that scan their pass, and onto a subway style platform underground. A few minutes later a train pulls up. They get on, the train takes off, the conversation continues and then 10-15 minutes later they stop at another underground station. Those who would like to ski Brighton or Solitude get off, ascend stairs or escalators or elevators and voila, they are in the Brighton parking lot. Or if our friends want to ski LCC, they stay on, ride for another 10 minutes to the next stop. They get off and walk out into the sunshine in the general area of the Albion base lodge at Alta. Probably no more than 30 minutes from walking on Main St. in PC and our skiers and boarders can be in either canyon. Flip it around and think of all the skiers and boarders who stay in BCC or LCC who get a bit bored at night (See: 4 nights in a row playing cribbage at the Alta lodge?...). Now, they can finish skiing, shower, and take a train to PC for a nice dinner or to hang out at a bar on Main St. and when they are done, they don't have to drive drunk for 60-90 minutes, they can stagger onto a train to go back to their hotel. I don't get T-boned on Wasatch Boulevard and they get to have a fun night out.</p> <p>• Yeah trains and tunnels are going to increase the number of backcountry skiers, but guess what human-powered-ski-touring associations? If we do nothing, backcountry user numbers are still going to shoot through the roof, but we are going to have fist fights and tow trucks at our backcountry trail heads (as already happens on Teton pass due to the increase in users there). AND with a train, everyone who uses them to access the backcountry will still have to climb up, no side-country cheating. Purists can rejoice! And people can do canyon to canyon tours without having to set up a shuttle, so less pollution. Win win win.</p> <p>• Summer use is out of control as well. There may not be a red snake in the summer months, but drive up Big Cottonwood Canyon on any Sat. or Sunday all summer and its clear things are already a mess. Trains and tunnels (along with some sort of bus service and parking at the base of BCC) will help tremendously every day of the year while allowing canyon to canyon style hikes and bike rides that are currently a logistic nightmare.</p>	<p>2/24/2015</p>
<p>• I have no problem with the basic idea of trading public land at the base of ski areas in exchange for giving up land in prime backcountry ski touring areas. Overall, its actually a great idea. BUT, if Alta gets a bunch of land to make \$\$\$\$\$ on real estate and lodging, and they get more water for snowmaking, they need to give up both Flagstaff and Grizzly. Flagstaff shouldn't be developed because it essentially annexes Cardiff, Days, and Silverfork, turning them into heavily used side country. It would also lead to a tremendous number of Search and Rescue situations as lift riders ignore signs and get into trouble in uncontrolled areas (i.e. What happens at the Canyons every year). Grizzly needs to remain undeveloped because a lift served area would turn Silverfork, Patsy Marley, and everything between Alta and Brighton into heavily used side country and would almost completely cut off access to these areas. Basically, these two areas represent a large part of the high altitude backcountry skiing that remains in the central Wasatch. The ski areas have already been given much of the best terrain and to give them either of these two areas would impose a huge burden on the backcountry using public. The proposals on the table are really good for Alta, and while its tempting the think of the marketing value of adding that terrain, come on! The skiable terrain Alta would add is garbage 9 out of 10 days due to the southern exposure, the good terrain is north facing and this would still not be in bounds, but as backcountry it would be destroyed by proximity. Alta doesn't need more terrain for profitability. It has 500 annual advantages that is every other ski area in the country would kill for. If they really want more skiers, more lodging at the base (which the Mtn accord will allow), and access to more skiers (which a train from PC to Alta would definitely open up) will be far more useful than some short term buzz in SKI magazine about some "expansion". Oh, and Alta could allow snowboarders. Don't worry, they would only show up once, but when they realize none of the lifts go to the top of the runs, they will never return.</p> <p>• Long term water quality needs to be the primary focus of this whole effort. Nationwide, clean drinkable water is becoming an increasingly scarce commodity (shame on the USA!) but we are lucky to have some of the best. This is only because of the control and protections in place to preserve our water. Climate predictions suggest prolonged droughts could be the norm in the future (another reason we need to preserve high alpine backcountry access in the central wasatch - you can't ski low and mid elevation terrain if there is no snow!). I understand construction of public infrastructure (i.e. Tunnels, snow sheds, and trains) could pose a short term problem in terms of water quality, but I have to think that with proper mitigation the long term benefits of reduced traffic, parking, accidents, avalanche risk, etc., outweigh the short term risk. But I suppose that is a question for the next phase/EIS studies.</p> <p>• A lot of the talk revolves around skiing and winter backcountry use. While the biggest bottlenecks do seem to follow winter storms, I feel that the overall winter use hasn't increased that dramatically in the last 10-20 years (non-scientific poll of 1 person - me). I would wager that ski area use has essentially been flat and compressed into fewer months (peak of Christmas thru mid-March as opposed to the past when it was Thanksgiving thru mid-March) while backcountry use has gone way up. However, my equally non-scientific poll of 1 also says that summer use has dramatically increased. Climbing and mountain biking are much more popular than they used to be and you can't walk on a trail without encountering dozens of men and women who view running 30 miles as a fun thing to do on a weekend. Any solutions have to address summer use or they will fail to protect our canyons. • Speaking of all the use our canyons get, and water quality, has there been much thought to where all these people pee and poo? Because the forest service restrooms are few and far between and of abysmal quality. I would propose that local cities and counties install and maintain, perhaps in cooperation with the forest service, a number of strategically placed restrooms of sufficient quality that people can actually use them. And that at least the restrooms at winter trail heads be kept open. This could go a long way towards reducing the number of people that dig a cathole in the dirt or snow and go about their business in a protected watershed. This is an important issue that does not seem to be getting any attention in the mountain accord process and could represent an easy, cheap, and non-controversial area in which all stakeholders could agree to better protect our water.</p>	<p>2/24/2015</p>
<p>• I can see a situation in which ski areas that border backcountry land start using professional guides to bring their skiers and boarders into the backcountry for a fee. In other words, without having to actually annex public lands, they could still use them for profit. This is sort of a human powered version of Wasatch Powder Birds Hel operation. While I am not reflexively opposed to this sort of use, I do feel that if a for-profit company is benefiting from public lands, they should have to compensate the public. If this sort of thing does happen, could the mountain accord put into place a mechanism that would direct a certain percentage of the profits towards maintenance and conservation of the central Wasatch? So if Alta or Deer Valley/Solitude or Brighton or Snowbird, or the Canyons start offering guided backcountry ski tours (see Jackson Hole for an example that already exists), for every dollar they charge, they should have to contribute say 10 or 15 cents to a fund earmarked specifically for upkeep of the central Wasatch infrastructure and environment. I know this is a peripheral idea, but funding mechanisms to help maintain the Wasatch are critically important for long term success.</p> <p>• Dear ski areas, please please please stop charging for people to park if they show up to your parking lots without any other passengers! I'm guilty of this myself sometimes but if you look at other ski areas around the west, after a bit of whining, people figure it out and adjust. Its not like someone who loves skiing Alta or Brighton is going to stop going and switch to Snowbasin just because of this. It is a win win win move. Less traffic = less frustration, less wasted time, less pollution, less parking headache, less danger of getting your customers wiped out in an avalanche while sitting in a traffic jam, etc.... As is, I often do NOT go skiing in BCC or LCC on big snow days because I know what a junk show its going to be and I refuse to deal with it. There have been days where I have actually gone skiing at Snowbasin, PowderHou, or Sundance because of the out of control traffic. That's lost revenue! Charge for parking or backcountry and my un-scientific analysis (i.e. guesswork) says that you are going to cut a meaningful number of cars off the road and make everything better. Hell, you will probably even make more money.</p>	<p>2/24/2015</p>
<p>The airlines were afraid to charge for bags, and we all know how that has turned out for them (\$\$\$\$)</p> <p>• Let me say it again, tunnels and trains would be AWESOME!!! They would save and benefit every type of user and every stakeholder, have maximum impact on the future of the canyons, stand up to long term population growth, and suddenly make Park City a cool place to live if you like to ski (sorry PC, couldn't resist the dig!). Long term water stability and quality need to have veto power, and every stakeholder needs to join the real world and realize they can't have everything. This mountain range, and the central Wasatch in particular is tiny. Its a pimple compared to the alps and without a real effort on everyones part and an actual plan that gets implemented, it will be destroyed. If the mountain accord breaks down, the reason so many of us live here will be loved to death.</p> <p>• My apologies to the person who has to wade thru this novel sized diatribe, but I actually mean it all.</p>	<p>2/24/2015</p>
<p>China straddling bus (English computer voice over) the only English copy: <a href="http://youtu.be/Hv8_W2PA0rQ">http://youtu.be/Hv8_W2PA0rQ</a></p>	<p>2/24/2015</p>
<p>Please add my comments regarding the Mountain Accord Central Wasatch Blueprint to the list. Thanks! • I am not in support of linking the resorts.</p> <p>• I am opposed to resort expansion but recognize that the final decision may involve compromise in this regard. Assuming that there is compromise, I remain very concerned about 'resort creep' and the impact that this would have on backcountry terrain in Honeycomb, Hidden Canyon, American Fork, Grizzly Gulch, Wolverine and Twin Lakes Pass.</p> <p>• I am not in support of expensive tax payer subsidized transportation (trains and tunnels) that significantly benefits the for profit ski areas.</p> <p>• Please preserve the ridgeline between catharine's pass and silver fork by not allowing this area to be taken over directly by ski areas or indirectly by allowing adjacent ski areas to essentially make this into side-country terrain.</p>	<p>2/24/2015</p>
<p>Committee: I attended the public meeting this evening in Park City and I have a few questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the committee aware of the Jordanelle Specially Planned Area and the expansion of the eastern end of Deer Valley?</li> <li>2. Why are there no public transportation plans for this area to Park City?</li> <li>3. There seems to be missing representation from Wasatch County? Where are they since they have significant development plans in the area?</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for hosting this meeting and the best of luck with a very difficult but very important challenge.</p>	<p>2/24/2015</p>
<p>While I am a proponent of railways up and down at least Little Cottonwood and Parley's canyons, please scrap the idea of trains running through mountains to connect absolutely everything. Among - canyon traffic is not as important as servicing swift, reliable, mass transit along the traditional routes up and down canyons.</p>	<p>2/24/2015</p>
<p>I'm looking at the map called "Environment Protection" in the "Proposed Blueprint / Idealized Systems / Final Environment Idealized System" link. The yellow shaded areas are labeled "Existing Protected City, County and Private Land." Could you explain what this means, particularly what are the protections on this land. Thank you</p>	<p>2/25/2015</p>
<p>Just to be more specific, in Lambs Canyon there are some yellow "protected private" areas shown on the map. I know Lambs canyon is under the FCO2 provisions but that would be true of all private land in the various Wasatch Front canyons. My real question is: What are the specific restrictions and protections in Lambs Canyon that caused these to be highlighted? I have attached a portion of the map with the area highlighted if that helps.</p> <p>Thanks</p>	<p>2/25/2015</p>
<p>Please, no more development into Silver Fork Canyon. I have been hiking this beautiful area for 65 years and I would like to see it left alone. Solitude ski resort already has taken the terrain in Honey Comb Canyon, which is a side canyon off of Silver Fork. They have a lift on the west facing slope of lower Silver Fork Canyon to bring skiers back to the main resort after skiing Honey Comb. Solitudes new plans for expansion in no way, shape, or form sound like a concession but more like a land grab. Please spare Silver Fork Canyon from <del>the same kind of development - Forest Service</del></p>	<p>2/25/2015</p>
<p>I attended the Skyline High School Open House this evening and had a few comments and questions. It is great to see a responsible approach to solving the problems that currently exist in the Wasatch Front and Back. The Mountain Accord group has a good combination of all the interested parties for all the voices to be heard. The information available at this time makes it seem like the Blueprint is a culmination of brainstorming ideas. Many of the solutions, particularly transportation, have little investigation behind them which prove their cost/benefit over other ideas. A more rigorous display of these analyses would help supporting the Blueprint easier. 1. Can the current infrastructure be improved with small changes to make significant improvement while more expensive and comprehensive ideas are worked on? For instance, improved bus schedules. The current buses are difficult to use during times when they are most advantageous to use. On big snow days a bus must be boarded well away from the mouths of the canyon in order to get a seat. I have waited for buses at the mouth of Little Cottonwood, only to have two full buses go by. Rather than waiting another 45 minutes for another potentially full bus I drove up canyon. Additional buses, express buses from farther field, and buses just between the mouths and the ski areas would be an improvement.</p> <p>2. How a bus or a train would be able to accommodate all the trailheads in the canyons is unclear based on the information available thus far in the Blueprint. During different times of year a bus or train schedule probably would not accommodate all users. For instance "dawn patrol" skiers during weekdays getting into the canyon at 6am or sometimes earlier. Can the addition of a increased buses or a train allow for these off-peak users to still access the canyons?</p> <p>3. When are the cost/benefit analyses going to be available to help the public understand the true merit of each of the different proposed transportation options? Costs are not only monetary but environmental, watershed, etc. Closely tied to these analyses would be where the money to initiate change would come from. State? Federal? Users only?</p>	<p>2/25/2015</p>

<p>Last night was my first meeting I've attended for the Mountain Accord, and let me say that I think it was well done and I appreciated the responses from all of the panel members. I'm sure you have a number of emails to get through so I'll be as brief as possible and as thorough as needed. First, I'll tell you a bit about me and what I do here in Park City. Second, I'll bring up a couple of points that may or may not be questions or need responses. Finally, I'd appreciate it if you could pass this email along to the panel members because I appreciated each of them and would like them to know that because I know that the majority of the time communication is only given when there are complaints and it always feels good to know that their efforts are appreciated. I have a degree in mechanical engineering and have worked on projects on every continent, save Africa. Two of those projects involved a water and waste water plant, so I have had exposure to water resources from start to finish, but in reality don't think that needs to be discussed too much because it is on the forefront of most members' minds. I've lived in Summit County for eight years and in Park City for the last two years. Three and a half years ago I started a property management company and primarily manage homes in the Colony (Canyons ski in/out homes). I currently have 11 homes in the Colony and two around lower DV. So, from a business/economic perspective, development and more exposure is something I want in order for my business to grow, but not at the expense of town (using that term to include all of your 4 tenants in the blue print). I want Mountain Accord to succeed, but what does that really mean? One of the underlying themes last night with the questions was "I have mine and not everyone else can have theirs because it will destroy town". I do know this is a simplification, but I hear this all of the time doing what I do. I'm apart of architecture reviews up in the Colony and a number of people are against people building a house on an adjacent lot, and I think it is completely selfish and myopic. I think the review sessions are essential to keep the character of the Colony, but everyone has the right to build the house they want on their lot within the guidelines. I feel like this is an apt analogy with Mountain Accord. I know and understand that when multiple groups come together, as you have done with Mountain Accord, compromise is needed, and I want to encourage all actors to do that, because development, growth, and increasing pressure on the environment are going to happen no matter what occurs with Mountain Accord and I think Peter Metcalf was spot on with what he said in the beginning of the Q&amp;A. This is a great opportunity to come together with a grand plan. We have master plans in Park City (both for PC and the individual communities) and that is needed and essential because without the view at 20,000 feet, we get caught up in the minutia of individual projects which prevents us from going in the "right" general direction. Yes, individual projects or developments may deserve certain exemptions, but that doesn't change the direction of the community's master plan. This is what is needed between LCC, BCC, Mill, and the Back. We need Mountain Accord to succeed. Chris and Andy really did a great job in answering questions and concerns, as well as Laynee in monitoring/diffusing answers. I really wish the other three members would have either been more involved or been given more opportunities to give their input, especially Peter. I really feel he has a unique perspective to offer and I wish I would have heard his take on half of the questions. Again, not that I wasn't impressed Chris and Andy, but I think we were able to see the predominant perspectives being expressed and I, personally enjoy being challenged with other points of view. Not that they would have been received well, but I do think that those forums are as much about informing the public as they are listening to the public. This is both something I'd like Andy and Chris to know, and also to a criticism of how the meeting was handled. As an example, Andy multiple times confronted the issue of "PC doesn't have enough representation on Mountain Accord" with "yes I understand, but this is how I'm seeing it from the inside as a PC resident and representative" and he did it in a great way where he related and understood the issue, but told them this is the reality of how it was formed and how it has progressed. I think the final topic I'd like to bring up is the issue of how much will this cost and how do we pay for it. Being a small business owner, I understand that this is absolutely critical, and we will need it at some point, but right now we need to come up with the "it", as it was said again and again last night. We are not at the cost/pay part of it yet. We need to define the problems first, understand the growth that is projected to happen, how the environment will be effected, and define where we want to go. Then money can be discussed. And, on a related note but a bit of a side note, if costs and paying for it are that important to people, then doing nothing should have a monetary amount associated with it as well. Which is incredibly hard to define. Take the air quality in SLC for instance. It is one of the largest reasons I live up here because there are a number of reasons and motivations I have to live down there, but not with inversions and ozone levels. How do you monetize that? I know there are ways and there are models, but my point is that if we are so worried about cost of the options (and I understand they are just options at this point) I think it goes back to my "I have mine and you can't have yours" point and it really isn't about the cost of the options.</p>	<p>2/25/2015</p>
<p>Finally a couple of bullet points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Park City/Summit County does need to increase our economic diversity (understanding the contradiction considering what I do)</li> <li>• Costs should be divided between the locals and the visitors</li> <li>• Tunneling/disturbing the earth below the surface has the potential to have more dramatic water shed/aquifer/well issues than a lift/gondola/tram option</li> <li>• The elderly lady from New York made a great point and didn't deserve the jeers she received regarding the ease of public transportation, not necessarily regarding the lockers at resorts. If it isn't fast, easy, convenient, reliable, and cost effective, it will not get used because it is not integrated into our lifestyle (as it is in Boston or NY for example) nor was our city/county planning incorporating public transportation into its thought process early enough.</li> <li>• Even though it is not part of Mountain Accord exactly, making Main Street pedestrian only and expanding PC public transportation to accommodate would be a great hand-in-glove process with Mountain Accord</li> <li>• I fully agree with the "annual recreation budget for the Central Wasatch recreation organization" though I don't know what it will actually mean or how it will be managed or how it will be funded.</li> </ul>	<p>2/26/2015</p>
<p>The proposed tunnel through the mountains to Park City is harmful to Park City, because it will promote further development and congestion in Park City and the surrounding area. By creating easy access to the southern part of the Salt Lake Valley, it will promote the development of dense primary dwellings in Park City, especially sites with easy access to the tunnel. Park City will be at risk of diluting its resort feel and character and become more of a suburb to Sandy, Draper, and Cottonwood Heights. Park City and the Synderville Basin is already under intense development pressure and has terrible traffic congestion. To preserve the resort character of Park City and the Synderville Basin, action must be taken to immediately reduce traffic congestion which could be done by establishing more efficient bus transportation.</p>	<p>2/26/2015</p>
<p>Hello, I do not think we need more ski lifts in the back country or on top of the ridges of pristine mountains, so I do not support the One Wasatch initiative.  I think it is unnecessary and would further damage the landscape. I think there is plenty of opportunity and terrain available to ski/snowboard the existing areas.  I don't think people really want to travel from resort to resort by lift, so this is a vote against One Wasatch.  Thank You.</p>	<p>2/26/2015</p>
<p>Hello,  Though requested comments and opinions are likely for show and have no bearing on a decision that has likely already been made by bureaucrats and businessmen, I'll go ahead and give mine.  I am a skier, hunter and outdoor enthusiast and completely oppose development of what is being proposed. Please keep access limited and tell foreign and domestic business attempting to profit from wild places belonging to the citizens to allocate their proposal to their respective rectums.  Thanks, and have a great day.</p>	<p>2/26/2015</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What do you think about resort connectivity? Absolutely support. Would travel there to ski more often.</li> <li>• Improved bus services? Not as critical as a high speed Mountain Rail option</li> <li>• Mountain rail? Very important/critical</li> <li>• No improvements at all? Poor choice, since your competing for a recreational dollar and your competition keeps moving forward. You have an advantage with tying together your housing &amp; various mountain activities that not many can match. It takes an honest assessment of what you want to do for 10 years out. Or in another words, which direction do you choose to look out? Windshield or rear-view mirror?</li> </ul>	<p>2/26/2015</p>
<p>I take trips to Utah and the Wasatch mountains to experience the back country. I will stop taking these trips if your plans go through as proposed.</p>	<p>2/26/2015</p>
<p>I have skied the Wasatch mtns for 35 years and at every resort. Its funny that you use the "population is going to double by 2050" to claim something needs to be done. At the current rate of skier decline (primarily due to the cost) there wont be many more skiers then than now. And the snow for the park city, Deer valley and canyons is expected to decline with winter warming (want to Canyons and ski today for Snowbird? - no way they have no snow!!!!) I think the interconnect is a waste of money and a poor plan - why? Well no one can fully ski any resort in a day so why waste the money to connect them to other resorts when using it to get there will waste skiing time? People flock to certain resorts because of the specifics of that resort or its area. I ski Snowbird - why - the challenging terrain. Does Alta have that? not without a mile of traversing. If you can't ski rough steep terrain, you go to park city or Brighton. If you want and expensive lunch, go to deer valley. I think you want to connect the resorts so you can "claim" to have the biggest ski area in north America - not because it will add to the skiing experience. It will not make the skiing experience any better - our resorts are VERY close (only minutes apart) compared to Colorado who is Utahs biggest competitor. The cost of all this should be paid by the resorts (ie the Skiers) NOT by tax payers. Skis, boots, bindings, poles, coats, helmet and pants is nearly \$2000 which places skiing out reach for many would be skier enthusiasts. A simple hot dog is \$13 - really - yes. Skiing was \$10 in 1980 and now is nearly \$100 and at that rate of it will \$1000 per day by 2050. You should be addressing that if you want more tourism. Buses are good and we already have them and a lot of people use them.</p>	<p>2/26/2015</p>
<p>I would love to see better transportation to the pool of area's in Central Wasatch. We stay in PC with family and many times trek via car over to the other area's. Having a chair, tram or other method that quickly would get us from one location to another would be great. In addition to this improving upon the bus system within PC would help as well. I would love nothing more than to park our vehicle at the house and not have to use it at all while we are there.</p>	<p>2/26/2015</p>
<p>The concept of connected resorts seems nothing more than a commercial gimmick. While it may allow some people staying in a particular resort access to all of the terrain, it comes at a cost of time required to get to your destination, provided you even know exactly where you want to go. Hence, the time left to the actual enjoyment of skiing will be far less than desirable or imagined. While it may preclude the need of a car, the transit option seem like a far more comprehensive solution. The ever so increasing traffic to the resorts, road closures and the real issue which is the air quality for the valley which anyone who regularly visits Salt Lake City has surely noticed, could be potentially all alleviated, with the dedicated mass transit option. That goes for both people coming from the valleys as well as the people staying at the resorts themselves. As a regular visitor and a big fan of Utah skiing, there is no doubt in my mind that the transit option is the better way to improve all aspects of the Wasatch experience and is the only year-round solution.</p>	<p>2/26/2015</p>
<p>Chalk my family and I up as supporters of the ONE Wasatch concept. It's somewhat polarizing, but the pros outweigh the cons for us.</p>	<p>2/26/2015</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What do you think about resort connectivity?</li> <li>• I disagree with the connecting all of the resorts on the Wasatch Front. I believe it will be more of a negative impact on why people come to Utah to ski. Each resort brings its own special entity and people should be able to have that resorts experience exclusively. Is Ski Utah promoting riding lifts all day or skiing pow?</li> <li>• Would you like to see improved, year-round public transportation?</li> <li>• Yes, I would go up into the canyons more often if there was public transportation available. Especially a mono rail or trax going up Parleys Way.</li> <li>• Improved bus services?</li> </ul>	<p>2/26/2015</p>
<p>As long as the improvements don't take away from the beauty of the mountains a connection between resorts would be great. Improvements should not look like an above ground transit rail system. I will be heading to DV tomorrow to enjoy a week of skiing. B</p>	<p>2/26/2015</p>
<p>connectivity would be awesome!</p>	<p>2/26/2015</p>
<p>I vote for no improvements at all in terms of transportation services and connecting various ski areas. Let the respective ski areas improve their own resorts.</p>	<p>2/26/2015</p>
<p>Are we really going to let a handful of back country skiers determine the economic tourism future of Utah? What about the masses of recreational skiers that should have the same opportunity to enjoy a European ski experience. It's going to happen regardless of what any Mountain Accord wishes might be. The bigger challenge will be how to deal with the infrastructure issues down the road when the marketing engines of Vail, Deer Valley and the Cummings figure what's at stake and crank up the volume. Wake up!!!</p>	<p>2/26/2015</p>
<p>For two reasons I'm against this proposal. Panel members at public meetings have made it clear that preserving the watershed and environment is the core issue in any plan for our mountains. I believe the only way to ensure both is to restrict the flow of people and vehicles in the canyons. The Proposal places no restrictions on individual traffic and could end up dumping numbers of people into the canyons and Park City year round. Secondly, according to articles in the Tribune, the State's long-range infrastructure budget is woefully underfunded. Nice-to-have trains and tunnels in the mountains could not and should not stand up to the needs for roads and utilities in the valley. Instead of this dramatic proposal, I suggest making both canyons gated entrances in a manner similar to Millcreek's. I also suggest elevating the standing of One Wasatch's proposal to connect the ridge lines with 2 or 3 additional lifts that would accommodate winter enthusiasts only. The give and take land swaps in the Accord Proposal consolidate and extend public lands. This should become a major focus for the Accord. I think it's a great idea to connect all of the resorts together.</p>	<p>2/26/2015</p>
<p>I think the Mountain Accord blueprint is a fantastic proposal. The connectivity of Utah resorts seems to be inevitable, and should be done in a way that is low impact as possible on the environment &amp; backcountry. The idea of having train transit system connecting Big &amp; Little Cottonwood Canyons, &amp; Park City is amazing, and long overdue (I really should have been instituted for the 2002 Olympics instead of the giant freeways!). So reduce car traffic, ease transportation between SLC &amp; the ski resorts, and protect the existing backcountry with land transfers? YES!</p>	<p>2/26/2015</p>
<p>Thank you for this opportunity. Having lived and skied here since 1977, I am an opponent of development outside of current resort boundaries. Stay with the current footprint, allow improvements within that footprint. I would hope for some improved mass transit including trains to effectively eliminate vehicles except for property owners. Pray for snow!!!</p>	<p>2/26/2015</p>
<p>I am from the northeast. I have been coming to Utah to ski, primarily Little Cottonwood Canyon since 1975. I have seen what growth has done to the Park City/Deer Valley/The Canyons area and it is saddening. I am against any further development in this area and further against linking of all the resorts in this area.</p>	<p>2/26/2015</p>

<p>Watershed! Watershed! Watershed! First concern for a growing population. Love the interconnect option on Ski Resorts. Love connecting hiking trails. Prefer to allow some commercial development in established areas in exchange for land and water swaps to the UWC National Forest.</p> <p>Prefer to smooth out the "islands" of private/state/federal land where they make sense. Prefer Rapid Transit Natural Gas Buses from major connection points (Trax, PNR's, City Centers) over the Train. Prefer train from an ecological/avalanche perspective, but feel that cost to build /inconvenience of train favors rapid bus service</p> <p>Dislike the idea of any other aerial transport (gondolas) that are beyond the 3-4 being proposed in One Wasatch.</p>		2/26/2015
<p>To Whom It May Concern, I'm a relative long-time Utah resident (32 years and counting), and have lived a couple of years in SLC and the rest in Park City. I am a lifelong skier and enjoy all of the Wasatch resorts, particularly the seven in the Central Wasatch and those in question in regard to One Wasatch/Mountain Accord/whatever you'd like to call it. For the record, I ski both inbounds as well as backcountry (about 60-70), enjoying the unique attributes and offerings of both. I am a HUGE supporter of resort connectivity, fully appreciating the fact that it would set the Utah ski experience apart from anything else in North America, thus attracting more out-of-state visitors and further offsetting out tax burden. To be perfectly honest, I see it as a no-brainer and am still a bit surprised it hasn't happened in the 30+ years of living here. The arguments against it, in my opinion, don't really hold up. There's very little quality backcountry terrain interconnectivity would impact — the majority of the proposed terrain does NOT offer good backcountry skiing. The small part that does (Grizzly Gulch, etc.) is a highway of backcountry skiers already. Plus, that land is currently private which should allow the landowner to do with what he/she would like (following all guidelines — EIS, etc. — of course). The landowners (resorts) don't want to trash their resorts, so they'll do the right thing in developing the interconnecting aspects of their respective resorts. In terms of it being a watershed, less snow is not going to fall simply because there are another half-dozen lifts — I'm not a scientist, but I'm pretty sure snow/rain falls regardless of development and/or open space, all of which goes through a strict sanitation process before going into our homes/schools. Please let me know if I'm wrong here. As a resident of Park City while being employed in Salt Lake City, I would love to see improved, year-round transportation (including affordability). A daily 59 roundtrip bus fare is simply too much and does not attract daily users. Improved bus service would be a help, at least up/down Parley's. I feel bus service is pretty good to/from the Big and Little Cottonwood resorts. I feel the best long-term option is mountain rail, connecting all resorts and communities. For the naysayers that claim Europe is not an "apples-to-apples" case study are simply wrong. Rail (light, heavy, mountain, cog) works wonderfully throughout Europe. It would take a little "training" for the public to utilize rail efficiently, but so did TRAX and look how successful it has been. Regardless, the Wasatch Front and Back, and everything in between, most definitely needs addressing from all stakeholders and interests. Thank you for your continued efforts to think and plan for the long-term benefits of visitors and locals alike (and our children's children).</p>		2/26/2015
<p>I think the idea of connecting the mountains is an outstanding idea. I would like to see Canyon bus service from the Edgemont condos to the Canyons once again. This was a service in the years past but was discontinued when the Cabriole was added. We really miss it.</p>		2/26/2015
<p>I am 100% in support of both the Mountain Accord and the One Wasatch concepts. It is imperative that we come up with a solution to the traffic in the canyons that will benefit everyone that lives in and/or visits the Wasatch Front, while still preserving the environment and the unique experience that the Wasatch Mountains provide for year round recreational activities.</p>		2/26/2015
<p>I personally would love to have a transportation route from Salt Lake to Deer Valley via Bus or tram because it is very hard driving all the way from Ogden to Park City every day or weekend. I would much rather drive to SLC and jump on a bus. Just like in Ogden, you can catch a UTA bus and go to Snowbird or Powder Mountain. I need more availability. Also, there should be a bus pass that is only valid for the ski routes so that I don't have to purchase bus passes that I will not use all year.</p> <p>Thanks!!</p>		2/26/2015
<p>Clearly, not all of the resorts are of equal desirability or popularity. Also, only 2 are snowboard free, which sets them apart and needs to be maintained. Transportation from each at a minimal cost or a discounted ticket for splitting the day would be sufficient.</p>		2/26/2015
<p>Resort connectivity is a good thing</p>		2/26/2015
<p>I am in complete support of connecting the 7 resorts of big and little cottonwoods canyons and park city resorts. I grew up in nearby Evanston, Wyoming skiing all these resorts through my graduation from BYU. I return often to ski Utah now that I live in Southern California. Environmentalists should appreciate this connect all resorts concept as traffic and parking will be enhanced. One can take the bus to any one resort and connect to other resorts without driving which results in less fumes and pollution and fewer cars in the various canyons, etc. this will double tourism and revenue as it will be the only European style ski experience and will position Utah at the top of the industry. We can balance the resort with progress and tourism, especially when those who ski and snowboard love these mountain as well as the environmentalists who fight against expansion. We see ourselves as stewards of these beautiful mountains!</p>		2/26/2015
<p>I've been a resident since 1989 and ski the Wasatch Front areas regularly. A few comments about your proposals that I hope you'll take into account as this thing moves forward.</p> <p>1) I'm for protecting those lands from further development, but I'm worried that, even though they may be protected, they'll still get something developed on them. I love the Cottonwood Canyons as they currently are and would not want to see more commercial or residential development in the canyons. They are a beautiful place to visit year round and development and lighting spoils that. One question I have is, is the existing Wilderness Areas that are near the valley floor already protected from development? It seems that development keeps creeping up the mountain. I'd like to see that stop.</p>		2/26/2015
<p>I briefly reviewed the blueprint created by the Mountain Accord. I applaud the work that has been done to this point. Taking the time to put a plan in place to preserve these areas is very important and certainly needs to happen before it is too late. I agree we need to have transportation options, other than individual vehicles, to access the mountains in the study area. Additional options for public transportation, including buses and especially mountain rail, are both viable options and should be considered part of the plan. Use of the Cottonwood Canyons as well as a rail system from the airport to Park City would be a great idea.</p> <p>I am concerned about the impact ONE Wasatch will have on those environmentally sensitive areas between the resorts. Connecting the resorts in some fashion seems to be a good idea to move people from one location to another. However, instead of connecting the resorts with chairlifts and runs, I would rather see these areas left for backcountry activities and access through hiking, mountain biking and ski touring. Would use of a tram or gondola system to connect the resorts from point to point have less of an impact? I don't know the answer but maybe something to be considered.</p> <p>Thanks for the work all of you are doing.</p>		2/26/2015
<p>Dear Mountain Accord Executive Board: I would like to thank you all for the hard work you have done on scoping-out the vision of Mountain Accord (Blueprint)... I attended the Q&amp;A session in Park City earlier this week and found it very informative and it has helped me formulate my opinion of the concept / recommendation. Overall, as a resident of Park City, I would have to say that I'm not in favor of the proposed blueprint, based on the following points: • First, I disagree with the proposal of building a tunnel between Little Cottonwood Canyon (Brighton) and Park City. I don't believe you have presented a truly rational environmental / economic reason for creating this link. Also, based on initial cost estimate, there is no way to justify the massive expense (Billions) to the taxpayers. The existing connection (I-80) between SLC and PC will always represent the best way to move people between these two economic zones. It already has the capacity to deal with the projected growth over the next 20 years and it truly represent the quickest way for a majority of people to get from point A to B. • I'm also very suspicious of the land swaps that are being proposed in the Big &amp; Little Cottonwood Canyons... I feel like these are basically incentives that are being given to those resorts / land owners to help sell this plan under the halo of protecting the environment. While it wasn't openly discussed at the meeting, from what I see, these swaps would basically shutdown the One Wasatch concept. While I'm not 100% behind the One Wasatch yet, I do feel that it is a more reasonable / realistic approach to connecting the resorts. I understand the watershed concerns, but there are already dozens of lifts effectively operating in Big &amp; Little Cottonwood that aren't impacting the watershed. At the end of the day, for Park City, I believe that we need to figure-out how to best deal with the increase of traffic coming off of I-80 to the resorts. We can't build a wall around Park City... the resorts up here still have a lots of untapped capacity (skier days) and we need to figure out a way to handle the growth responsibly. Also, so you understand, I never supported the interconnect concept (Ski Link or One Wasatch) based on the idea it would take cars off the road. However I do support these concepts based on creating a one-of-a-kind skier / rider experience that would truly differentiate Utah from our competition. Again, thank you for all your hard work and for providing the opportunity for me to provide my feedback.</p>		2/26/2015
<p>As an avid skier, I can tell you that the most appealing places to visit are the ones which have several resorts from which to pick. SLC is good, because I can go to any one of 9 resorts depending on the road conditions and snow conditions. Lake Tahoe/Reno is a great destination because, again, there are 8 resorts to visit (or not) depending on conditions. You have and are what skiers want. LEAVE IT ALONE. As a skier, good skiing is much more important to me than some advertised supposedly "glamorous" condition of unlimited trails. If I wanted to ski under glamorous conditions, I could probably go to Aspen, CO. I will no longer ski at Val because of what they have done to that mountain and to the parking situation. They have priced the activity of skiing out of financial reach of the average person. Vail is for the rich. That is fine.</p> <p>SLC has been and is GREAT because the entire scene has been for the average person who happens to love to ski. It is not out of financial reach. If you let the Vail committee come in and change SLC, you will be changing the SLC experience. BUT MAKE NO MISTAKE, YOU WILL NOT BE MAKING CHANGES FOR THE SKIER, YOU WILL BE MAKING CHANGES FOR THE CEO'S AND ADVERTISERS. In further answer about opinions:</p> <p>The buses are fantastic! They make the mountains accessible without having to drive a fearful drive on the edge of the cliffs to get to the mountains. And they save a person the worry about having an accident (bad for the other person and yourself). It seemed to me that the skis were better on the outside of the buses than in the interior bins to drive. The equipment all bangs against each other scoring the boards and banging the edges of the equipment. It is hard to spend big bucks to fine tune your equipment only to watch it bang around against all the metal in those bins.</p> <p>Most people thank the drivers when exiting the busses. Just ask them. I would be glad to testify about any of the above.</p>		2/26/2015
<p>The concept of linking all those resorts with a chair lift sounds very enticing, YET, being an active skier and having skied those resorts this season as well as two years ago, I do not think I would spend money for a lift ticket to ride a chair lift for an extended period. I want to ski each resort. To ride a lift or series of lifts from the CANYONS to ALTA would likely take considerable time. I would rather ski each resort separately by driving to the particular resort on a given day.</p>		2/26/2015
<p>I think ONE Wasatch is a great idea. They do it in Europe why not in Utah. And it would have to be good for the tourist economy.</p>		2/26/2015
<p>As a lifelong resident of this general area and a skier for over 40 years, I would like to urge you to reconsider any more expansion, such as chairlift connectivity or rail service plans. The Wasatch Front ski areas have already attracted so many outside tourists that it is difficult for families living on the national average wage or lower to even take our families skiing or even teach them anymore. It's simply just getting too expensive for those of us on average wages who have frequented the resorts and supported them for so many years to even go anymore. Please do not expand anymore in this direction. It will only drive up prices further, and make it even more out of reach for those of us who have been the supportive backbone of the resorts and kept them in business for decades. Rather than expand, may I suggest offering more locals discounts (such as those for Southern California residents at Disneyland) where Utah residents can get in at a substantial discount by showing their drivers license at the ticket window. Please reconsider any more expansion. Thank you.</p>		2/26/2015
<p>No to One wasatch. Make a universal season pass good for all of the 7 wasatch resorts. Make a light rail in the canyons (big and little) and charge cars to drive.</p>		2/26/2015
<p>Dear Committee Members, I have been following the Mountain Accord process for some time and have attended all but one of your public meetings over the past two weeks. I believe the recommendations which you have been presenting are excellent and should be pursued vigorously. My wife and I have been visiting Alta, Snowbird and Salt Lake City for the past fifteen years. We have observed considerable change during that period of time, not all of it positive. The proposals you have made to protect water resources, increased protection of fragile ecosystems (through land transfers, land purchases, limitations on vehicular traffic), the installation of a light rail (train) system to serve Little Cottonwood Canyon, Big Cottonwood Canyon and connect both Solitude/Brighton and Park City, and build the economy in designated areas are creative and necessary for protecting the Wasatch and the quality of life for generations to come. I was particularly disappointed by the reactions of many at the Alta Open House meeting on Feb. 23rd. The overt nimbyism was disappointing at many levels. Their resistance to change, despite the many environmental benefits the Mountain Accord process offers was difficult to understand. The concept of trading mutually beneficial outcomes and respecting private property rights seemed to elude many in the audience. It was something that I did not see at any of the other Open Houses. The discussion by the Mayor of Alta and the participation of Town Council and Planning Board Members was encouraging. Hopefully they will take a broader, long term view of the proposals and not "cave into" a vocal minority. Change occurs everyday, managing that change thoughtfully is the most important responsibility of any public official. I believe Heritices (sp?) is quoted as saying, "The only thing in life that is permanent is change", in about 64 BC. Hopefully the majority of the public and public servants, including Local, State and Federal officials, will embrace the proposals the Mountain Accord is presenting and they can be implemented over the next decade for the benefit of future generations. Thank you for your efforts.</p>		2/26/2015
<p>I am a huge supporter of the One Wasatch concept. I grew up spending ski vacations in Europe and being able to ski area to area will be wonderful and a huge attraction to ski tourists. One Wasatch allows us to differentiate ourselves from other areas in a North America.</p>		2/26/2015
<p>I am a proponent of more buses up to the ski areas. Although light rail sounds appealing, I think the cost would be too expensive. We take the free bus in Park City all the time, matter of fact we want to get a larger place, but will not look at anything that is not on the bus route.</p> <p>I did read somewhere if Mountain Accord's plan was adopted then One Wasatch could not occur. I would think that would be a huge mistake.</p> <p>Thank you for reaching out to get people's opinion.</p>		2/26/2015
<p>Leave it the way nature intended!! There is no reason to interconnect these great resorts. Stop trying to spoil a great thing! (Skied Utah 9 out of the last 12 years and keep coming back) ☺</p>		2/26/2015
<p>I believe that linking the resorts via chairlift is the best way to reduce traffic congestion and CO2 emissions by thousands of workers and visitors to the resorts. Additionally, linking the ski resorts would be a tremendous boost to the local tourism economy—rivaling and even surpassing the ski visitor experience of multi-resort passes at the Val Resorts in Colorado. Utah has the benefit of 11 ski resorts within 1 hour of SLC airport. Having all the resorts linked and with reciprocal tickets would increase skier days in Utah and boost the economy. The impact on the backcountry by lifts linking the resorts would be far less than the environmental impacts to the backcountry by increased traffic congestion and hydrocarbon emissions.</p>		2/26/2015
<p>I worry that Brighton and Solitude will feel like Alta — I love Alta, but for a different reason. Solitude is so reasonable and family friendly. I would be sad to see that lost. (I visit almost every year with our kids)</p>		2/26/2015
<p>Hello I am an avid snowbird/alta skier and local to Sandy. I have 46 days so far this season. I am 15 so my opinion does not matter as much but one Wasatch sounds like a very good idea I only have one problem. As it is snowboarders are not allowed in Alta and so I wondered how that will work out and I don't want the resorts to become super congested its already busy enough as it is and management of the masses would be another concern of mine but overall I think it is a very cool idea and I would love to see it happen. But I'm still a bias local and would love to keep the numbers down at the resorts. Also would costs of resort passes go up because of this? I just love the resorts the way they are and I don't want them to become a massive pandemonium that takes 20 minutes to get through a line. However overall I would be very interested to see what it could do for the economy of the greatest snow on earth.</p>		2/26/2015
<p>And oh my word if we could improve the damn resort transportation it would be terrific! I kid you not the ski bus sucks anything to improve transportation would be awesome.</p>		2/26/2015
<p>Any form of transportation that would allow city dwellers access to mountains is ALWAYS good.</p> <p>Anything we can do as stake holders to keep individual gas engines off the roads and decrease SLC pollution is always good.</p> <p>Anything we can do to keep tourism dollars driving the economy will keep the mountains sacred</p> <p>To that end lets move people by rail (airport to Park City Kimball Junction would be prime) LNG intermountain routes and gondolas linking the Cottonwoods, Park City would be a benefit</p> <p>Many thanks</p>		2/26/2015

I like the idea of resorts connected and mountain rail.		2/26/2015
I love the idea of connecting the 7 resorts that would make a unique experience and hopefully attract more skiers to Utah as now more people travel to CO to spend their money. I would also suggest high speed lifts from the Valley Floor to the ski mountain base for future expansion similar to what they do in Europe where everything is down in the valley and the low impact lifts transport people to the resort bases.		2/26/2015
I DO NOT want One Wasatch to be installed and in operation. There are way too many reasons NOT to do this and only one to do it... Greed.  No Thanks You!  Powder To The People!		2/26/2015
When I ski, I want my car at the base of the lifts. Improve the roads and parking and forget everything else.		2/26/2015
What do you think about resort connectivity? Un-needed, wrong for mountain ecology and avalanche control risks. Encourages resort sprawl takes away from pristine scenic mountain experience. You already have helicopters to allow the access for those who don't want to earn their turns by a little physical effort. Please answer this question how many people have taken the guided resort to resort tour this year? How many people bought a lift ticket at the Big 5 areas you want to connect? I bet that statistic is less than 1/2 1 percent of all those skiers. A set of linked ski lifts will not help cut congestion or improve transportation. A ski lift ride to work from Park City to Alta would likely cost more than the current \$108.00 Alta-Snowbird Day Pass. This is a far cry from the cost of UTA bus fare Ski One-way Fare of \$4.50.  Would you like to see improved, year-round public transportation? Lifts between resorts will not provide that just higher costs.  Improved bus services? Yes, UTA add more buses during peak times weekends and holidays  Mountain rail? Not needed  No improvements at all? <u>read above!!</u> Wow...I love the ideas...I hope you are true to the commitment of preserving the natural resources!		2/26/2015
The Mountain Accord is much more than the future of snow sports! As you already know, Alta is the "linchpin" of this negotiation. If you can not satisfy the owners of Alta with certainty, the effort will fail. One of my concerns is with the Save Our Canyons group. The executive director's language does not convey a real commitment to the proposal. Frankly, I think he believes major re-negotiations will occur during the EIS process. I don't mean to be negative, but I have been through this type of regional land planning process and understand the many pitfalls. You have put together a great vision and proposal for the future of the Wasatch!		2/26/2015
Thanks for asking!  Love the idea but understand the need to ensure environmental impacts are minimized.  Our daughter goes to Univ of Utah and our family has a vacation home in Midway, so we've been coming out twice a year for almost 10 years and have seen the growth. It sure would be convenient to have a simple back way up to Brighton or Alta from Midway since that existing road is only a 3 season road, instead of now driving an hour and polluting SLC more. What I don't know though is how much traffic that really is and if the downside of expanding that existing road or putting a Gondola up that backside would be worse than the big loop thru SLC up 215 to the Cottonwood canyon resorts.  Another value seems to be reinforced by the reality that if current forecasts turn out to be true, the amount of skiable snow is going to continue to decrease, so the more the resorts can work together to share access to the highest peaks and elevation will give everyone an opportunity to survive if maintaining snow at less than say 7,500 feet is not long term viable.  Happy to help, so put me on a list of volunteers if appropriate.  Thanks I have not followed all the discussions very closely, but I have listened and read a bit.		2/27/2015
In general, I'm not a fan of making all the connections. I enjoy the mountains in all seasons of the year (cross country, back county and resort skiing, snow shoeing, hiking, biking, backpacking) alone and with my family and friends. That's part of the reason I enjoy living along the Wasatch Front. The various resorts in the study area are amazing, but nothing I've seen/read so far has convinced me of a significant benefit from connecting them. I think a small number of people would benefit from the development, but average folks who live here, people who visit from out of town, the community in general and the environment would likely see little to no benefit.  I think there is a lot that could be done to improve access, connect accommodations, and all that sort of thing, but I don't think adding connecting tunnels, lifts, etc is desirable or required to encourage economic improvement.  I'm certainly open to being convinced otherwise, but as I mentioned, nothing I've seen or read so far has helped me see a value to this connection plan.		2/27/2015
Having moved out of the area years ago my knowledge may be some what out dated, here is my opinion. Knowing that the Salt Lake metro area will continue to quickly grow and prosper, with the sensitive high mountain water use- storage issues, along with the value and popularity resulting from alpine tourism creates many tough decisions all with an essential visionary perspective. The goal of increased access to the sensitive fragile mountain environment, I believe, screams for high quality resource management. An efficient mass transit seems to be an obvious choice, while the interconnect concept provides a uniqueness in marketing of the tourism dollar. It would seem that the general tourist needs a simple interconnect infrastructure beyond a lift pass before they will plan a vacation utilizing these unique options. Taking the tour to other canyon ski areas has always been an amazing experience, though a bit inconvenient when returning to the hosting hotel at the end of the day. These issues are not new, Europe has decades of experience in these areas.  avid skier for many decades.		2/27/2015
What do you think about resort connectivity? Excellent idea. Would you like to see improved, year-round public transportation? To be able to stay in the area and be transported to the ski areas sounds great! Improved bus services? Yes Mountain rail? Interesting. Sounds promising. No improvements at all? No		2/27/2015
Been going to Wasatch area for 40+ years & my son lives in PK City I think the all area connectivity is great for for skiers and economically as well for the entire area.		2/27/2015
I have looked over the proposed plans and I am in total favor of moving the process forward. It is good for Utah, good for skiers and riders and a solid idea that's time has come to move into action.		2/27/2015
It would be a huge advantage over other Western resorts		2/27/2015
Hello,  I think that the Mountain Accord should release the name of the person/company who comes up with the train/bus system that will travel up Little Cottonwood Canyon. I love the idea that a plan will be proposed, however if it is run by UTA/TRAX, it does not leave me confident that there will be an efficient system in place. I have tried to use this system, and have found it very unreliable. More specifically, the frequency of stops is too low, so I feel that I cannot count on the system if one happens to be full, or I miss a car. If UTA/TRAX does oversee this plan, I would like them to publish the plan, and hopefully have some other organization make comments on this plan (I don't think the public, including myself, have any idea how to create a functioning, efficient, transportation system).  Best regards,  Emerson Mann		2/27/2015
Expansion is a good thing.  One thing you are missing is the fact skiing is not growing as a sport. I work in the business.  The industry has to attract younger skiers and snowboarders. You are pricing families out of the market.  Ignore the environmentalists since they don't care about the planet, just controlling your lives.		2/28/2015
Many interesting suggestions are included in the Mountain Accord Blueprint. However before adopting any of the "front runner" ideas many details need to be addressed. Basically there are two competing factions for the well being of BCC and LCC: the tourist ski industry and locals enjoying the wilderness close to home. Decisions must address which is the more important since even compromise (which the Blueprint makes a valiant attempt to do) will favor one over the other. Up front I will admit I favor the local user-winter and summer. Transportation: The train up LCC seems like a good idea on the surface, but without additional parking somewhere near the base of the canyon its value is diminished. Many of us on the east bench have no easy access to public transportation to get to the canyons and so must drive. Frequency of travel is also an issue. I've heard many complaints that during "off" hours the buses do not run frequently enough to accommodate users. There is also the question of stops. Will the train stop at the ice climbing area and at White Pine or is this really just a resort transit system? If so why are taxpayers footing the bill? Given that only 7% of Utahns ski is spending billions of Utah money to service out of state skiers the best use of the money? I realize that the ski industry contributes to the overall economic well being of Utah but at what point is the tail wagging the dog? Beyond this question the cost of the train to the user is key to its being used. I doubt that it would be cheaper for a family of 4 to take the train than to drive. If the goal is to discourage driving rather than allow more folks up the canyon there has to be an economic incentive to use the train system. Perhaps showing the receipt could get the user a discount of 1.5 times the cost of the ticket on their lift pass. The tunnel suggestions present another interesting suggestion. I may have missed something in my admittedly hasty reading but these are private vehicle tunnels, right? If that is the case and all three tourist ski domains are linked doesn't that increase traffic in the canyons, rather than decrease it? Other than present a unique marketing point for the ski areas, is a tunnel between Big Cottonwood and Park City really better than just improving and plowing the existing road over Guardsman Pass? And again the question of cost rears large. With the very likely continued cutting of Federal spending, where will the funds come from? If the tunnels are a toll road usage will be discouraged. However if connecting the resorts via tunnels serves to satisfy the "One Wasatch" concept, it is much preferable to lifts. But more on that in my recreation response. Enhanced public transportation between SLC and Park City would be real boon in both summer and winter. With all the biking available in the PC area and the Crest Trail offering a human powered return such a transit system would be well used. Not to mention the commuters who could be enticed to give up driving Parleys canyon. Speaking of biking (I digress) there was talk of building a bike route up Mill Creek Canyon. Is that still on the table and part of the Mountain Accord agenda? Recreation: Ski area expansion: The proposal allows for expansion seemingly beyond existing borders which is contrary to present guidelines. Admittedly with the mitigating "retirement" of private lands this is not all bad. However the exact alignments of the Alta and Solitude lifts are essential to this being a real compromise. When canyons built the 9990 lift there was much talk about locating it so that back country access would involve substantial hiking to somewhat preserve what had been exclusive non lift served terrain. That didn't happen and three major destinations for back country skiing were lost to the "mobs" existing the lift and a lesser impact felt in surrounding area. ANY IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HONEYCOMB LIFT AND THE GRIZZLY GULCH/TUSCORORA LIFT MUST MANDATE THAT THE LIFT PLACEMENT NOT ALLOW SIMPLE ACCESS TO TERRAIN NOW EXCLUSIVELY USED BY HIKERS. Well some of the terrain the Honeycomb lift could incorporate is now used by Powderbirds so we have competing "economic interests".		2/28/2015

<p>The proposed tunnels and lifts would do much more than just let people get to more resorts faster: they have the potential to change the entire dynamic of the winter recreation scene. Public transportation through the tunnels allows "side country" resort skiers to enter areas reached by the new lifts, and ski terrain now used by backcountry skiers and easily return via the tunnels.</p> <p>The recreation compromises seem to preserve some open space at the expense of the non lift served skier. Over the 30 years that I have been back country skiing I have seen much of the terrain available when I started disappear (Honeycomb, Supreme and East Castle, Snake Creek Pass, Lake Catherine area, Dutch Draw, MacDonalds Draw and West Monitor to a lesser extent. The lift and tunnel alignment threatens East Bowl of Silver Fork, Catherine Pass and the bowl into Brighton, Wolverine, Tuscarora, Patsy Marley, West Bowl of Silver Fork, Main Days Fork, No Name bowl, South Monitor and all of Willow. These are among the premier backcountry ski areas in the Wasatch and the reason why many professional folk live here and contribute greatly to the economy of Utah. Losing this terrain to de facto ski area expansion would be a tragedy for local users.</p> <p>Water:</p> <p>As we prepare for growth in the Salt Lake Valley we should be looking to preserve water, not make more available for snowmaking. One could argue that water out for snow making is water in when it melts, but much is lost to evaporation as it sprays and to sublimation as it sits as snow. I am also concerned about water quality as tunnels and rail lines are built and as traffic increases due to the tunnels.</p> <p>Final comment:</p> <p>It would be great if we had the collective courage to say to the ski areas "we appreciate all you do for our economy, but we don't need any more. Therefore changes to encourage growth are off the table. We will however do all that is possible to insure that the CURRENT level of activity is maintained."</p> <p>This is a good idea that would reduce auto traffic up Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. Visitors could leave from the Park City side and eliminate a lot of driving.</p>		2/28/2015
<p>Mountain Accord: Since 1988, I have been a resident of Salt Lake City, Utah. I am active in hiking, cross country skiing, and snowshoeing in the Wasatch Mountains. I will comment on the Mountain Accord Proposed Central Wasatch Blueprint. I appreciate and respect the need to develop a plan for the Wasatch Mountains, the Wasatch Front, and the Wasatch Back. It is great that the proposed blueprint supports the protection of the natural environment and watershed of the Central Wasatch. I am also in favor of the expansion of mass transportation services to mountain destinations. However, I am concerned about some of the proposed actions in the Blueprint to improve transit. I understand that the ambitious plans to construct light rail transit or rapid bus transit on an exclusive guideway up Little Cottonwood Canyon (LCC) need National Environmental Policy Review (NEPA). I am uneasy that such an extensive construction project could have a negative impact on the quality of the watershed. I am also concerned that the additional guideway (with an accompanying snowshed) for the train or rapid bus will diminish the visual beauty of LCC. I am also concerned about the environmental impact of constructing tunnel connections between Alta and Brighton and between Brighton and Park City. Again, I recognize that those projects need NEPA review. I oppose the potential alternative plan to construct aerial connections between Brighton and Park City. Any aerial connection between resort areas will diminish the beauty of the Wasatch and negatively impact the natural character that is valued by many Wasatch visitors. The need to improve mass transit between the Salt Lake Valley and Park City and up and down Millcreek, BCC, and LCC is necessary. However, I question the need to have mass transportation connections between Alta and Brighton and between Brighton and Park City. The inter resort connections would not benefit the majority of the visitors to the Wasatch. Another concern regarding trains, tunnels, and aerial systems is the high construction and maintenance costs. How would these projects be funded? As proposed in the Blueprint, I support implementing disincentives to discourage and limit private motor vehicle use in Millcreek Canyon, Big Cottonwood Canyon (BCC), and LCC. I support shuttle service for Millcreek Canyon. I support expanded year round bus service in BCC. Instead of trains, tunnels, and aerial systems, I would like to propose that a bus/shuttle system be organized to serve Millcreek, BCC, and LCC. This bus shuttle system that I have in mind is similar to what is used on the South Rim of Grand Canyon National Park and Zion Canyon in Zion National Park. In this system, private motor vehicle use will be limited to canyon residents and few visitors and canyon workers that obtain a limited number of passes. All other visitors and workers would use the buses / shuttles. The bus /shuttle system would use the existing roadways in Millcreek, BCC, and LCC. This alternative would not require the construction of additional guideways in the environmentally sensitive canyons. The bus/shuttle system does require the construction of transit hubs in the Salt Lake valley preferably near the Wasatch canyons. Because of the high demand for parking at the trailheads during every season, this bus system needs to function all year and have routes that stop at the trailheads. During the peak ski seasons, express routes to the resorts should be utilized. Another transportation solution that should be considered is a shuttle/bus route that links the trailheads and parking areas along the west flank of the Wasatch. This Wasatch Front route could link the West Grandeur, Neff's Canyon, Mount Olympus, Ferguson Canyon, Bells Canyon trailheads and the 3900 South/Wasatch, 6200South/Wasatch, mouth of BCC, mouth of LCC parking areas. This project should not be very problematic to implement because the park and ride lots are already constructed and are in use. The proposed Cottonwood Canyon Taskforce Recommendations (CTFR) is complex. The negotiations must be very challenging. The potential exchange of base areas from the United States Forest Service (USFS) to ski resorts and the exchange of upper elevation has benefits to ski resorts interests, backcountry recreation interest, and government land management (USFS). The proposed exchange could also help maintain and manage the watershed. Because the process is still going through negotiations, I am not comfortable to fully support or oppose the tentative recommendations. Because I value the natural character of the Wasatch, I hope that Grizzly Gulch would remain undeveloped. If Alta decides to develop Grizzly Gulch for resort skiing, that would be a big loss of an area that has been natural and a place for undeveloped recreation. Since the Mountain Accord Blueprint is setting a plan for the Wasatch Mountains and the local communities I would like the Blueprint recognize the importance of preserving Willow Heights area in BCC as undeveloped.</p>		2/28/2015
<p>I support that the Forest Service land in Willow Heights maintain the 3.1w management prescription (Protection, Maintenance, or Restoration of Biophysical Resources-Watershed Emphasis). Willow Heights is a good area for backcountry skiing and snowshoeing. Because most of the moderate angle terrain at the heads of BCC and LCC is reserved for resort downhill skiing, it is important to preserve Willow Heights from development. Preservation of Willow Heights will be more important if Grizzly Gulch, Hidden Canyon and Hidden Canyon and part of Silver Fork become developed for downhill skiing. Although the Mountain Accord Blueprint does not state that Willow Heights will be developed, the exact plans for the transportation solutions proposed in the Blueprint are not defined. If the plan for a tunnel from Brighton to Park City does not work out, I do not want an alternative Brighton to Park City interconnect to include Willow Heights! The Mountain Accord Blue proposes limited development in the mountains that will be focused around thoughtfully designed transit stops. I also wish to emphasize that any new development not compromise the watershed and not be an extension of the urban sprawl. No ugly high rise structures and no amusement park rides. It is important that the mountain and forest character of the Wasatch be supported. The Mountain Accord Blueprint plan to improve the regional trail system. Hopefully the financial means to maintain and construct new trails will improve. I think that the initial emphasis should be to repair existing trails rather than to construct new trails. The Blueprint proposes that recreation destinations be connected with trails. Please note that there are good existing trails that link Brighton to Alta, Brighton to Solitude. An unmaintained but well-defined route on the Bullion Divide Ridge line connects Alta and Snowbird. I hope that work on extending the Bonneville Shoreline trail will continue. That trail will be an important means to connect many west flank trailheads. The Blueprint proposes a regional trail network that includes trails along the bottoms of LCC and BCC. I assume that these trails would link the Salt Lake Valley to trailheads and resort areas of BCC and LCC. From a walking and hiking perspective, those trails would not be practical and a good use of trail constructing resources. It would take too long to walk from the Salt Lake valley to trailheads and mountain resorts. For hikers to get to the trailheads, it would be better to use the bus. Also those proposed trails could encourage dispersed camping close to the LCC and BCC creeks. That would not be good for the watershed. However trails along the BCC and LCC bottoms may be more practical for bicycle travel. The Mountain Accord Trail Committee will hopefully address the trail issues and design a practical trail plan. Any plans for the future of the Wasatch should include activities where individuals and organizations volunteer effort to protect and maintain the Wasatch. These activities need to be under the direction of managing agencies such as the U.S Forest Service, Cottonwood Canyons Foundation, and local governments. Many such activities now exist, but we still need to plan and support their continuation. These efforts are critical because of the impacts caused by increased visitation. In addition to doing important work, this stewardship will nurture deeper connections to nature and the areas that we love. I hope that the Mountain Accord process will help to support the economic vitality of Utah and keep the Wasatch a great place to enjoy the outdoors. More important, I hope that this process will help to protect what remains of the natural character of the Wasatch and protect the watershed. Thank you for your efforts. Thank you for considering these comments.</p>		
<p>Hi. We been 4 time's, My husband loves it out of all the places we have been. Easy to get to and Guaranteed Snow and good weather and Affordable! We came last year and I did the interconnect tour with the guides and 8 other people. Were not sure if it matters if you connect the mountains except the bragging rights. We love the way it is. We did Park city the first time 20 years ago and loved the ride down there from Snow Bird/ Alta. You could see the mountain Goats up on the Hill off the Highway on the left. Its a nice ride We also met some one at the Cannons 3 years ago and enjoyed that mountain. Not sure you would get many people to do SB to PC and back? We did Europe when I was little and its similar because you had to take the Tram to the mid mountain and there were chair lifts from there. Well my father wanted to ski down were you were to take the tram??? It was not fun...and we got lost, and lost each other, and would never do anything like that again. Were always cautious of all of this when we ski. I don't even like to go way skiers right on Sugarloaf, Maine, which is the Brackett Basin area ( new woods!!!! because I'm not sure if it's patrolled thoroughly at the end of the day? I would feel the same about the connection there. Lots of \$\$ and I would rather see \$ dumped into a large snow tubing type area for adults like 1/2 way down the mountain road that would require a chair lift ride back, with a cost around 30 \$ a ride. Or the top of Alta down into SnowBird.Or try to improve the shut down of the mountain road ( avalanche) somehow. Been there done that! ( Sucks ) Just to give you and idea of us. I'm 53 and my Husband is 57 we have skied all our lives We live in Utah and we love it!!!! We have been over 50 ski places in our life time. We go on ski vacation 's once a year. I pick one year and he the other. We will be there next year. I brag about S/A to every one I discuss skiing with. I guess to sum it up : NO Need... In our book Love it the way it is !!!</p>		3/1/2015
<p>I like the idea of resort connectivity, but am cautious about it for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will drive up the price of a daily lift ticket? They're already high enough. For instance, the Alta/Snowbird combined ticket is more than a ticket for one or the other of those two ski areas. Given the size of both, just skiing one or the other for a day is enough, so why would I want to pay extra for the access to both on the same day?</li> <li>• I've skied all the Utah major areas and like the distinct personality that each one provides. That's what makes it fun and interesting to mix it up and ski at multiple areas. They're unique unto themselves. Will combining them make them all the same and bland?</li> <li>• I also like that the competition between them helps promote innovations and improvements. Will that be lost if they're all connected?</li> </ul> <p>The idea of better mass transit, rail or bus, is a great idea. It would be great to be able to move around between resorts and the valley area without having to contend with bad weather and traffic. But it needs to be reliable. The joys of skiing in a big snow storm at Alta or Solitude or wherever can't be dampened by the inability to get there because the railway shuts down during a snow storm. It should be an enhanced and more sure-fire way to move around. Not one that creates more uncertainty.</p> <p>Hope this feedback helps. I'll submit more if other ideas or thoughts come to me.</p> <p>Thanks for asking!</p>		3/1/2015
<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I would like to address many of the issues that were raised by the "blueprint" that was recently provided to the public.</p> <p>1) I feel that there is a severe lack of effort to preserve the Central Wasatch and instead a much greater intention of increasing development within the canyons. The idea of creating a new mass transit system, increasing lodging at the resorts, building tunnels through the mountains, and widening the footprints of the current ski resorts all fly in the face of preservation. The Central Wasatch is a relatively small range that has unparalleled access. Increasing access in a responsible manner is paramount, however, that does not necessarily mandate the aforementioned strategies. Keeping a simple and minimalist approach to moving people into and out of the mountains is the most responsible means of maintaining the fragile balance that currently exists in our beautiful canyons.</p> <p>2) I don't believe that the ski resorts footprints should be expanded at the expense of backcountry terrain. In particular, Alta's desire to expand into Grizzly Gulch and/or Tuscarora should not be permitted. Alta already enjoys a great deal of the best terrain in the Central Wasatch. The proposed expansions would wipe out a large swath of land upon which many people recreate during the winter currently and would further strain the relatively small amount of backcountry terrain available to the public. Maintenance of Emma Ridge to Mt. Superior is absolutely critical as this is some of the most utilized terrain by backcountry enthusiasts. It would be an absolute travesty if this land were to be turned into lift accessed terrain. This is true for Snowbird as well to a large extent, however, developing access from American Fork Canyon would be a reasonable means of reducing the utilization of Hwy. 210 and would be unlikely to impinge upon highly desirable terrain. As for Brighton and Solitude, I am not opposed to a connection of the two resorts.</p> <p>3) This effort is obviously being driven by economic incentives. Utah hopes to increase revenue from its attractiveness as a skiing destination. While attraction of resort skiers is a large source of revenue, it is important to recognize that many people visit for the purpose of ski touring as well. The Wasatch Range is famous for its world class ski touring and should be marketed as such. The ski resort industry is seeing flat to declining revenues. The backcountry ski equipment market is the fastest growing segment within the industry. People enjoy getting away from others, exercising in the mountains, and scoring huge powder descents for which Utah is famous. The ski resort, in contrast, offer 1-2 hours of untracked terrain after a storm and a ton of competition with other skiers during those few hours. Decreasing access to this segment of the industry seems short sighted.</p> <p>4) With regard to transportation, I think that the construction of an aerial tram between Park City and Big Cottonwood Canyon would reduce the overall solitude of the canyon. I particularly cherish the lack of access that Park City has to the canyons of the Salt Lake Valley. That keeps many tourists in Park City and lessens the use of the Cottonwood Canyons. Such a tram would also destroy the serenity of the backcountry that currently separates the two end points. The idea of a tunnel is less intrusive with regard to backcountry users, however, would also promote use of the resorts from the Park City side. While I understand that this is the point of the system, I am not a proponent of increasing access from Park City to the Cottonwood Canyons. Regardless of my stance on that issue, blasting holes through the mountains is expensive and disruptive and probably not an economically viable alternative to much simpler solutions.</p> <p>5) A train up Little Cottonwood Canyon? Seriously? This seems like the most expensive, expensive, and unnecessary "solution" to a problem that occurs on only a handful of days a year. While the traffic jams going up the canyon as a result of powder fever or closures secondary to avalanche control are annoying, I don't think that taxpayers are willing to foot a VERY expensive bill to pay for building a train track up Little Cottonwood Canyon. This seems to benefit the resorts much more so than the public. While a bit frustrating, the occurrence is infrequent enough that an alternative to the train should be considered. We don't have enough infrastructure with light rail that would permit realization of a true benefit from such a project.</p>		3/2/2015
<p>In other words, people don't really use the train currently so trying to model our canyons after Europe is a faulty endeavor with which to begin. Buses, particularly those that run on natural gas, are clearly a much more economically feasible and reasonable means of getting people up all of the canyons (including Big Cottonwood Canyon). Bus schedules can be modulated to adjust to demand. While this doesn't address the avalanche control issue, I don't think that that issue merits a new means of transportation for the entire canyon that costs millions of dollars. Building a designated bus lane that is protected from avalanches would certainly be a better alternative to the train, however, this is also overkill in my opinion given the infrequent nature of the aforementioned issue. It also comes not only with a high price tag but at the cost of further extending the road into the canyon's natural territory. While the use of the canyons is dramatically decreased during the summer from personal observations, I would support the implementation of a year round bus service that simply runs less frequently when the demand is lower. I feel that it is also important to service not only the resort skiers, but other outdoor enthusiasts that want to be able to be dropped off in the canyon at areas other than the resorts. Establishing stops all along the canyons would be an important consideration. Given the funding, which appears to be by the public, it should provide service to the entire public and not just the customers of the ski resorts.</p> <p>6) The watershed is another issue that needs to be considered when proposing development. We live in the second driest state in the country. The snowpack and rain that receive is vital to our sustenance and its preservation is paramount. This seems to be an overlooked component of the blueprint.</p> <p>7) I think that it is great that land is being considered for permanent protection. The development of a trail system is an additional, excellent consideration that would enhance access to the mountains under this protection. I fully support an integrated trail network. Our current trails are lacking in extensiveness currently. During the winter one can travel easily on the snow, however, in the summer we are relegated to preexisting trails. Thank you for your consideration of the public's opinion. I would like to reiterate that preservation, not development, should be the goal of this project. To this end, responsible means of achieving this goal in the face of increasing pressure should only be considered. Making money is a short sighted vision that will destroy the very resource that sustains this valley and already contributes largely to its economy. The issue of transportation into the canyons is of particular import as misappropriation of taxpayer's money for an unnecessary train would be a mistake. Buses are an easy and cheaper solution that don't further encroach into the canyons' natural footprints.</p>		

<p>March 2, 2015 To Mountain Accord: The issue isn't about trains or tunnels. The issue is about the take-over of public lands by private interests. I grew up here and have skied the Wasatch for more than fifty years. I skied GAD Valley before the Tram was built. At the time both GAD Valley and Peruvian Gulch were "backcountry." Now they are part of what is called "lift-serviced" terrain. I ski-toured in Albion Basin when there was nothing beyond the Albion single chair. I toured up to Germania before the Sugarloaf lift was built. Now this is lift-serviced terrain. So it goes. I toured to Point Supreme before the Supreme lift was built. Now this is lift-serviced terrain. So it goes. I used to tour in Grizzly Gulch until the Accordian Flasco of spring 2015 gave Alta the green light to destroy this area as well. And so it goes. Eighty percent of the tourable terrain in the Wasatch has been swallowed alive by ski resorts and private development. And now we are being asked to accept the few remaining backcountry crumbs as some kind of a milestone in negotiation. Each new generation accepts the squalor of the present as its birth-right. There is no accord to be found in the current proposals. The Mountain Accord is only the latest installment in the long spate of hollow promises designed to make private interests appear magnanimous. Privatization is like a ratchet. It only tightens, never loosens. These mountains used to be called simply the Wasatch. Even the defenders of the "backcountry" feed into the enemy's vocabulary by accepting the distinction between "front-country" and "back-country." The language of "accord" would lead us to believe there is no enemy. Naturally the enemy themselves will say as much. Even where terrain remains nominally public, ski resorts control access to these lands. Self-powered uphill traffic – on public land that Alta has the gall to call "their" frontcountry – is regularly busted by Alta Ski Patrol. Of course Alta Ski Patrol phrases such harassment as being in the interests of "safety," as though common sense is no longer expected of mountain travelers. The "common sense" that public lands are public lands and deserve to be protected as such by governmental agencies such as the Forest Service is an idea which has also gone the way of all flesh. Many different peoples have come to live in the land now called "the State of Utah." Some of these people have stayed to live, especially in Salt Lake City, because they have valued and value the recreation opportunities on these extensive public lands so close to a metropolitan area. Many who called and call Salt Lake "home" nourished an innocent expectation that public agencies would safeguard public lands. Instead we have witnessed a total cave-in by the Forest Service to the hollow promises of private interests.</p> <p>Hollow promises is a nice way to put it. Planned deceit is more accurate. At a public meeting held at Zion Lutheran church in Salt Lake City, before Magic Man Dick Bass came up with oil money to build the tram and plaza, I heard Snowbird guru Ted Johnson promise solemnly that Snowbird would never construct anything more than the final tram tower and disengagement apparatus on the top of sawed-off Hidden Peak. Witness now the steel monstrosity currently in place and under construction on the summit. Hollow promises. Sometime in the not-so-distant future the backcountry folk will sign a final agreement with the Accordians. At stake will be a patch 350 feet long by 6 feet wide in one of the chutes dropping from Wolverine into the Twin Lakes drainage. There will be a pact, signed sincerely by all Parties, that this particular gully will be protected, unmolested by privatization For All Time and Eternity. But on the day the pact is signed, on paper as worthless as the paper containing all the other hollow-promise Agreements of the past fifty years, one more audible click of the ratchet will be heard. Young people don't know any better and old people forget. Only the land remembers. Stumps don't lie. And even if, in the desperation of extreme uncton, the pact were called a Sacred Covenant, recorded in stone, it would still be worth nothing, no more than the bare granite into which it was chiseled. Any observer with his or her skis on the snow would know the couloir patch was only one more slice of Real Estate, up For Sale to the highest bidder.</p>		3/2/2015
<p>1. What do you think about resort connectivity? I don't think that resorts should be artificially connected with chairlifts, etc. I do ski from Brighton to Solitude, but it is on an existing hiking trail both ways. No additional building was required to reopen the SolBright Trail to ski/snowboard. I think that this is an area with a precious watershed and as much space as possible needs to be available for the animals to move freely without human interference. Leave the beauty natural.</p> <p>2. Would you like to see improved, year-round public transportation? I would like to see improved year round public transportation. My plan is this: implement REGULAR bus service up and down the canyons. If the buses were regular – every 20-30 minutes ALL day, people would not need to drive. I believe driving up the canyons should be limited or banned altogether. If the buses were REGULAR, this would not be a big inconvenience. Just build a big parking garage down near Hog Wallow and we'd be good!</p> <p>3. Improved bus services? See above. Take the bus all winter to Brighton and Soli. I would take it in the winter, too, if it were available. I still have to drive, frequently, however because the last bus UP is at 4:18 pm. I can't get there in time after work to catch the last bus up. There is only ONE bus down after 5:30 pm – the 8:30. REGULAR bus service would mean I could go up for an hour or two after work and not be stranded up there till it is freezing and icy at 8:30. It is snowing right now and I don't want to take my car up tonight. I am missing the powder because I don't want to drive and I am missing the bus up. There should be REGULAR buses all day and into the evening. It would be great if the buses ran regularly all day long instead of sporadically. I sometimes have to drive because there is no bus between 12:30 and 2:30. How about a 1:30 and 2:00 pm bus. Nearly all of my friends leave around 2 so often I am begging a ride from them. I wonder if there were a 1:30 and a 2:00 pm bus if they would no longer drive their cars!</p> <p>4. Mountain rail? Just use the bus!!! We have already have a road. I am watching landslides every week! Why mess up what little natural environment we have with more tracks.</p> <p>5. No improvements at all? Add more buses. Do not add more chair lifts. Thank you for asking for my opinion and for honoring nature in Utah. It is its greatest asset. ☺</p>		3/2/2015
<p>I like the idea of a year round transit connection as that would help reduce traffic, preserve the environment as well as expanding access. As a visitor to Salt Lake City during ski season I always made use of the transportation to the Cottonwood Canyon ski areas and loved that there was that transportation available. I like the idea of being able to get to Park City from the Cottonwood Canyons and vice versa via public transportation. Personally I would prefer the transit option over the gondola/lift option as that would serve more people as well as being year round.</p>		3/2/2015
<p>I would like to see rail transport instead of bus as that would have less of an impact on the environment. Less noise and pollution. I think one of the great assets of Salt Lake City is the Tracks system.</p>		3/2/2015
<p>To who it may concern, I think a train would impact the land much more then proposed and would be extremely expensive. I would like to know where the money would come from to build the train and how it would impact backcountry skiers and climbers. So I think it is a very bad idea. Also, I think the resorts are busy enough and don't need more people in the canyons and therefore don't need to expand. I am very opposed to the plan and think it needs to be rewritten and new options found to deal with traffic.</p>		3/2/2015
<p>I've been to Park City once and it is my favorite ski destination. We also skied Solitude, which is in my top 3 of ski areas. All the ideas about increased public transportation are good to the extent that they don't cause environmental harm or over-use of the areas. I do think it is critical that ski areas maintain their distinct personalities.</p>		3/2/2015
<p>First it is a shame that the ski resorts already have all the prime ski terrain in the Wasatch and now want to expand even more? Also keep in mind that some of that expansion would take away backcountry use and would ban snowboarding with Alta expansion. I thought more of the Wasatch was suppose to made available to the public. We are making the Wasatch exclusive with these policies. Also why are publicly funding a transportation solution for two resorts that ban snowboarding? Dont you know that 40% of the snow sliding public snowboards and 60% of families are mixed. Why should snowboarder taxpayers fund this silly idea??</p>		3/2/2015
<p>If u can have snowboarders and skiers on the same hill, 100' s of brands of gear, any ethnic group, all kinds of foods from different countries, then GOD HELP ME, why can't there be Pepsi and Coke on the hill at the same time???</p>		3/2/2015
<p>4. MOST PEOPLE WON'T MAKE MULTIPLE CONNECTIONS – People don't like making multiple connections to get to their destinations. This means that transportation solutions ideally don't involve MORE THAN ONE, perhaps TWO transfers to get to a destination. Many people will not walk or drive to a transit center or park-and-ride lot, then catch a bus or train, then transfer to another train or bus, then walk to their place of employment or restaurant, etc. People also are less willing to make any connections if they are going to get wet, cold, or risk being late because they may miss connections. Recommendation: Research the transportation patterns and requirements of people traveling to, from, and within the Summit County area and determine specific trips where transportation alternatives can be put in place that conveniently and effectively connect people to destinations.</p>		3/2/2015
<p>We are so excited about the prospect of resort connectivity! We would like to see improved year round transportation to ensure quality recreation experiences for everyone!</p>		3/3/2015
<p>I am writing to express my opinion regarding the proposed blueprint.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is not enough balance between development and preservation. Currently there is too much development</li> <li>• Expanding the ski resorts should be done very carefully. Permanent land preservation as in the snowbird expansion is ok.</li> <li>• Alta's desire to expand into grizzly gulch or plan B up Tuscarora are not acceptable. This is pristine land used by hundreds of backcountry users each weekend.</li> <li>• An aerial tramway connecting PC and BCC is not acceptable</li> <li>• The Wasatch is a tiny area compared to Alps, stop one Wasatch and any interconnect idea.</li> <li>• Creating a viable public transit system up BCC and LCC is a good idea. This system needs to be designed in a way that offers dispersed stopping locations, not just at the resort bases.</li> <li>• A shuttle system up Millcreek in high use summer months similar to Zion Canyon would be ideal.</li> <li>• Connecting BCC, LCC and PC via tunnel is better than via road or ski lift. This option seems very expensive and there is no mention of how these funds will be raised.</li> <li>• Protecting the watershed should be priority #1</li> <li>• In the last 10 years ski resort visits have been on the decline. During this time backcountry skiing use has grown exponentially. Backcountry skiers contribute just as much to the economy as resort skiers and this trend in falling skier days at resorts should be considered.</li> <li>• Expanding the summer trail network in the central Wasatch is a good plan that should be pursued.</li> </ul>		3/3/2015
<p>I have lived in SLC most of my life, and support full public access to the backcountry. These are our public lands, and I feel it is appropriate to maintain public access. I support protection of the watershed in the strongest terms, we need that water! I do NOT support the commercial development of these public lands, no interconnecting all the ski resorts. Alta and Snowboard are connected now, and the high lift ticket prices effectively limit most of the public from using this access. In addition, if you use the Alta/Snowbird access route, you spend most of your day going between resorts, not skiing. I think it is not reasonable for skiers to travel between resorts in Park City and the Cottonwood canyons in one day. Much of the day would be spent in traveling from one resort to another. Please do not trade in our wilderness, watershed and public access for the commercial gain of a few. Please leave the lands and water the way it is for my children.</p>		
<p>To the contrary I think more destination visitors would stay in Park City if a day of skinning at Alta or Snowbird were an easy and pleasant train ride away. However the proposed train line should not stop in Park City but continue on through Snyderville Basin and down Parleys and/or Emigration Canyon to the airport. This would serve two purposes. It would make it much more likely, and dare I say enjoyable (based on my experience of Swiss resorts) that visitors would choose not to rent cars or ride shuttles to Park City. It would also make it viable for local residents to leave their cars in their garages and ride the rail down to Salt Lake. ☺ To whom it may concern,</p>		3/5/2015
<p>My main concern with the Wasatch is the proposed expansion of the ski resorts. They already control the most desirable and easiest to access terrain. All the remaining ski terrain is heavily used by self-powered recreationists; skiers, snowboarders and snowshoers in the winter, hikers in the summer. Any expansion of the resorts will exclude even more terrain from public access. Please do not allow the ski resorts to expand! Thanks</p>		3/5/2015
<p>Please protect the watershed, preserve backcountry terrain, provide affordable public access to what are, after all, mostly public lands</p>		3/5/2015
<p>To those concerned, Please do not develop more in any of the canyons. There is no need!!!! As a Utah local who has been going to these mountains all my life and an employee at one of the resorts, I do see the need for better transportation (especially snow days) TRAINS ARE NOT THE ANSWER!!! If there was more parking available at the bottom of the canyons and regular shuttles to and from resort and a \$40 parking fee at resort if alone or \$5 for a full car of people (four or more). Something along this line would eliminate the parking problem, cut down on more than half the cars and take away the need for OVERBUILDING in our SACRED AREAS!!!! You can NEVER get back the nature that is compromised!!! There will be no QUIET places to escape, No more dark areas to see the stars. Also, compromising the home to the animals that live in these areas and the water!! If there is no snow, there is little to no traffic. Summers are still quiet and for the few big snow days and Saturdays, the proposal is too much for what is needed! PLEASE recognize these mountains are so close to a huge city, they are already in dire need of more protection than they are currently getting! DON'T BE PART OF THE PROBLEM!!! We do NOT want to lose the solitude and beauty these canyons offer, for unnecessary development when there are better gentler and more cost effective alternatives. WHY start so big? There is a much easier solution. I hope we can all come to the place of making this a wonderful place for everyone without developing in the canyons. Starting with more available parking at the base and incentive to ride share. I hope you take time to consider these thoughts and do all you can to PROTECT our most valuable resources!!! also supporter of SAVE OUR CANYONS.</p>		3/5/2015

<p>To Whom it may concern,</p> <p>I am writing to express my opinion on the light rail transit option outlined in the Mt. Accord Blueprint. I have deep concerns about this option primarily because of the impact on the watershed and wild aspects of Little Cottonwood Canyon. We are unique in the Salt Lake Valley in that we have access to precious wild lands within easy reach of our homes. The millions of us who over the years have sought respite and recreation in the canyons know that we will be sharing the open spaces with others, but we also know that the canyon ecosystem can only handle so much before it is permanently degraded. The visitors who have fallen in love with the area know that very effort must be made to preserve the quiet, the open space, the wildlife, and the precious water resources.</p> <p>The light rail transit option has too many unknowns and presents the risk of too many negative unintended consequences. No amount of study or planning can anticipate what may happen to the watershed in a worse case scenario, and water is far too precious and valuable to take risks with. The thousands more footsteps that would come from casual visitors passing through by LTR would trample the fragile soils and plant cover that help create clean water for the million people who make the Salt Lake Valley home.</p> <p>The impact to the quiet, accessible, friendly, and "wild" aspects of the area designated for the LTR would be profound. Some experiences, some encounters with a clean, wild, and un-built space are just too rare to risk—walking up the road to Abion Basin on a quiet summer day is one of those experiences. While the effects would be hard to measure, I for one know that I would never be able to engage with the place that is Little Cottonwood Canyon in the same way, and I would feel a terrible loss.</p> <p>A rapid bus system also has risks but is far more predictable and knowable. In a way, however, it places a small but worthwhile burden on casual visitors to the canyon by gently forcing them to a decision to take the time to abandon the car and share a space with fellow travelers also seeking quiet and beauty. It slows them down to ready them for what they will experience when they arrive.</p> <p>LTR is a "through-the-window" way of experiencing the canyon. The vision and goals of Mt Accord includes in the list of corridor purposes: Create unique, attractive traveler experience? To increase tourist and resident visitation. I argue the visitor experience would be of little consequence if people are simply riding through this special space, and surely many would simply be traveling through. For those who would seek recreation in the canyon, LTR brings too many people to too small a space and diminishes the recreational experience. Why not ask people who seek the beauty of the canyon to engage directly with it? And why not keep it just a bit more remote which makes it a lot more special? And if the canyons are already over-used and crowded, why would a goal be to increase visitation, especially when it requires degrading the visitor experience by degrading the place?</p> <p>It is a deep human need to experience quiet and open space surrounded by natural beauty. It is the kind of experience that will inspire people to care for and preserve the canyons for future generations.</p> <p>Yes, more people will come to the canyons. We should take every effort to shape the way they visit Little Cottonwood Canyon in ways that minimize the inevitability of growth and crowding. The top of Little Cottonwood Canyon is extraordinarily valuable simply as a precious and rare place. It should not be reduced to another over-built convenient attraction. We have plenty of those. What we don't want to lose is the treasure of wild, clean, quiet, open spaces where we can escape the steel and concrete of the rest of our lives. Growth is inevitable.</p> <p>Setting a goal to encourage the impact that comes from growth is foolhardy.</p>		3/5/2015
<p>I support protecting this mountain range from developers, corporations and anyone who would damage this land.</p>		3/5/2015
<p>The proposal relieves economic congestion to the Park City area, in exchange for land protections surrounding the Park City area. The proposal offers increased infrastructure that will actually encourage growth, not just manage it. We do not need to encourage more tourism to maintain a vibrant economy. The proposal does not benefit those that love big and little cottonwood canyons - the majority of the patrons. Instead, it creates a transit system that will draw more destination tourists from the park city area into big and little cottonwood recreation areas, and also vagrant traffic on public transit from the valleys. This does not benefit those who truly love, use, and appreciate the local resource. The protections offered in exchange are vague and unsubstantial. Increased use, and increased marketing will only bring more people and commercial traffic to the area, damaging the environment. When rapid growth is a concern, why do we push to grow it faster? Jobs created will be low wage, resort jobs - not highly skilled workers, developers will benefit wildly with large property/business owners, while local, Salt Lake Valley people stand little to gain.</p>		3/5/2015
<p>Comments Regarding Mountain Accord: Dear Accord Committee, Thank you for your efforts to look at the long term future of the Wasatch Mountains. My comments address the proposals for Little Cottonwood. Our family has owned a cabin on Grizzly Ridge since 1955, so we are well acquainted with the history and the reality of living/recreating at the top of the canyon. In my view the transportation future in the canyon would be best served by a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) model which could be adjusted based on the season and demand. The cost would be a very small fraction of the rail model. The upfront cost of the rail and tunnels is astronomical, not to mention the ongoing operating cost and maintenance. The demand for rail would be very seasonal with little or no demand during the "mud season" from mid-April until late June and from early October until late November. The BRT model could restrict car and truck traffic in the canyon to property owners, vendors, and private transportation providers with the minimal requirement to build a parking facility near the mouth of the canyon and a terminal at the base of Alta. I also support the concept of trading some of the Alta Ski Lift property in Grizzly Gulch for a small parcel at the base of the lifts and lodges to accommodate a transportation, hospitality, and small retail presence to support the BRT system. I do not support the construction/development of high rise condominium or hotel development. Thank you.</p>		3/6/2015
<p>To whom it my concern</p> <p>I appreciate the concern about our Wasatch transportation needs. To put trains in is drastic !!!! The Wasatch needs to be protected !!!!</p> <p>The Wasatch needs better transportation during the winter months, YES. The summer months slows down considerably. Buses are not run in the summer. A train running all year will destroy our Wasatch!!!!</p> <p>We need to protect our canyons!! Trains are not the answer.</p>		3/6/2015
<p>I am writing to say that I am against changing anything about Little Cottonwood Canyon! I love everything about this absolutely gorgeous piece of Americana having visited it since 1979. Thank you for letting me state my piece.</p>		3/6/2015
<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I have been recreating in the Wasatch backcountry for almost 15 years (also almost half of my life) and the thought of giving the ski resorts the ability to expand beyond their current boundaries curdles my stomach. I believe that the balance that currently exists between resort skiing, backcountry skiing, snowmobiling and snowshoeing is ideal and should not change. I am heavily in favor of preserving Grizzly Gulch and Tuscorora in their current states and continuing to provide the public with some of the best and most accessible fantastic backcountry ski terrain in the lower 48.</p> <p>I am open to the idea of public transportation up the canyons, but I am highly concerned about the probability that this transportation way will affect another one of my recreational passions: bouldering. I am interested in a conversation revolving around widening the road to allow for a train or increased bus traffic (hopefully electric) for the winter, but I don't want to see the great pathway for bikers running and climbing access across the creek in Little Cottonwood canyon destroyed to put in a tram.</p> <p>Thanks for your time and I look forward to moving forward on our efforts to preserve the Wild Wasatch in its current state.</p> <p>Hello,</p>		3/6/2015
<p>I am a graduate of the University of Utah's Sustainable Tourism Management program, and a Utah native that was born and raised in the mountains you plan on developing. Naturally, I have been very curious about your board and projects. I have been reviewing your "Proposed Blueprint", "Vision, Goals, and Metrics", as well as your other proposals, scenarios, and alternatives found on your website.</p> <p>Let me first say, that I support your goal of lessening car traffic in Utah's Central Wasatch Mountains. So many times, I've driven up Little Cottonwood Canyon in the middle of a massive line of traffic; a chain of carbon emissions that is destroying the snow we look to enjoy. I think a visitor experience that does not require a car to enjoy the Wasatch is a vision locals and developers alike can get behind. However, the opinions of how to achieve that goal is obviously up for debate. Personally, I'm in favor of your "Option D" on your "Transportation Purposes and Alternatives", it being the minimalist development plan in a delicate watershed. However, if you do decide to drive forward with blasting through the Wasatch Mountains, consider this. Snowbird ski resort has monitored the water quality coming out of their mountains since the resorts founding. Since the canyon's history of mining, the water purity has continuously improved while Snowbird has been the leading steward in its mountains. This is an important legacy that The Mountain Accord should always seek to uphold with it's construction plans. In addition, Whistler Blackcomb has set the bar on minimizing construction impacts in mountain ecosystems with its 2006 Symphony Project. If you're not familiar with it, I suggest you look into this admirable example of minimizing construction impacts by putting the ecosystem first.</p> <p>One troubling aspect of your transportation plan is your obvious favoritism to developing solutions for tourists while the employees that truly drive the industry are forced to commute from areas like Kamas and the Heber Valley due to Park City's outlandish housing prices. Where is the consideration for the employees that are sweating to make your quarterly reports profitable and to generate the tax revenue that so many government entities rely on?</p> <p>The rest of your "Proposed Blueprint", and "Vision, Goals, and Metrics" is troubling to say the least. It seems your transportation blueprint is the only thing that is specific at all. The entire "Vision, Goals, and Metrics" is entirely lacking the critical "Objective" portion. You have the goals, but what specific objectives are you undertaking to achieve them? On all your documents, you use phrases like "additional protection of federal lands", but specifically what protections will you be able to add? Another goal is to reduce greenhouse gases and air pollutants, but how are you going to do this when tractors and backhoes are chugging up the Cottonwoods to blast a tunnel through the mountains? "Degree of impairment or improvement to watershed" could mean so many things when you don't provide specific objectives. It could be as benign as monitoring and controlling water contamination levels or as invasive as putting the cottonwood rivers into underground pipes. When you use this vague language to describe your environmental goals and metrics, without specific objectives, it gives your projects the freedom to treat the Wasatch Mountain ecosystem as you see fit, and this is dangerous. Compounding this, some of your metrics aren't quantifiably measurable either! My favorite example of this was in your "Recreation System Group" goals. When measuring the goal of "Preserve special, unique recreation areas and settings to maintain opportunities for solitude and naturalness", you put "Desirability of the proposed management strategy to preserve recreational values on public lands" How on earth do you measure desirability?! It seems to me, that your main goal is to increase access and business, but the environmental protection is just an afterthought that has not been given the same planning process and consideration. Until The Mountain Accord proposes a comprehensive and specific environmental strategy, I will refuse to support your project, and, even worse, I will fight it.</p> <p>The Mountain Accord and Vail Resorts have recently outlined very expensive projects to develop the Wasatch Mountains. In the face of increased climate change that is already affecting the ski tourism in the area, these improvements seem extremely short-sighted and misguided. Each year has been getting warmer than the next, a scientific fact, and now it rains in Park City in the middle of January and February. This is a phenomena that I have never witnessed in my 25 years living in the area, and the snow line seems only to be rising. NASA, EPA, NOAA, and others have put forth climate prediction models (links below) that make the same conclusion: that we are at a tipping point. If we take aggressive actions against greenhouse gas emissions, these effects will be minimal. However, if we continue our current path or take a modest approach, the temperature is set to rise exponentially going into the latter half of the 21st century. Spending millions on projects to develop an industry that is currently deteriorating rather than spending that money on initiatives to minimize the forces causing that deterioration is short-sighted at best, and borderline insanity at worst. It seems to me that these funds could better be used to minimize greenhouse gas production locally while putting pressure on politicians nationally to reduce this pollution and save the Greatest Snow on Earth that we have all built our livelihoods around.</p>		3/6/2015
<p>Hello and thank you for considering my comments.</p> <p>I am a native Utahn with over 40 years of history recreating and working in our central Wasatch mountains. I appreciate the efforts of the Mountain Accord to get in front of the curve as it is painful to see how these precious resources are getting loved to death. In terms of the blueprint, I think the underlying purpose is inherently flawed by attempting to satisfy too many competing interests. I believe that will lend itself to an indefinable purpose and need statement for the EIS, it reads "The purpose of Mountain Accord is to preserve the legacy of the central Wasatch through responsible stewardship of the natural resources, quality recreation experiences, a vibrant economy, and a modern, environmentally-sustainable transportation system." I for one, am skeptical that the term "vibrant economy" is appropriate. More importantly, the charter does not make mention of the Forest Service's public land management obligations that are a critical component to any path forward. I can appreciate the private land rights of the resorts and their dogged interests to continuously expand and grow, but I do not believe that those interests are compatible with the USFS' responsibilities. In particular, Alta's efforts to expand up Grizzly Gulch exceed the USFS' land management obligations to consider the cumulative effect of its decisions. Alta would not exist in its current form if it were not for the public land lease upon which it operates. Alta's push to overtake Grizzly Gulch and the Tuscorora area is unacceptable because it dramatically favors one interest over many others and is an irreversible commitment of USFS resources that primarily benefit a non-representative segment of the population. In addition, it will further increase watershed impacts and increase the risk, by whatever degree, of further impinging the water quality of the Salt Lake Valley. Even by implementing best management practices, the continuous expansion into our watershed's upper territory exposes all downstream users to the ill effects of an inadvertent spill of hazardous materials, or decreased water quality thru increased sedimentation and human waste, or any other host of potential outcomes. Therefore it is the cumulative impact of continuous expansion that is especially concerning. With that in mind, Snowbird should be commended for its willingness to 'give up' some of its interests for the general good and to reach a compromise to meet some of its other interests. Alta needs to adopt a similar approach.</p> <p>As far as addressing the transportation ills of Little Cottonwood, it is ludicrous to suggest a massive publicly-funded infrastructure project is within the charter or even remotely 'sustainable. It may be 'modern' but similar to the term 'vibrant', an unnecessary descriptor. All alternatives need to be considered, including restricting access to personal vehicles. No single-driver vehicles should be allowed on high-traffic days and the resorts should be required to provide mass transit for their employees. After a certain vehicle count has been met, additional vehicles should not be allowed up the canyon. This would require Alta and Snowbird to publicly disclose the amount of legitimate parking they have available. The trade off may be that their base facilities cannot be expanded until they address these parking concerns, which is a common requirement of almost ever commercial facility seeking a building permit. In days when the avalanche hazard threatens the road, the current restrictions on access should continue and with less vehicles on the road, the results should be improved. In addition, the EIS needs to analyze the pollution generated by hundreds of idling cars adjacent to Little Cottonwood Creek when traffic comes to a standstill. I do not think a 'modern' transportation system needs to be prioritized before other alternatives, including a change in driving behavior, is considered. I certainly do not think that the public coffers should be tapped to serve the interests of so few, especially when other social issues remain unresolved and under-funded, such as public education and healthcare.</p> <p>Thank you for your efforts and consideration. I would like to be added to an email distribution list if possible. this is the second time I have made that request.</p>		3/7/2015
<p>You should do AS MUCH as you can to get people to drive less. The smog is really bad, a train up to big and little cottonwood canyon seems like a good idea.</p>		3/7/2015
<p>I ski at least 3-4 days a week at Alta. I try to avoid the weekends because it is so crowded in the canyon and it is hard to find parking places. I ski pretty much off-trail because I find the groomed runs to be too crowded and dangerous. Although I get a free pass at Snowbird, I won't even consider skiing there because of the out of control skiers and boarders. Skiing in this canyon is already becoming an unpleasant experience, and I don't even want to imagine more people up these cottonwood canyons. Although a mass transit system would be a great idea rather than individual cars, it would allow for even more people up the canyons which I don't believe the environment can take without destroying the little wildness we have left.</p> <p>Snowbird has to shut down lifts during the week as it is because of lack of skiers...why put even more lifts and more hotels in these canyons.</p> <p>Enough is enough...let's try to save something. I am against any further building or development up the cottonwood canyons.</p>		3/7/2015

<p>Mountain Accord Comments</p> <p>My immediate reaction is to applaud Mountain Accord for their organization and initial efforts to address the issues dealing with the "Central Wasatch Mountains" and their blueprint for the future. In response to your request and my interest in the process, I offer my suggestions and comments.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the pursuit of "Ski Utah" and their pursuit of connecting the resorts. The sole purpose for such an undertaking is simply for "bragging rights" to say we are the largest connected ski areas in the US and all the money the ski industry will make is bogus; greed has never been a solution for progress. The practicality of such a connection makes no sense for skiers to take the time or the expense to travel from Snowbird to Park City via chair lifts or from the other way. It is not sensitive to the environment and is just another encroachment of the dwindling backcountry so dear to most of the Wasatch Front and Back Community. If maximizing how much money the ski industry can make is the driving principle with any of the options being considered, it is wrong and against what I understand the purpose of Mountain Accord.</p> <p>Ultimately, the final blueprint must have an economic rational and one that may best be achieved in stages, step by step rather than all at once. Many I have talked with are skeptical when the question of finances are discussed or how it will be financed. I recognize the need for an ultimate solution, but how may that solution be reached is paramount. If a railroad or Trax is the agreed path, the least costly first step seems widening the road (3 lanes) with a reversible bus lane, up in the AM and down in the PM. Under any circumstance Little Cottonwood Canyon needs the road. Buses heading down after their drive up in the morning, use the regular down lane and like wise, buses going up in the PM, use the regular lanes. (Certainly, a more thoughtful traffic pattern can be developed).</p> <p>The development to widen the road could be engineered to accommodate a rail system in the future, unless a more favorable route follows the other side of the canyon. Snow sheds would be necessary for both bus and train. Under any circumstance, convincing the public to ride the bus or a train will require a significant effort, exactly how best to accomplish such a task, I leave to others more qualified. I simply know how difficult it is to get SLC skiers to ride the bus today! Of course the first step is to optimize the service.</p> <p>The beauty of the Utah skiing has been the individuality and culture of each resort. The trend seems to be, consolidation. I would do all you can to prevent it becoming one corporation. Again, connecting resorts in whatever manner seems a negative path forward. Possibly a tunnel between Little and Big Cottonwood Canyon's might allow a variation of traffic flow down and up, but improving the road in LCC might be the best and least disturbance to the environment. I'm particularly against the tunnel concept and it's disturbance to the mountain.</p> <p>Again, whatever the final solution, especially the transportation question, unless there is a specific strategy to attract riders or force in some manner skiers to ride public transportation, the final solution will be a waste. A road toll, expensive parking fee, or such, needs to be part if any solution. Presently, the UTA is used by only a handful of skiers, I know, I ride the bus most every day to Alta. Many who don't ride the bus say it's because their service is lousy, but my sense is we love our cars, so changing the skier's culture will be a challenge.</p> <p>Finally, to prevent the multitude of rumors and miss-information being floated around, more communication might be helpful. Most I discuss the issues with are skeptics. Again, it is all a most difficult process and compromise is key and the final agreement will face a difficult scrutiny, but a final solution is a necessity to save the Wasatch.</p>	<p>3/8/2015</p>
<p>My comments are specific to Little Cottonwood Canyon.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What do you think about resort connectivity? – I live in Denver and do most of my skiing at Alta. I do so for several reasons. The size and feel of the resort is perfect. The fact that the resort is based on skiing and not real estate is unique, unlike many places in Colorado. The fact that the canyon and the two resorts (Alta, Snowbird) have not changed over the decades is an experience that very few places in North America can offer. I think skiers do their research and ski where they feel comfortable in terrain and resort services. I think resort connectivity will diminish the experience for everyone. The advanced and technical skiers in the country know how special these two resorts are. If connectivity were to take place, I would exclude these two resorts. Little Cottonwood canyon is one of the most special places in North America.</li> <li>• Would you like to see improved, year-round public transportation? – I am only there in the winter so I am not familiar with the other 3 seasons.</li> <li>• Improved bus services? – I work for the Regional Transportation District in Denver and have used the UTA's service in Little Cottonwood. The service is great and all the Drivers I have spoken to have been extremely helpful and friendly. I cannot see where it needs improvement.</li> <li>• Mountain rail? – Increasing the capacity to these two resorts would dramatically change the experience.</li> <li>• No improvements at all? – Correct.....I would not change a thing.</li> </ul>	<p>3/8/2015</p>
<p>I have been visiting Alta nearly my whole life, and have lived and worked there. It has been my escape, my sanctuary, my playground, my home. I know many others feel this same way.</p> <p>Please consider alternatives to tunneling through the mountains. Please protect this special place for all of us to enjoy.</p>	<p>3/8/2015</p>
<p>Regarding ski resort expansion: I would be willing to let the resorts expand base facilities in exchange for guaranteed protection of numerous recreational areas that they are continuously proposing to develop. I am opposed to development of Grizzly Gulch as I hike and ski there 4 seasons of the year.</p> <p>I understand that it is in the best interests of the ski resorts to want to constantly expand, get bigger, compete with other ski resorts nationally and abroad. Realistically, the climate of the Wasatch is changing and we have had less and less snow the last few years. Having lived here for 40 years, I bought an umbrella for the first time this winter because it has never rained in the city in the winter until last year (February) and this year—January and February, no snow in the city for two months, just a little rain. I think ski resort use will change over time due to climate change; also I only "skit" the local population downhill skis (surely in part due to economic reasons, who has \$100 to spend on a ticket?). We should cater more to local backcountry skiers and less to people who visit for a few days and don't live here year-round; I guess if I worked in the ski industry and had a lot to gain financially from expanding to compete with other resorts I would see the issue differently. But those of us who recreate as often as possible in the Wasatch are TIRED of this constant effort to expand, expand, expand and make more money, make more money, make more money, at the expense of the environment and those who want to see it preserved for future generations to recreate in.</p> <p>Regarding a train in Little Cottonwood Canyon: This is a bad idea, particularly regarding how construction of a train would negatively environmentally impact the canyon (too fragile for the Olympics but OK for a train?). To say that the construction or presence of a train would not impact the watershed is laughable. And, who would pay for this billion dollar project?</p> <p>I am in favor of maximizing bus use, instituting paid parking and canyon-user fees. In 50 years a train seems the only viable option it can be re-visited (a-la Zion Canyon National Park transportation). Maybe there will be better transportation options in the future. I think a train at this point in time is premature, too expensive, environmentally destructive, not necessary.</p> <p>Regarding connecting Big and Little Cottonwood canyons with a tunnel—This is worse than just a bad idea! Why destroy pristine terrain so a few people can go between these Canyons? There is no need for that! This is just one of the worst ideas in the Blueprint. If a tunnel has to be in the mix, considering connecting Park City and Big Cottonwood Canyon would be a possibility but again, why do these areas have to be connected at all? So a few people can enjoy the fabulous night life in Park City and the bluebug skiing in Big Cottonwood in the same 24 hour period?</p> <p>I think the mindset that bigger is better, and that expansion at any environmental cost to local interests, is unfortunate, misguided, and driven by dollar signs. Most people who live here are fine with letting the ski areas remain independent of each other.</p> <p>Maintenance of the status quo regarding 4 season recreation for locals is more important than expansion at whatever cost so that more tourists might come here and spend money (if "they" want more tourists, do something to improve the liquor laws so that people don't have the perception that it is hard to get a drink in Utah!) Yes, there isn't much night life in the Cottonwood Canyons. So what?</p> <p>Regarding connecting the canyons with an improved trail system, that sounds like an interesting and good idea.</p> <p>As a Wasatch recreation enthusiast, I appreciate the attempts to preserve the beauty of the Wasatch for all of us. It's difficult for us to swallow some of these blatant attempts to "improve" on the present situation by further development so that a few people can make money off our precious wilderness. We know we have to compromise, everyone does...Thank you for your efforts.</p>	<p>3/8/2015</p>
<p>To All Concerned,</p> <p>I have spent hours going over the Mountain Accord (MA) website and reading almost all of the documents provided there. I also attended the public meeting held on February 24, 2015 in Park City. In addition to that I have read information on the websites of various members of MA, and had discussions with various members of the community. Based upon that, I have the following comments:</p> <p>1.) The Mountain Accord process is not fully transparent to the general public. For example, none of the actual public comments collected are available to view on the MA website. Only "summaries" of comments are shown. What about all of the various meetings taking place within MA, are there audio recordings of such meetings? If not, why? If such recordings exist, are they easily available to the public? If not, why? 2.) The presentation of the "blueprint" to the public at the Park City meeting was full of ideas and concepts, but completely lacking any specific, definitive answers to almost all of the issues involved. There is no way for the public to make an informed decision on such "blueprint" without the facts, and yet that is exactly what MA is now asking. That raises doubts as to the legitimacy of the "blueprint" and the "public input" in the entire MA process. 3.) It is obvious that MA is being driven by the ski resorts' and their political allies' desire to have public money pay the multi billion dollar cost of a light rail and tunnel system to interconnect all resorts in MA. This is to fulfill their longstanding desire to have an interconnect "wow" factor for marketing purposes and bragging rights, while also enriching politically connected landowners and politicians in the various communities through increased development and (hoped for) tourism activity. (Sandy becomes the "Gateway to Park City"? Vail Resorts buys out and becomes the owner monopoly of all of the resorts?) That is not legitimate because it only benefits a few individuals and corporate interests, all at the public expense. It also promotes more unwanted congestion and sprawl. Beyond that, are there any legitimate transportation problems, now or in the future, in need of a solution? I don't see one. The MA's own materials state that currently there are only a few days during the ski season that traffic congestion in LCC, BCC and PC are problematic. It's analogous to a traffic jam around a big public event – like a football game or concert. It is a temporary and infrequent problem. That does not justify any of the transportation "solutions" proposed. MA also relies heavily on future population projections for northern Utah to justify the "need" for these transportation "solutions". However MA states that only about 5% of all skier visits are from within the Utah population. Nationally the total number of people skiing/boarding has been stagnant/declining for the past 25 years. While MA relies on dubious future projections of population growth and user numbers to justify the need for these "solutions", it ignores the real impacts of climate change which will take place in that same future time projection, and which will likely result in the demise of the ski resort industry altogether, negating any need for the transportation "solutions".</p> <p>It is also important to acknowledge that the majority of the resort/hospitality/tourism industry jobs pay very low wages, which are not sufficient to live on. That cannot be considered much, if any, economic benefit to the state. 4.) The one true critical issue the Wasatch faces today is climate change. In the same time periods the MA uses for its future projections, climate change will result in the devastating loss of the municipal watershed for the MA communities. It will cause all kinds of destabilizing changes to the plant, animal and micro organism ecosystems of the mountains. The fragile ecosystems that exist today will become destabilized and extinct. The Wasatch could easily transform from lush, pristine, verdant alpine mountains filled with wildlife, to a dry, barren, lifeless Mars like mountain range. The negative consequences to the human population in northern Utah will be significant, widespread, and profoundly disruptive.</p> <p>5.) The Wasatch needs protection and preservation NOW. Above all else. There should be no change in, or expansion of any existing uses. No new uses should be allowed. Total visitor numbers should be carefully monitored and controlled on a daily basis. If necessary, private vehicle use should be restricted, replaced by a shuttle system on existing roads, like the system used in Zion National Park. The entire range from I-80 to Provo Canyon should be managed as a national park or monument. It is our only hope for the future.</p>	<p>3/8/2015</p>
<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am an avid outdoor recreational user of the Wasatch Front. Though I don't live in Utah, I travel to the Wasatch at least a half dozen times a year to ski, hike, and bike. The following are my comments with regard to the proposed "blueprint".</p> <p>Transportation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I recognize that the traffic situation in Little Cottonwood Canyon is unsustainable on some winter days, and while I understand the impetus to promote a train version of a fixed guideway, I feel that the bus system is far from optimized and with proper implementation, could service both the ski resorts and dispersed users on a year-round basis far more effectively than a train.</li> <li>• Providing copious parking near the mouths of the canyon would be a critical component of this.</li> <li>• Without trying an optimized bus system using the existing infrastructure I feel it is impossible to justify major infrastructure changes (adding lanes or a installing a train)</li> <li>• Charging a per-vehicle fee – either via a daily fee or an annual pass – would help subsidize the optimized bus/parking system and provide an incentive to ride the transit system</li> <li>• Incentivize ridership by making the bus fee free or only a nominal price.</li> <li>• The bus system would need to have both a Snowbird-servicing bus and multiple Alta express buses.</li> <li>• Current and future UDOT plans to add passing lanes on Hwy 210 for private vehicles should be focused on improving bus transit systems.</li> <li>• Snowsheds and/or bridges over slide paths can/should be added for increased avalanche mitigation for the highway.</li> <li>• I fully support optimizing year-round bus Rapid Transit for Big Cottonwood Canyon. Again, with copious parking at the mouth of the canyon.</li> <li>• A tunnel linking LCC and BCC is not needed. Improved public transit would alleviate the traffic issues associated with LCC, and the "safety" issues that have been ascribed to a tunnel have been overblown; there have not been any documented injuries/fatalities associated with overuse of LCC that would not be overcome with improved transit.</li> <li>• Tunnel connections would create more defacto resort sidecountry terrain, effectively increasing the resorts' footprints.</li> <li>• The tunnel would basically be a taxpayer-funded connection that would exist to benefit four businesses (ski resorts) with no/very little validation that such a connection would actually be economically beneficial to those businesses. There are no significant "problems" that an LCC/BCC tunnel would solve, despite a considerable cost to taxpayers.</li> <li>• The same argument is applied to a fixed guideway system connecting BCC to Park City. It would not necessarily save time for PC-BCC travelers, is not supported by Park City officials, and would again be a taxpayer-subsidized benefit to a handful of businesses (ski resorts) who have not proven that such a connection would even be beneficial today, much less in the future considering global warming and the flat/declining trends of the resort skiing industry (according to their own study).</li> <li>• The question on the survey asking if the transit "solutions" are "environmentally-sustainable" is fundamentally flawed: transit systems are not intended to be "environmentally-sustainable"; they are intended to transport people from point to point. Since NO ONE –including trans engineers who have looked into this project – knows if they'll actually be environmentally-sustainable (eg degrading the watershed) that point is misguided at best and badly misleading and irrelevant at worst. The question should be "is this a solution that I as a user of the Central Wasatch would actually use and be willing to pay for?"</li> <li>• At the moment parking is the limiting factor for pressurized use in the Cottonwood Canyons; enabling as many people as possible to use the canyon will result in more user pressure. Optimizing Bus Rapid Transit will be an intermediate step to moving possibly-somewhat more people up the canyon to put only moderate additional use pressure on the canyons.</li> <li>• I am in full support of a year-round bus shuttle system for Mill Creek Canyon.</li> <li>• I am in full support of a train/light rail system linking the Salt Lake Valley with Park City. This is a system that I feel would be used far more extensively by commuters and lower-income resort workers around the clock on a more-regular schedule than a LCC canyon train that would be associated almost exclusively for time-intensive recreation.</li> <li>• The rationale provided for abandoning the Parley's rail transit - that was favored in the Trans system group - is that it would not be competitive with the freeway; however, this rationale was not applied to the successful SLC airport Trax line.</li> </ul>	<p>3/8/2015</p>

<p>Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am in full support of creating a trails network in the upper reaches of the two canyons</li> <li>The trails should be a mix of hiking exclusive, mountain biking exclusive, and shared (and/or with management techniques conducive to habits; ie Snowbird's new trail being uphill till the tram runs and then it becomes downhill).</li> <li>Any new road/transit construction must have improved road cycling facilities (wider shoulders, exclusive bike lanes, disconnected paved bike paths)</li> <li>LCC/BCC parking areas need to be enlarged and enhanced for the major dispersed user trailheads, with optional stops for the Bus Rapid Transit at White Pine, Argenta, Butler Fork, Mineral Fork, etc.</li> <li>I support the permanent protection of the Emma Ridges to Superior ridgeline from development.</li> <li>I do NOT support a chairlift in Grizzly Gulch. I recognize that it is private property, but also appreciate that much of Alta's operations are on public land and that they stand to benefit greatly from enhanced base development on a lot of lucrative land, additional water use, increased snowmaking, and improved LCC transit. Grizzly Gulch and the surrounding area should be put into some sort of permanent protection.</li> <li>I could be supportive of chairlifts and development into the American Fork Canyon depending on alignment and scope.</li> <li>I could be supportive of a re-aligned chairlift in Honeycomb Canyon, depending on the alignment, provided there are no effects on Silver Fork backcountry</li> <li>I am supportive of Brighton's formal adoption of Hidden Canyon, provided any chairlift reaches back towards the Great Western chairlift.</li> <li>I am supportive of increased connectivity between Brighton and Solitude in the SolBright area.</li> <li>I am supportive of enhanced facilities at identified high-use nodes to both concentrate use in appropriate close-in areas and disperse use in more-remote areas</li> <li>I am in support of modifying wilderness boundaries to accommodate new and existing sections of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.</li> <li>I fail to understand how the Mountain Accord can consider all forms of recreation in the Central Wasatch except for one of the most significant and controversial forms: Wasatch Powderbirds. To me this "oversight" of neglecting helicopter skiing in our tiny range -that was based on a Forest Service administrative timeline that was arbitrarily changed from 5 year renewals to 10 years - is an egregious omission.</li> </ul> <p>Economics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I support enabling the ski resorts to utilize more water for snowmaking</li> <li>I support adding potential land and altering zoning for additional development at the various resorts' bases.</li> <li>I support enabling the ski resorts to expand their summertime activities within their existing footprints.</li> <li>I support enhanced modern avalanche mitigation techniques (ie Gas-X) above Alta. I do NOT support a chairlift on Flagstaff peak</li> <li>I do not support extraordinarily-expensive, taxpayer-funded "solutions" to "problems" that enable profit maximization for ski resorts whose lift tickets are pricing their customers out of an already-flat-to-declining market.</li> </ul> <p>Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am not an environmental specialist, so I cannot comment on the survey question: "does the Blueprint achieve environmental stewardship of the natural resources?"</li> <li>I know that the EPA has determined that ski resort development has a more profound effect on watershed integrity than ANY other development. But I am cautiously optimistic that SLC Water and various other governing bodies will ensure water quality despite the threats associated with increased use, transit, and development.</li> <li>I am in favor of a re-forestation effort on (particularly) the Emma ridgeline area</li> <li>I am becoming increasingly convinced that simple people-pressure on the canyons is having a degrading effect on the watershed, and dramatically increasing opportunities to transport people up the canyons will have a commensurate effect on the watershed quality.</li> <li>I am concerned that the ski resorts are getting many of their desired "gets", and their "gives" are more along the lines of "we are not taking as much as we could take", at the expense of potential environmental and backcountry terrain preservation.</li> </ul> <p>Overall I have found the "blueprint" (it should have been called a "proposal") to NOT be reflective of the thousands of hours of work that people put into the system group meetings and submeetings over the summer; it confirms to me that the Exec board was made up of a lot of Important People who were not very engaged in the process and therefore created a plan that represented their impressions/interests rather than what was determined by the System Groups.</p> <p>Therefore I do not support the "blueprint" in its current form, but I am a strong believer in the Mountain Accord ideals and timing, and am very hopeful that a more equitable balance of gives and takes can be achieved to accommodate many constituents/stakeholders' desires, if they are all willing to concede on some of their desires. <a href="#">3</a></p>		3/8/2015
<p>The international flow of skiers is primarily concentrated within Europe. The number of skiers using long haul flights to go skiing is rather limited. For instance, overseas skiers represented only 3.8% of total skier visits to U.S. ski resorts in 2012/13 (including Latin American visitors). Source: Vanaat 2014.</p> <p>France and Austria lead in Europe in terms of skier visits and numbers of ski lifts, both of which are similar to the United States. However, whilst Austria has about 254 resorts (199 with more than 4 lifts) and France has 325 resorts (with 233 of four or more lifts), the USA has 481 (with 354 of four or more lifts). The reason for this is that America has far fewer really mega resorts than Europe.</p> <p>According to Vanaat's 2014 report, using figures over the previous five years, only 47 resorts worldwide averaged more than one million skier visits per annum. 41 of these were in Europe. Whistler-Blackcomb, Vail, Breckenridge, Mammoth, Copper Mountain and <a href="#">Colorado Springs</a></p> <p>This should be built to allow high density traffic, possibly two lines with a loop either end.</p> <p>The entire route, which would be about 4 to 5 miles in length should be in a tunnel and / or protected by avalanche sheds. Ideally it would be connected by underground pedestrian walkways from the main hotels / lodges in Snowbird and Alta. If it is done as a funicular, with passing places, the link needs to be fast to allow a high frequency service.</p> <p>One of the principal benefits of this would be to provide an alternative route into / out of Little Cottonwood Canyon when avalanche danger is high. The train could be used to move between Canyons and then Big Cottonwood Canyon, which is seldom affected by avalanches, could be an alternative ground route by car, bus or shuttle to Salt Lake City and the Airport. Would such a rail connection be worth it? The Mountain Accord documentation postulates an extensive public or public/private transport network for the "One Wasatch" area. The problem is persuading people, particularly local people, to stop using their cars. If one considers countries with traffic free villages, the rail option has in some cases been in existence before cars were a prevalent means of transport. The Zermatt - Visp link in Switzerland is typical of many Swiss mountain railways, being over 100 years old. There was not a major issue persuading people to leave their cars, because they never got used to using them to this resort in the first place. But in the USA, there will be massive resistance. One way to try and persuade locals of the benefits of rail travel, is to offer it first, where people cannot currently use their cars - a new link between the eastern ends of Big Cottonwood and Little Cottonwood Canyons. Once local people begin to become more comfortable with mountain rail travel, it may be time to review whether the network can be extended to some of the other areas proposed by Mountain Accord. What form(s) of transport should be encouraged / discouraged in the Cottonwood Canyons?</p> <p>One unique feature of the Cottonwood Canyons is the density and size of population resident near the foot of the Canyons. This is very different to examples of high-altitude traffic-free villages in the European Alps where the main valleys are usually populated with smaller towns or other villages. Visp, lying below Zermatt, has a population of fewer than 10,000 and nearby Brig is about 13,000. Such settlements do not generate the intense local traffic flows experienced on winter weekends in American cities such as Salt Lake City and Denver. Innsbruck in Austria is an example of one of the largest cities in Europe set in a mountain environment, but even here the population is only 120,000, only a fraction of the Salt Lake conurbation. I am unsure what demand figures Mountain Accord is planning for. A rather elderly study from 2006 still partially available on the internet, appears to indicate that for the period 1993 - 2003, traffic flows on SR 210 were about 8,000 vehicles per day on February and March weekends. If this is still the case, I presume that it means over 10,000 people moving up and down Little Cottonwood Canyon on such days. One of the greatest challenges is that a very high proportion of more than 10,000 people want to go up the Canyon between 7.30 and 8.45 am on winter weekends and come down between 3.30 and 5.30 pm. This intensity of flows will be very difficult to cater for.</p>		
<p>The same strictures about the positioning of the base area and the top stations for a mountain railway apply as with a gondola.</p> <p>Congestions at the stations, particularly the lower terminus (applies to gondolas and railways) - and en route to the lower terminus.</p> <p>Although road congestion in the Canyons may appear to be the most severe problem, the road network to the base of Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons is not ideal to cater for high densities of early morning or late afternoon traffic. From Junction 6 of I-215 it is about 1.7 miles to the base of Big Cottonwood Canyon and 5.5 miles to the base of Little Cottonwood. The distance along SR 209 from Junction 295 on I-15 to the base of Little Cottonwood Canyon is about 7 miles.</p> <p>Any transport solution which relies on a large proportion of Canyon users driving to the foot of the Canyon and parking there, creates a "muddy gate" problem, where the approaches to the lower terminus become congested with private vehicles trying to reach the car park.</p> <p>Of course, one would like to think that most users could be persuaded to use public transport all the way from their homes to the slopes. In the American context, is this realistic?</p> <p>Why not test out buses first?</p> <p>Before investing in highly expensive gondola or rail options in Little Cottonwood Canyon, why not try a moderate improvement option?</p> <p>As an experiment, a partnership including Utah Transit Authority, UDOT, Snowbird and Alta, could seek authorisation to close SR 210 on one Saturday early in April 2016. Only property owners in the Canyon, essential service vehicles and possibly shuttle services for destination visitors arriving to stay in or leave Alta / Snowbird, would be allowed to use the road on this day.</p> <p>The two resorts should try to stimulate late ski season demand for that day by a major incentive such as a free or very low cost lift ticket. UTA should provide a free bus service. UTA would round up every bus they could spare for the periods 7.00 to 9.00 am and from 3.30 to 5.30 pm. The aim would be to try transporting more than 10,000 people up Little Cottonwood Canyon in under two hours at the start of the day and back down again at the end. This would need a lot of buses.</p> <p>The advantage is that there could be multiple starting points around Salt Lake and Sandy, reducing the "muddy gate" problem. 250 bus trips up the Canyon by road may not seem a very green alternative, but it is considerably greener than 8,000 cars.</p> <p>It does little to address the avalanche issue except insofar that the smaller number of vehicles on SR210 should be easier to manage. However, if this looks like a possible improvement, even in the medium term, it is easier and more flexible to buy more buses than to introduce light rail. Whilst light rail has a much greater carrying capacity in urban areas, the logistics of mountain travel for skiing and snowboarding are very different.</p> <p>Commuters using light rail in the City create peaks Monday to Friday about 50 weeks per year (= 240 to 250 days annually).</p> <p>How many days is the traffic in Little Cottonwood Canyon really bursting?</p> <p>On how many days does the number of vehicles wanting to go up exceed 8,000 vehicles? 20 days? 30 days annually?</p> <p>What is the average daily traffic in Little Cottonwood Canyon? 6,000 vehicles? 7,000 vehicles? These are still very high figures for a mountain road with considerable avalanche danger.</p> <p>The other issue with introducing a mountain rail or gondola solution into Little Cottonwood Canyon is displacement. Would this result in those who want to drive to a resort choosing Big Cottonwood instead? Understandably this will not be an acceptable outcome for Snowbird and Alta Resorts.</p>		
<p>The advantage of an enhanced bus option is that if it works for Little Cottonwood, it could, in time, be applied to Big Cottonwood as well.</p> <p>Mountain Rail in Parley's Canyon</p> <p>Despite what has been said above, I have more positive feelings about the potential to create a system to transport passengers from and to Salt Lake Airport to Park City by rail. A greater proportion of these would be destination visitors, using rail to transfer to their lodging, rather than locals. Destination visitors coming to Park City for several days are less sensitive to a journey taking an hour rather than half an hour than are local day visitors. For destination visitors on shorter breaks, time becomes more pressing. The arrival / departure of destination visitors is likely to be less subject to Saturday or Sunday time specific peaks than the travel needs of locals.</p> <p>I have not aimed to address all the issues considered by Mountain Accord; this response is more than long enough already.</p>		
<p>Hi.</p> <p>While I think there are a lot of proposed options that are extremely unnecessary, there are a few points that will be very beneficial to the area.</p> <p>Adding trains and tunnels is extremely unnecessary. It seems that they will be mostly tax payer funded and to me the people seeing most or all of the profit will be the ski resorts themselves. Added more buses and widening bus pullouts would be sufficient.</p> <p>Implementing chairlifts like in ONE Wasatch is a terrible idea also. We live in a world plagued with obesity and they want to greatly reduce the main active winter activity that we have to participate in here in Salt Lake. If people want to ski fresh powder or the areas not easily accessible, they need to get a touring set up or some snowshoes and get out there. Adding the chairlifts would also do a major disservice to a handful of companies, who are based in SLC, that are backcountry based. These companies employ a large amount of people and help bring people to our city. They not only include major companies like Black Diamond and Voile, but smaller companies such as Wasatch Touring. Adding chairlifts will have a much larger economic effect then you might think.</p> <p>Also we already have a huge air pollution problem and cutting down trees for chairlifts is not the way to go. If anything we should be planting more trees!</p> <p>With these things said, I am very improving the trail network for mountain biking, as an avid biker trails are congested and are slowly starting to fall apart Building more trails is an amazing way to enjoy the Central Wasatch with minimal impact to the environment.</p> <p>Increasing public transit for year round access is also a great idea. But again this is where buses are a better idea. BCC seems to be the canyon with more summer use. Having buses allows for adjustment of public transit based on the need.</p> <p>I love living in SLC and I look forward to it's advancements. I just think that we need to keep high intensity activities alive to support our active culture and we also need to keep air quality in the forefront of all decisions. I believe there is a solution, it will just take a little bit to work out the kinks!</p> <p>Thanks for listening</p>		3/9/2015

<p>Mountain Accord,</p> <p>The following are my (shared) views on the proposal:</p> <p>Transportation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I recognize that the traffic situation in Little Cottonwood Canyon is unsustainable on some winter days, and while I understand the impetus to promote a train version of a fixed guideway, I feel that the bus system is far from optimized and with proper implementation, could service both the ski resorts and dispersed users on a year-round basis far more effectively than a train.</li> <li>• Providing copious parking near the mouths of the canyon would be a critical component of this.</li> <li>• Without trying an optimized bus system using the existing infrastructure I feel it is impossible to justify major infrastructure changes (adding lanes or installing a train)</li> <li>• Charging a per-vehicle fee - either via a daily fee or an annual pass - would help subsidize the optimized bus/parking system and provide an incentive to ride the transit system</li> <li>• Incentivize ridership by making the bus fee free or only a nominal price.</li> <li>• The bus system would need to have both a Snowbird-servicing bus and multiple Alta express buses.</li> <li>• Current and future UDOT plans to add passing lanes on hwy 210 for private vehicles should be focused on improving bus transit systems.</li> <li>• Snowsheds and/or bridges over slide paths can/should be added for increased avalanche mitigation for the highway.</li> <li>• I fully support optimizing year-round Bus Rapid Transit for Big Cottonwood Canyon. Again, with copious parking at the mouth of the canyon.</li> <li>• A tunnel linking LCC and BCC is not needed. Improved public transit would alleviate the traffic issues associated with LCC, and the "safety" issues that have been ascribed to a tunnel have been overblown; there have not been any documented injuries/fatalities associated with overuse of LCC that would not be overcome with improved transit.</li> <li>• Tunnel connections would create more defacto resort sidecountry terrain, effectively increasing the resorts' footprints.</li> <li>• The tunnel would basically be a taxpayer-funded connection that would exist to benefit four businesses (ski resorts) with no/very little validation that such a connection would actually be economically beneficial to those businesses. There are no significant "problems" that an LCC/BCC tunnel would solve, despite a considerable cost to taxpayers.</li> <li>• The same argument is applied to a fixed guideway system connecting BCC to Park City. It would not necessarily save time for PC-BCC travelers, is not supported by Park City officials, and would again be a taxpayer-subsidized benefit to a handful of businesses (ski resorts) who have not proven that such a connection would even be beneficial today, much less in the future considering global warming and the flat/declining trends of the resort skiing industry (according to their own study).</li> <li>• At the moment parking is the limiting factor for pressurized use in the Cottonwood Canyons; enabling as many people as possible to use the canyon will result in more user pressure. Optimizing Bus Rapid Transit will be an intermediate step to moving possibly-somewhat more people up the canyon to put only moderate additional use pressure on the canyons.</li> <li>• I am in full support of a year-round bus shuttle system for Mill Creek Canyon.</li> <li>• I am in full support of a train/light rail system linking the Salt Lake Valley with Park City. This is a system that I feel would be used far more extensively by commuters and lower-income resort workers around the clock on a more-regular schedule than a LCC canyon train that would be associated almost exclusively for time-intensive recreation.</li> <li>• The rationale provided for abandoning the Parley's rail transit - that was favored in the Trans system group - is that it would not be competitive with the freeway; however, this rationale was not applied to the successful SLC airport Trax line.</li> </ul> <p>Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I do NOT support a chairlift in Grizzly Gulch. I recognize that it is private property, but I also appreciate that much of Alta's operations are on public land and that they stand to benefit greatly from enhanced base development on a lot of lucrative land, additional water use, increased snowmaking, and improved LCC transit. Grizzly Gulch and the surrounding area should be put into some sort of permanent protection.</li> <li>• I could be supportive of chairlifts and development into the American Fork Canyon depending on alignment and scope.</li> <li>• I could be supportive of a re-aligned chairlift in Honeycomb Canyon, depending on the alignment, provided there are no effects on Silver Fork backcountry</li> <li>• I am supportive of Brighton's formal adoption of Hidden Canyon, provided any chairlift reaches back towards the Great Western chairlift.</li> <li>• I am supportive of increased connectivity between Brighton and Solitude in the SolBright area.</li> <li>• I am supportive of enhanced facilities at identified high-use nodes to both concentrate use in appropriate close-in areas and disperse use in more-remote areas</li> <li>• I am in support of modifying wilderness boundaries to accommodate new and existing sections of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.</li> <li>• I fail to understand how the Mountain Accord can consider all forms of recreation in the Central Wasatch except for one of the most significant and controversial forms: Wasatch Powderbirds. To me this "oversight" of neglecting helicopter skiing in our tiny range -that was based on a Forest Service administrative timeline that was arbitrarily changed from 5 year renewals to 10 years - is an egregious omission.</li> </ul> <p>Economics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I support enabling the ski resorts to utilize more water for snowmaking</li> <li>• I support adding potential land and altering zoning for additional development at the various resorts' bases.</li> <li>• I support enabling the ski resorts to expand their summertime activities within their existing footprints.</li> <li>• I support enhanced modern avalanche mitigation techniques (ie Gas-X) above Alta. I do NOT support a chairlift on Flagstaff peak</li> <li>• I do not support extraordinarily-expensive, taxpayer-funded "solutions" to "problems" that enable profit maximization for ski resorts whose lift tickets are pricing their customers out of an already-flat-to-declining market.</li> </ul> <p>Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I know that the EPA has determined that ski resort development has a more profound effect on watershed integrity than ANY other development. But I am cautiously optimistic that SLC Water and various other governing bodies will ensure water quality despite the threats associated with increased use, transit, and development.</li> <li>• I am in favor of a re-forestation effort on (particularly) the Emma ridgeline area</li> <li>• I am becoming increasingly convinced that simple people-pressure on the canyons is having a degrading effect on the watershed, and dramatically increasing opportunities to transport people up the canyons will have a commensurate effect on the watershed quality.</li> </ul>	<p>3/9/2015</p>
<p>Hello People,</p> <p>I have been very involved in the Mountain Accord process as a member of the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance. I'd like to go on record on behalf of myself and my family in regards to the Mountain Accord Blueprint in its current form...</p> <p>Transportation</p> <p>I recognize that the traffic situation in Little Cottonwood Canyon is unsustainable on some winter days, and while I understand the impetus to promote a train version of a fixed guideway, I feel that the bus system is far from optimized and with proper implementation, could service both the ski resorts and dispersed users on a year-round basis far more effectively than a train.</p> <p>Providing copious parking near the mouths of the canyon would be a critical component of this.</p> <p>Without trying an optimized bus system using the existing infrastructure I feel it is impossible to justify major infrastructure changes. (adding lanes or installing a train)</p> <p>Charging a per-vehicle fee - either via a daily fee or an annual pass - would help subsidize the optimized bus/parking system and provide an incentive to ride the transit system.</p> <p>Incentivize ridership by making the bus fee free or only a nominal price.</p> <p>The bus system would need to have both a Snowbird-servicing bus and multiple Alta express buses.</p> <p>Current and future UDOT plans to add passing lanes on hwy 210 for private vehicles should be focused on improving bus transit systems.</p> <p>Snowsheds and/or bridges over slide paths can/should be added for increased avalanche mitigation for the highway.</p> <p>I fully support optimizing year-round Bus Rapid Transit for Big Cottonwood Canyon. Again, with copious parking at the mouth of the canyon.</p> <p>A tunnel linking LCC and BCC is not needed. Improved public transit would alleviate the traffic issues associated with LCC, and the "safety" issues that have been ascribed to a tunnel have been overblown; there have not been any documented injuries/fatalities associated with overuse of LCC that would not be overcome with improved transit.</p> <p>Tunnel connections would create more defacto resort sidecountry terrain, effectively increasing the resorts' footprints.</p> <p>The tunnel would basically be a taxpayer-funded connection that would exist to benefit four businesses (ski resorts) with no/very little validation that such a connection would actually be economically beneficial to those businesses. There are no significant "problems" that an LCC/BCC tunnel would solve, despite a considerable cost to taxpayers.</p> <p>The same argument is applied to a fixed guideway system connecting BCC to Park City. It would not necessarily save time for PC-BCC travelers, is not supported by Park City officials, and would again be a taxpayer-subsidized benefit to a handful of businesses (ski resorts) who have not proven that such a connection would even be beneficial today, much less in the future considering global warming and the flat/declining trends of the resort skiing industry (according to their own study).</p> <p>The question on the survey asking if the transit "solutions" are "environmentally-sustainable" is fundamentally flawed: transit systems are not intended to be "environmentally sustainable"; they are intended to transport people from point to point. Since NO ONE - including trans engineers who have looked into this project - knows if they'll actually be environmentally-sustainable (eg degrading the watershed) that point is misguided at best and badly misleading and irrelevant at worst. The question should be "Is this a solution that as a user of the Central Wasatch would actually use and be willing to pay for?"</p> <p>At the moment parking is the limiting factor for pressurized use in the Cottonwood Canyons; enabling as many people as possible to use the canyon will result in more user pressure. Optimizing Bus Rapid Transit will be an intermediate step to moving possibly-somewhat more people up the canyon to put only moderate additional use pressure on the canyons.</p> <p>I am in full support of a year-round bus shuttle system for Mill Creek Canyon.</p> <p>I am in full support of a train/light rail system linking the Salt Lake Valley with Park City. This is a system that I feel would be used far more extensively by commuters and lower-income resort workers around the clock on a more-regular schedule than a LCC canyon train that would be associated almost exclusively for time-intensive recreation.</p> <p>The rationale provided for abandoning the Parley's rail transit - that was favored in the Trans system group - is that it would not be competitive with the freeway; however, this rationale was not applied to the successful SLC airport Trax line.</p>	<p>3/9/2015</p>
<p>Recreation</p> <p>I am in full support of creating a trails network in the upper reaches of the two canyons.</p> <p>The trails should be a mix of hiking exclusive, mountain biking exclusive, and shared. (and/or with management techniques conducive to habits; ie Snowbird's new trail being uphill till the tram runs and then it becomes downhill).</p> <p>Any new road/transit construction must have improved road cycling facilities. (wider shoulders, exclusive bike lanes, disconnected paved bike paths)</p> <p>LCC/BCC parking areas need to be enlarged and enhanced for the major dispersed user trailheads, with optional stops for the Bus Rapid Transit at White Pine, Argenta, Butler Fork, Mineral Fork, etc</p> <p>I support the permanent protection of the Emma Ridges to Superior ridgeline from development.</p> <p>I do NOT support a chairlift in Grizzly Gulch. I recognize that it is private property, but I also appreciate that much of Alta's operations are on public land and that they stand to benefit greatly from enhanced base development on a lot of lucrative land, additional water use, increased snowmaking, and improved LCC transit. Grizzly Gulch and the surrounding area should be put into some sort of permanent protection.</p> <p>I could be supportive of chairlifts and development into the American Fork Canyon depending on alignment and scope.</p> <p>I could be supportive of a re-aligned chairlift in Honeycomb Canyon, depending on the alignment, provided there are no effects on Silver Fork backcountry.</p> <p>I am supportive of Brighton's formal adoption of Hidden Canyon, provided any chairlift reaches back towards the Great Western chairlift.</p> <p>I am supportive of increased connectivity between Brighton and Solitude in the SolBright area.</p> <p>I am supportive of enhanced facilities at identified high-use nodes to both concentrate use in appropriate close-in areas and disperse use in more-remote areas</p> <p>I am in support of modifying wilderness boundaries to accommodate new and existing sections of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.</p> <p>I fail to understand how the Mountain Accord can consider all forms of recreation in the Central Wasatch except for one of the most significant and controversial forms: Wasatch Powderbirds. To me this "oversight" of neglecting helicopter skiing in our tiny range -that was based on a Forest Service administrative timeline that was arbitrarily changed from 5 year renewals to 10 years - is an egregious omission.</p> <p>Economics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I support enabling the ski resorts to utilize more water for snowmaking.</li> <li>• I support adding potential land and altering zoning for additional development at the various resorts' bases.</li> <li>• I support enabling the ski resorts to expand their summertime activities within their existing footprints.</li> <li>• I support enhanced modern avalanche mitigation techniques (ie Gas-X) above Alta. I do NOT support a chairlift on Flagstaff peak.</li> <li>• I do not support extraordinarily-expensive, taxpayer-funded "solutions" to "problems" that enable profit maximization for ski resorts whose lift tickets are pricing their customers out of an already-flat-to-declining market.</li> </ul> <p>I know that the EPA has determined that ski resort development has a more profound effect on watershed integrity than ANY other development. But I am cautiously optimistic that SLC Water and various other governing bodies will ensure water quality despite the threats associated with increased use, transit, and development.</p> <p>I am in favor of a re-forestation effort on (particularly) the Emma ridgeline area.</p> <p>I am becoming increasingly convinced that simple people-pressure on the canyons is having a degrading effect on the watershed, and dramatically increasing opportunities to transport people up the canyons will have a commensurate effect on the watershed quality.</p> <p>I am concerned that the ski resorts are getting many of their desired "gets", and their "gives" are more along the lines of "we are not taking as much as we could take", at the expense of potential environmental and backcountry terrain preservation.</p> <p>Overall I have found the "blueprint" (it should have been called a "proposal") to NOT be reflective of the thousands of hours of work that people put into the system group meetings and sub meetings over the summer; it confirms to me that the Exec board was made up of a lot of important People who were not very engaged in the process and therefore created a plan that represented their impressions/interests rather than what was determined by the System Groups. Therefore I do not support the "blueprint" in its current form, but I am a strong believer in the Mountain Accord ideals and timing, and am very hopeful that a more equitable balance of gives and takes can be achieved to accommodate many constituents'/stakeholders' desires, IF they are all willing to concede on some of their desires.</p>	
<p>Thanks for hearing my input</p>	

<p>Why would Snowbird and Alta want to and be willing to degrade their brand with overcrowding from Summit County? The idea floated in the blueprint is that by having multiple access points dispersion would lessen the effect of overcrowding. Not when Little and Big Cottonwood get substantially more snow and Little Cottonwood has far superior ski terrain and scenic beauty.</p> <p>Another issue I have a hard time getting my arms around is that is suggested that blueprint calls for some give and take. Snowbird puts into the public domain its private land holdings from Mt. Superior to the end of the Emma Ridge as well as some land west of the resort in exchange for being able to expand over towards American Fork Canyon, get more water and be able to more fully develop their base area. Alta also gives up property to get property and water rights and development ability. What does Brighton and Solitude give up? They are asking for expansion to their resorts and taxpayer paid improvements to bring more business to them in exchange for what?</p> <p>And the unspoken deal with Summit County is that they provide money and parking in exchange for access.</p> <p>I am in favor of County tax payer paid parking and bus service enhancements as well as snow sheds for public safety but link Big and Little and Big to Park City I am completely against. With a few small changes I endorse the "blawg" put out Tom Diegel of the Wasatch Back Country Alliance dated on March 7th where he is referred to as T-Dawg.</p> <p>Oh, Grizzly Gulch should be included in the land exchange with Alta.</p>	
<p>Dear "Mountain Accord", I am an alpine skier. I strongly oppose your project. I see no evidence of effort to involve the public. The public has not been given enough information on which to form informed views. The title of your project is presumptuous. No "accord" can be said to exist at the beginning of a project. No where do you examine the benefit of potential ski area expansion on the best available terrain rather than on the basis of a Wasatch interconnect basis. I oppose the interconnect because this would occur at the expense of backcountry skiing. Without the interconnect, I strongly doubt that the public will be visiting the Wasatch in numbers sufficient to justify the light rail expansion proposed. Why do you refuse to relate transit potential riders with transportation investment dollars? Your effort so far does not inspire confidence. Sincerely, Thomas A. Linell</p>	3/10/2015
<p>Hello</p> <p>I wanted to provide my input of the Mountain Accord Blueprint. I have lived in Utah since 2002 and have seen a lot of changes and growth in that short time. I have resided in both Salt Lake City and in Park City so I feel I have a good understanding of the needs of both citizen groups. Transportation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I recognize that the traffic situation in Little Cottonwood Canyon is unsustainable on many winter days, and while I understand the impetus to promote a train version of a fixed guideway, I feel that the bus system is far from optimized and with proper implementation, could service both the ski resorts and dispersed users on a year-round basis far more effectively than a train.</li> <li>Providing copious parking near the mouths of the canyon would be a critical component of this.</li> <li>Without trying an optimized bus system using the existing infrastructure I feel it is impossible to justify major infrastructure changes (adding lanes or installing a train)</li> <li>Charging a per-vehicle fee - either via a daily fee or an annual pass - would help subsidize the optimized bus/parking system and provide an incentive to ride the transit system</li> <li>Incentivize ridership by making the bus fee free or only a nominal price. The current costs to ride the bus makes it more expensive than driving a car with 3 or more people.</li> <li>The bus system would need to have both a Snowbird-servicing bus and multiple Alta express buses.</li> <li>Current and future UDOT plans to add passing lanes on Hwy 210 for private vehicles should be focused on improving bus transit systems.</li> <li>Snowsheds and/or bridges over slide paths can/should be added for increased avalanche mitigation for the highway.</li> <li>I fully support optimizing year-round Bus Rapid Transit for Big Cottonwood Canyon. Again, with copious parking at the mouth of the canyon.</li> <li>Tunnel connections would create more defacto resort sidecountry terrain, effectively increasing the resorts' footprints.</li> <li>The same argument is applied to a fixed guideway system connecting BCC to Park City. It would not necessarily save time for PC-BCC travelers, is not supported by Park City officials, and would again be a taxpayer-subsidized benefit to a handful of businesses (ski resorts) who have not proven that such a connection would even be beneficial today, much less in the future considering global warming and the flat/declining trends of the resort skiing industry (according to their own study).</li> <li>The question on the survey asking if the transit "solutions" are "environmentally-sustainable" is fundamentally flawed: transit systems are not intended to be "environmentally sustainable"; they are intended to transport people from point to point. Since no one - including transit engineers who have looked into this project - knows if they'll actually be environmentally-sustainable (eg degrading the watershed) that point is misguided at best and badly misleading and irrelevant at worst. The question should be "Is this a solution that as a user of the Central Wasatch would actually use and be willing to pay for?"</li> <li>At the moment parking is the limiting factor for pressurized use in the Cottonwood Canyons; enabling as many people as possible to use the canyon will result in more user pressure. Optimizing Bus Rapid Transit will be an intermediate step to moving possibly somewhat more people up the canyon to put only moderate additional use pressure on the canyons.</li> <li>I am in full support of a year-round bus shuttle system for Mill Creek Canyon.</li> <li>I am in full support of a train/light rail system linking the Salt Lake Valley with Park City. This is a system that I feel would be used far more extensively by commuters and lower-income resort workers around the clock on a more-regular schedule than a LCC canyon train that would be associated almost exclusively for time-intensive recreation.</li> </ul>	3/10/2015
<p>The rationale provided for abandoning the Parley's rail transit - that was favored in the Trans system group - is that it would not be competitive with the freeway; however, this rationale was not applied to the successful SLC airport Trax line.</p> <p>Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am in full support of creating a trails network in the upper reaches of the two canyons</li> <li>The trails should be a mix of hiking exclusive, mountain biking exclusive, and and shared (and/or with management techniques conducive to habits; ie Snowbird's new trail being uphill til the tram runs and then it becomes downhill).</li> <li>Any new road should include improved road cycling facilities (wider shoulders, exclusive bike lanes, disconnected paved bike paths)</li> <li>LCC/BCC parking areas need to be enlarged and enhanced for the major dispersed user trailheads, with optional stops for the Bus Rapid Transit at White Pine, Argenta, Butler Fork, Mineral Fork, etc.</li> <li>I support the permanent protection of the Emma Ridges to Superior ridgeline from development.</li> <li>I do not support a chairlift in Grizzly Gulch. I recognize that it is private property, but I also appreciate that much of Alta's operations are on public land and that they stand to benefit greatly from enhanced base development on a lot of lucrative land, additional water use, increased snowmaking, and improved LCC transit. Grizzly Gulch and the surrounding area should be put into some sort of permanent protection. ☹️</li> </ul>	
<p>I could be supportive of chairlifts and development into the American Fork Canyon depending on alignment and scope.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am supportive of Brighton's formal adoption of Hidden Canyon, provided any chairlift reaches back towards the Great Western chairlift.</li> <li>I am supportive of increased connectivity between Brighton and Solitude in the SolBright area.</li> <li>I am supportive of enhanced facilities at identified high-use nodes to both concentrate use in appropriate close-in areas and disperse use in more-remote areas</li> </ul> <p>Economics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I support enabling the ski resorts to utilize more water for snowmaking</li> <li>I support adding potential land and altering zoning for additional development at the various resorts' bases.</li> <li>I support enabling the ski resorts to expand their summertime activities within their existing footprints.</li> <li>I support enhanced modern avalanche mitigation techniques (ie Gas-X) above Alta. I do NOT support a chairlift on Flagstaff peak</li> <li>I do not support extraordinarily-expensive, taxpayer-funded "solutions" to "problems" that enable profit maximization for ski resorts whose lift tickets are pricing their customers out of an already-flat-to-declining market.</li> </ul> <p>Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am in favor of a re-forestation effort on (particularly) the Emma ridgeline area</li> <li>I am concerned that the ski resorts are getting many of their desired "gets", and their "gives" are more along the lines of "we are not taking as much as we could take", at the expense of potential environmental and backcountry terrain preservation.</li> </ul> <p>I do not support the "blueprint" in its current form, but I am a strong believer in the Mountain Accord ideals and timing, and am very hopeful that a more equitable balance of gives and takes can be achieved to accommodate many constituents'/stakeholders' desires, if they are all willing to concede on some of their desires.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	
<p>Here are my comments on the proposed blueprint:</p> <p>I definitely think something needs to be done about the traffic situation in Little Cottonwood Canyon, however I am opposed to a tunnel/train that continues on to Big Cottonwood Canyon or Park City. I support bus rapid transit or a train terminating at the top of Little Cottonwood Canyon, however I am skeptical that a train is a better option due to cost and environmental impact. I think the money would be better spent on snow sheds. My main concern with all of these options is parking near the mouth of the canyon. I think a lot could be accomplished by revamping UTA (making it year round, more affordable, running earlier/later/more often, with more express buses to Alta and stops at various trailheads) and charging skiers to park in the Little Cottonwood Canyon resort lots. There has to be some incentive for people to carpool or ride the bus and currently, the bus system is useless for many of us who work and recreate in Alta.</p> <p>I support year round bus rapid transit in Big Cottonwood Canyon and a shuttle system in Millcreek Canyon. Any road construction should include improving these canyons for road cycling.</p> <p>I support a train/light rail system connecting Salt Lake City/Airport with Park City/Wasatch Back.</p> <p>I support destination trails in the canyons.</p> <p>I support the permanent protection of the Emma Ridge/Superior ridgelines from development.</p> <p>I support increased water for snowmaking. 210 acres of ski area boundary expansions that include Hidden Canyon and lower Silver Fork, and 258 acres of base area development, however I question the need for 108 more units in the Alta base area.</p> <p>I am adamantly opposed to developing 416 acres in American Fork Canyon as part of the exchange for the land north of Alta being spared.</p> <p>Finally, I would like clarification on what "under consideration" means for Grizzly Gulch before Mountain Accord moves forward with the land exchange.</p> <p>I think the Blueprint is off to a good start...thanks for listening.</p>	3/10/2015
<p>It appears to me that this is yet another version of One Wasatch and is primarily resort driven. Rail lines from Park City to Alta, from Brighton to LCC? Expensive infrastructure dumping more people into the Cottonwoods. Alta wants 108 units at their base? This is a trade for their private land in Grizzly Gulch and the Emmas? Their entire resort is already on public land and they want more? More units means more people, more stress on the roads and watershed. Would they give up their snow cat operation in Grizzly? How about giving up Supreme? And Solitude wants to trade land in Guardsman Pass that is currently overrun by snowmobiles for 75 acres in lower Silver Fork. They say it is for a realignment of the Honey Comb lift. You don't need 75 acres to accomplish that. Sounds like a development scheme to me. Winter seems to be going away. Why this push for more development of the ski resorts? Let's not make the Wasatch like Europe. It is unique the way it is. What needs addressing is the worm up the canyons on powder days. Parking at the mouths of the canyons and a more efficient mass transit (as in buses that stop at trail heads and have dedicated lanes) would be very helpful. I have sat in the "worm" on the bus standing w/ my ski for over an hour going from Big to Little. No wonder no one wants to use it. If you park at the newly paved and downsized lot across from the Porcupine you have to hustle up to the bus lot w/ all your gear. Why doesn't the bus stop there?</p>	3/10/2015
<p>NO TRAINS NO EXTRA LANES UP LITTLE COTTONWOOD CA NY ON IF YOU MUST DO SOMETHING GET THE STATE TO STOP SPENDING \$\$\$ TO ENCOURAGE OUT OF STATE TOURISTS. TO COME HERE AND CLOG THE CANYONS</p>	3/10/2015
<p>The ski industry underestimated global warming and invested too much in the Park City area. Now that they realize that Park City itself will not have enough snow in the winter they want tunnels so that they can ship their tourists to Alta if necessary. This entire mountain accord plan still underestimates global warming, because you are assuming that the ski and other nature tourists will be able to fly in. Flying has such a large carbon footprint that in the future it will only be possible for the super-rich. But SLC is close enough to San Francisco that it can be reached by train, especially if there is a high speed train line. If you make such a big tourist infrastructure investment as the mountain accord, then you have to complement this by getting a high speed line (expensive) or at least an intercity and fast freight train line (cheap) from California to SLC. The future of both passenger transport and freight transport is on trains, and SLC has a geographic advantage. I hope someone is working on this.</p>	3/11/2015
<p>I have been trying to find any discussion of this, but unable to. With the proposed blueprint and shuttle system up Millcreek, what would be the proposed public access plan? What about dogs in the canyon? Could you please clarify, and if available, point me to mentions of this in the proposed plans. While I realized that watershed protection is important, there is also an aspect of life that has brought, and kept, many of us here. The ability to have a dog friendly canyon with adequate cooling/shade during the summer for dogs is critical to a way of life. With the rest of this project already focused on keeping the resorts and the industry happy, losing that aspect of lifestyle in a future plan would heavily incentivize me to take my life, my professional talent and my tourism away from SLC. On a whole this plan also needs to address integration with sustainable transportation planning through the valley and accommodation to those of us WHO LIVE HERE. Otherwise you're just moving the bottle neck and the wealthy resorts will just keep pricing us out. This will soon become a (though I believe it has already) a money talks and the highest bidder develops situation to ruin already over-stressed precious piece of landscape and natural resource and shut out the locals, who build, support and sustain the greater SLC-Utah Valley industry. Contrary to popular belief, this is not just skiing. Please don't ruin our back yard, there are already too many eye sores and too much private development on public lands.</p>	3/11/2015
<p>To all who have worked hard on this project,</p> <p>I have just read through the proposal and find that what it contains is a realistic, insightful and practical look into the future of the Wasatch mountain community. I support this whole heartedly and will do all that I can to make my support known to others.</p> <p>Way to go!</p>	3/11/2015
<p>I generally agree with the proposed plans of Mountain Accord. However, I strongly disagree if the plans in any way leave open the possibility of further ski area expansion or lift expansion into Grizzly Gulch. Grizzly Gulch should be expressly excluded from any further development by Alta Ski area or any other resorts. For public land preservation, watershed concerns, visual pollution, and preservation of a uniquely accessible wild area, Grizzly Gulch should be protected and preserved. Grizzly Gulch is one of the most accessible wild areas left at the top of Little Cottonwood Canyon. A short hike, ski or snowshoe take one away from the sight of ski resorts and into a forested heaven. It is a place many of us had our first backcountry ski tours or snowshoeing adventures. Ski lift expansion in Grizzly Gulch would be a tragedy for not only that area but also for the area near Twin Lakes, Lake Catherine, Silver Fork, Days Fork, Cardiff Fork and other adjacent areas.</p>	3/11/2015
<p>If you improve the connector between Cottonwood Canyon and Park City you will have lots of traffic, construction trucks and traffic, and buses using that route. You need to consider having the road improved and widened so that road and mountain bikers can use the route without fear of being run over by trucks. Brown Canyon Road is a good example of a road that has marginal shoulder width for road bikers, given the volume of heavy truck traffic to the gravel pits. I'd like to see what specific plans are being considered for road biking. As a recreational sport it has really taken off in both Salt Lake and Park City, and it needs to be included in your plans.</p>	3/11/2015
<p>I support additional parking at the bases of the canyon with increased shuttles, as well as canyon entry/parking fees to discourage driving and encourage subsidized mass transit. ☹️ No tunnel/gondola is necessary between Little Cottonwood and Park City. This seems very expensive, and I believe the cost will outweigh the benefit (adding Park City people into LCC, which is already at capacity--to the extent that it is a benefit). To the extent Summit County needs better access to the Salt Lake Canyons, adding rail from Park City to Salt Lake and along the bench to the mouths of the canyon would improve access for Summit County residents and visitors without compromising the mountains, and would also improve mass transit commuting, which hopefully would ease air pollution as well. No ski-link or gondola system should be added between Park City and BCC, or between BCC and LCC. See Comment No. 1 re resort expansion. I appreciate your consideration of these points and hope the revised Blueprint will incorporate my comments.</p>	3/11/2015
<p>LOL, get tourists to pay for road or train concepts- Utah Taxpayers will not</p>	3/11/2015

<p>Dear Mountain Accord,</p> <p>That was my reaction when I learned that the Executive Committee is taking seriously a proposal that would build a mass transit corridor through Little Cottonwood Canyon to Brighton, Park City and beyond. What more effective way is there to destroy the natural and watershed values of Little Cottonwood? Such a project would produce years of dirty and damaging construction in the Canyon, followed by interminable noisy train traffic in the canyon. And, by the way, do the commercial interests propose to pay the required billions for the proposed project? I'm sure that the answer is NO, they will expect the taxpayers to subsidize them. The same comment goes for a train in Big Cottonwood. And one sure way to reduce tourism is to destroy the natural beauty and solitude of these mountains.</p> <p>The current approach of the Committee seems to treat all the "interests" as if they should have equal footing. This is a mistake. Utah, as well as the rest of the Southwest is already experiencing drought, and the predictions of climate science are that the droughts to come (during this century) will be even worse. Plus the population of the valley is growing rapidly. Any sane and prudent person would realize that expanding commercial exploitation of the Wasatch is a very risky business. Watershed values should trump commercial development. You can't have it all.</p> <p>Hope this helps</p>	<p>3/11/2015</p>
<p>We feel that there is not enough information available for the public to make a decision. You have had public meetings, but no one can tell us exactly what you are planning to do. We feel that taking TRAX up 7200 south would effect fewer homes because the road is wider. The canyon is wider as well. But no one seems to want to commit to telling us what your plans really are. We really feel that it would be a negative effect on both canyons. It will detract from their beauty and is a poor use of funds that could be used elsewhere. There are other solutions that would make a huge difference and those issues are not even being addressed. We also feel that there should be citizens on your committee that are directly effected by this project - people who live in the mouth of the canyons or further up on the hills above the resort either on 9400 N. or 7200 South, not people who live in unaffiliated areas.</p> <p>The installation of these lifts and ski runs could be accomplished in one or two years with virtually immediate improvement to the environment. So often, when we drive visitors down Parleys and into the frequent inversions, they immediately comment on the smell and the ugly cloud hanging over the valley. The Salt Lake valley has enough automobile pollution without thousands of visitors from Park City adding to it every week of the ski season while driving to the Cottonwoods. Furthermore, the costs of installing the lifts and runs that would reduce pollution would be borne by private enterprise, i.e. the ski areas, not by government financing, which ultimately places the burden on homeowners and other taxpayers. Conversely, the transit connections proposed in the blueprint will cost billions of dollars and entail a decade or more of planning and construction. Ski lifts are the only type of non-auto transportation that could provide a significant near-term reduction in automobile pollution of the air and water. If and when the comprehensive rail and tunnel system advocated by the draft blueprint are put in place, there obviously would be a further significant reduction in automobile pollution particularly with respect to travelers to the Cottonwoods from the Salt Lake valley. But it does not seem environmentally responsible to fail to effect an easily attainable significant reduction in automobile pollution as soon as possible. While ski lifts can help to significantly reduce automobile pollution, I believe they could and should be sited and constructed in a manner that minimizes the impact on iconic ridge lines. This could be achieved in several ways and it seems to me that the blueprint ought to consider them. For example, a condition for the approval of any ski lifts could be that their tops be placed in a topographic location which does not have high visibility, or utilize a notch or tunnel in order to preclude scenic degradation. While this would increase the cost of installing a ski lift, the fact that various ski areas have used small tunnels to good effect indicates that cost alone might not preclude its installation. While I do advocate the over-the-snow inter-connections described in the One Wasatch concept, I believe a balanced approach to the protection of the central Wasatch requires that these connections be accomplished without the construction of any additional commercial or residential structures within the public and privately owned areas lying between the Park City and Cottonwood resorts. I recognize that some backcountry ski routes could be adversely affected by the ski lifts envisioned in the One Wasatch concept. Most days I myself carry a beacon, shovel and probe, and I have observed, for example, the marked increase in the number of backcountry skiers hiking up from the top of 9990 since that lift was installed at the Canyons. But, much as I wish I was the only one able to access most of my favorite backcountry runs, I think it is somewhat disingenuous to suggest that is a real environmental issue. Even if ski lifts were installed to connect the seven resorts mentioned in the Wasatch One concept, there would still be a large amount of backcountry terrain that could not be easily accessed. And, in the interests of fair balance, the blueprint ought to recognize that if and when a rail transit system connecting the Cottonwoods and Park City is installed, it will facilitate an even more widespread use of the backcountry over a far broader area than the several ski lifts that were suggested. I recognize that some backcountry skiers adamantly oppose any over-the-snow connection between the seven resorts, but I likewise know a number of avid backcountry skiers who, like myself, believe that those connections could enhance our opportunity to enjoy the mountains. We are not in favor of placing noisy vehicles up in the mountains, but to many of us the combination of sweat energy, gravity and ski lifts adds to, rather than detracts from, our enjoyment. In addition, from personal observation and many conversations, it is clear to me that the vast majority of resort-based skiers do not choose to go into the backcountry even where that opportunity is easily presented.</p> <p>There probably are some older or less fit folks who would be more inclined to go into the backcountry if they could ride back on a ski lift or a rail link, but I believe that would represent a relatively small percentage increase in the number of backcountry skiers. And I believe on balance that is a small price to pay for the many benefits which would accrue from the establishment of over-the-snow connections between the seven resorts. In summary, I believe the proposed blueprint gives too much weight to the views of one vocal segment of backcountry skiers, and under weights the environmental, transportation, recreation and, most particularly, the attendant economic value of the One Wasatch concept. I recognize there appear to be some folks who wish the Wasatch could be reserved for local residents only and who don't have any desire to increase the area's attractiveness to visitors. But the facts are that the ski industry is essential to the livelihood of a great many local people, and that skiing is a major economic driver for this region. Therefore, in my opinion, a balanced blueprint ought to recognize the enormous value of establishing the central Wasatch as the single largest ski complex in North America. This would be an enormous marketing hook and provide a major competitive advantage against other world class ski venues such as Aspen, Vail/Beaver Creek, Lech/Zur/St. Anton, the Trois Vallees, and Whistler Blackcomb. Of course, the Wasatch has many competitive advantages including very warm and friendly people, great snow, a variety of challenging terrain, the wonderful and authentic Park City, and the convenience of a major international airport 30-45 minutes from so many ski areas, among others. But this is not a static field and other world class ski venues are continually trying to improve the experience for their visitors in order to attract and retain their patronage. By linking the seven resorts over the snow into a single 18,000 acre ski complex, the largest in North America, the Wasatch can create a marketing dynamo that others will struggle to match. Can the Aspen ski company link its four resorts over the snow? Can Vail link up with Beaver Creek over the snow? Longer term, those may be possible at great expense. But the central Wasatch can be linked over the snow in one or two years at minimal expense. What a recreation and economic opportunity to squander! An opportunity that carries with it the near term reduction of automobile pollution and no significant cost to taxpayers. Indeed, as the economy grows, the inflow of tax dollars from visitors will provide a substantial net benefit to the state and the nation. A balanced blueprint ought to embrace this opportunity. Rather, than doing so, the draft blueprint seems designed to forever thwart the realization of these obvious economic, environmental, recreational and transportation benefits by placing land which is currently privately owned into a status of preservation under the guise of environmental protection. Indeed, one of the points that was emphasized in the One Wasatch announcement was that it could all be accomplished on private land. No surprise then that those who immediately opposed it sought to use "preservation" as a key blocking step. After further consideration, I sincerely hope that the Mountain Accord blueprint will recognize the many near and long term benefits of establishing over-the-snow links among the seven resorts Thank you for considering my comments.</p>	<p>3/11/2015</p>
<p>I am concerned that things like railways and tunnels will be very expensive and in order to generate enough revenue to make them feasible, significant development will be required; lodging, food, entertainment, supporting infrastructure... That development would be contrary to the nature of the canyons as they are currently appreciated and used by many. Park City, and Snowbird to a lesser extent, already offer that more "glitzy" option. Maintaining the more natural option is vital for multiple use. The land exchange footprints lend themselves to extensive development no matter what current "powers that be" may say. If it doesn't remain restricted now, there is no guarantee that it will not be developed in the future. The mountain has a carrying capacity for cars, sewer contributors, and recreationists. Most of the private lands proposed for swap are already protected by existing regulations or de facto. The proposed swaps do little to enhance that and risk opening the doors to significant impact.</p>	<p>3/11/2015</p>
<p>The land swap would increase the value of Alta Ski Lift Company dramatically and make them far more attractive to an acquirer like Vail Resorts substantially increasing the probability such a change of ownership would happen. An acquirer like Vail would not hesitate to develop the property as fully as possible as that is their business model. While I certainly cannot fault the Alta Ski Lift Company for working to make the land swap a reality, I do not think it is appropriate for the Forest Service to trade away a low value steep pitched mountain slope asset for the developable land at the Alta Base. Nor do I think it appropriate for the Forest Service to, with a penstroke, irrevocably alter the Alta that the Alta Town Office, Friends of Alta, and thousands of friends, admirers and residents of Alta have fought for decades to protect. Note that the plan for the area includes building avalanche snow fences in all of the significant slide paths above town. This would likely eliminate the building restrictions currently in place due to the danger of these slide paths and open up the entire Alta base area to commercial development. There is a middle ground. Currently all of Alta's buildings are on Forest Service land. It would make sense to trade the land under their buildings for the undevelopable parcels up on the mountainside. Perhaps a land buffer around these properties could be included in the swap. But the road through town, the parking, and the currently undeveloped areas should remain public in order to insure access to the surrounding public lands for future generations. Please note that I count many of the management team at the ski lift company as friends and wish them no ill will. However I takes a broader constituency than a single company, ultimately ruled by the profit motive, to keep public access to public lands open and preserve the true value of Alta, Utah. Thank you for your thoughtful efforts on behalf of the town.</p>	
<p>No trains and No tunnels in our canyons</p>	<p>3/12/2015</p>
<p>To whom it may concern - I make a plea with you to pursue the land swaps as they are currently planned. The land swaps are detrimental for the following reasons: 1. Parking under the swap could be problematic for many patrons. Under the swap it is not unreasonable to think that parking in the future could be restricted or limited to fees for the surrounding public lands particularly in Alta. 2. The swap could lead to a private owner setting a back country fee for visitors. These lands should be public and one person should not have the right to profit from them. 3. The land would be opened up to significant development. The whole reason many go up there is to get away from the city and enjoy our beautiful state as it is. Even now when you go to Alta the parking lots are almost always full but the restaurant is not. People are there for the outdoor recreation. Development would significantly impact the current appeal. We love the way the Canyons are now with limited development. That is why we go there. 4. We want to continue to access back country in a convenient way. The land swap does not address this and the possibilities for alternative routes (paid lifts) could be the only access point in the future. I think there is a middle ground. In Alta particularly, it would make sense to trade the land under their buildings for the un-developed parcels up on the mountainside. Perhaps a land buffer around these properties could be included in the swap. But the road through town, the parking, and the currently undeveloped areas should remain public in order to insure access to the surrounding public lands for future generations. I ask you to please take these things into consideration and look out for the people who love this great state and the mountains we currently enjoy as is. Please don't let just the big investors and special interests speak for us.</p> <p>I have looked at the proposed template for future access to the mountains in and around "Tri County Peak". This is where Summit, Wasatch and Salt Lake Counties meet (directly behind the Jupiter Chairlift). It would be best to avoid and discourage more and improved roadways through this area. (tunnels are a huge expense). The short term solution is simple. Build two High speed gondolas, one from the base of the Jupiter Chair to the circle in Brighton and one high speed gondola from the base of Mill through Grizzly Gulch to the Albion Basin side of Alta.</p> <p>This will accomplish several things. Its the beginning of a larger transportation system that can grow as needed.</p> <p>These lifts will act as the "interconnect" the resorts want to have while keeping the tourists out of the back country many of our locals want protected. These lifts will also control the logistics to having an interconnect by allowing the areas to control/coordinate openings and closures.</p> <p>For a relative cheap price and possibly all on private property the short term growth in these areas can be realized.</p> <p>Long term satellite parking with access to a year round transportation system (Funiculars?) would be needed to help keep the pristine nature and rugged beauty of our Wasatch Mountains. These transportation devices can be installed in all 3 counties spreading out like spokes in a wheel to provide safe clean and energy responsible transportation for future generations.</p>	<p>3/12/2015</p>
<p>I strongly support the protecting of the environment as main thrust of the accord. Protecting the watershed is of primary importance. Further development can only push further degradation. Climate change make the ski industry the last place to support growth. Beyond improved bus service, transportation expansion will just increase pressure on a finite resource.</p>	<p>3/12/2015</p>
<p>Greetings:</p> <p>I have practiced as a licensed transportation planning engineer and civil engineer for many years. I offer the following comments for consideration based on my education and experience.</p> <p>Those who benefit from any transportation system improvements in the canyons or to Park City should pay for the capital and operating costs.</p> <p>The typical user of these systems will have an income well above average.</p> <p>Transportation improvements are typically paid for by taxes on all people not just users. Accordingly, the high income users of any transportation system proposed by Mountain Accord will be subsidized by lower income people.</p> <p>The cost per trip if capital and operating costs are totaled is very high. The Bay Area Rapid Transit system (BART) twenty years ago cost over \$50 per passenger trip. A similar calculation for the current or any future UTA operation will likely show high public subsidy of upper income people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What do you think about resort connectivity?</li> </ul>	<p>3/12/2015</p>
<p>It's unnecessary. And I say this as an urbanite who visits SLC 1-2 times a year specifically to spend a week skiing, not a local NIMBY. I fly over Aspen and Big Sky to come here! Why? Because I can hit great skiing at a different resort each day with minimal planning! I'm not tied to a specific resort. If the mountains were a 2 hour drive from SLC this would make sense, but I don't see the need. It's a marketing gimmick. In 10 years I've never even bothered to do the Alta/Snowbird interconnect. I just hit one each day. You need to spend a day at a resort to enjoy it anyway.</p> <p>It seems liek it would cater to the wrong kind of skier... someone who is in a rush and wants to see it all in 2-3 days maybe? I don't want to ski with those people.</p> <p>If this were to go through Utah would lose some of what's special about it, adding to on piste congestion in my opinion, needlessly tearing up the land. I would consider skiing elsewhere in the future if this came to fruition. Right now you've got my captive attention not to mention the 10s to 100s of strangers I've convinced to skip Colorado and head to Utah!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• improved bus services?</li> <li>• Mountain rail?</li> </ul> <p>I've never ridden the bus. With a small family and affordable rental rates it wasn't a need. I would consider it if I came out solo.</p> <p>Rail is intriguing as a prefer rail for commuting, and if rail was a way to get up to the resorts when the pass is closed, or in rough weather that starts to make more sense.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No improvements at all?</li> </ul> <p>I'm fine supporting this option. You've got something unique and special in the North American ski market. Don't fuck it up.</p> <p>The cost is too great and the benefits too small to place the burden on the taxpayers. I am not in favor of blasting tunnels in the mountains. The train next to a hiking trail is very invasive.</p>	<p>3/12/2015</p>

<p>Ladies and Gentlemen;</p> <p>Finally! I see an official document that contains one of the ideas that I have been talking to people about for over 25 years! I'm talking about the Sandy/Snowbird/Alta/Solitude/Brighton/Park City/Canyons Transportation Corridor.</p> <p>I'm a Utah native and lifelong skier. I've always known from my backcountry experience how close the resorts of the central Wasatch lie to each other. It's really only a couple of ridges that separate all of them. Some of these ridges already have mining tunnels that run through them i.e. The Trans-Wasatch Tunnel. A Swiss-born engineering colleague of mine once suggested that if we built a rail line up Little Cottonwood Canyon we could protect it from avalanches by various means. It could proceed through a tunnel to Big Cottonwood canyon to Solitude and Brighton, then again through a tunnel to Park City, The Canyons, and beyond. After having this discussion with my colleague, I was so taken with the idea that I spoke in 1989 with the then CEO of UTA, Mr. John Pingree. He agreed that it was a good idea, but that it was not something that they were going to pursue because they could not afford to build anything without Federal assistance. He said that the Federal assistance was all tied to meeting certain criteria like "does it serve the needs of the handicapped or some under-served community". Things have changed a lot in the past 26 years. Our state has grown and it is no longer an issue that would be addressed by the UTA alone but it is a quality of life issue, an environmental issue, an economic development and tourism issue, and a water management issue. It is just the sort of problem that takes agreement from all the stakeholders to commit the resources needed to solve once and for all. Recently I've been buying season passes at Snowbird and I've come to the conclusion that about half of the local skiers there on any given day drove their personally owned vehicle from Summit County! In other words they live in the Park City area and they drive down Park City's canyon to drive up Little Cottonwood canyon to ski. Then they reversed that path to return home. I'm guessing that they drive about a 100 miles round trip to go somewhere that's less than 10 miles away - as the crow flies!</p> <p>The advantages of having a safe, short, reliable light rail ride either from the Sandy or PC areas to the resorts are fantastic, but they can't compare with the advantages of having a rail-based means to commute from anywhere along the Wasatch Front to the Wasatch back and vice-versa by light rail!!!! It is so gratifying to see that the idea may be getting traction. Still, I would like to make a couple of additional suggestions.</p> <p>The time to act is NOW! One of the keys to success for this system is that we have to make it attractive for people to get out of their cars and use the system by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Purchasing and setting aside enough parking space at the transportation hubs so that people can park their cars and get onto the train.</li> <li>2. Providing enough security at these park-n-ride centers that they still have catalytic converters and stereos in their cars when they return.</li> <li>3. Putting a small fee on the use of the train (perhaps keep it free for season pass holders and very economical for everyone else).</li> <li>4. Placing a toll gate at the base of each of the canyon roads and charge a fee to drive up them. The fee should be more than the cost of riding the train.</li> </ol> <p>If there is anything that I can personally do to assist with promoting this project, please let me know.</p> <p>Just wanted to take the time to thank you for all the work that is being put into this blueprint. I own a rock climbing shop in the valley and have enjoyed the mountains for years climbing, skiing, hiking and more recently flying. I write to describe my experience entering the paragliding world. Utah's paragliding community is perhaps one of the best in the country. I belong to local clubs that share the same values as mountain accord and hope that we can be involved. The point of the mountain is a sort of resort for paragliders. Especially suitable for those entering the sport. I received great mentoring when I began venturing into the mountains which is an entirely different side of flying. This year the National XC competitions will be held in Utah and Utah has always been a premier location for flying. Our community is respectful and conscious of the environment. Paragliding is incredibly low impact as most of the sport is spent in the air. I have enjoyed the use of our mountains and hope that continued use will be available. Please let me know if there are any developments as to the use of land for paragliding.</p> <p>Sometimes the "devil's in the details". A light train that goes up Little Cottonwood Canyon could be fantastic - the best thing for the valley since Brigham Young said "This is the place".</p> <p>On the other hand, if the train were significantly slower than taking a car up or down the canyon that would be bad. And if it added stop lights and/or train crossings for car traffic - even worse! Don't do it! Another Trax boondoggle!</p>	<p>3/12/2015</p> <p>3/12/2015</p> <p>3/12/2015</p>
<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I am writing to express some concerns regarding the mountain accord that is being currently open for public comment.</p> <p>First, I am happy about the efforts that are going into the development of the proposed blueprint. However, I also am concerned that some of the groups that are currently using the areas that will be covered by the proposed blueprint will be negatively affected in the future. I am especially concerned about the potential limitations that will be imposed on the free flying community, representing paragliding, hand gliding and speed flying. As the plan moves forward I would like to ask that the recreational opportunities of the free flying community be protected, assuring future use of the sites that are currently in use by this community.</p> <p>As the board members may be aware, Utah is a world class destination for free flight, and participants travel from around the world to fly in the Wasatch range. National competitions have been held in this area, and national records have been set from sites in Big Cottonwood Canyon. Many of our sites are within the borders of areas that have been noted as under consideration for enhanced protection.</p> <p>Our sport is of low impact, and likely has lower impact than that of other groups of recreational users like hikers, runners, skiers, and bikers. To illustrate the type of use we are engaged in: The majority of our use occurs in the air, without any noise or air pollution. For launching or gliding, we rely on access to multiple hillsides and mountain tops without any environmental impact on vegetation or wildlife. To allow us to land we rely on open areas in the canyons. Thus, the environmental impact of free flight is extremely low.</p> <p>In its current version of the mountain accord project there is a significant threat to our community because areas of current use by the free flight community would be not accessible by us in the future. This threat is severe since our community is often equated with powered aviation, which translates into severe restrictions or even prohibitions for paraglider and hang glider pilots. For example, all of the federal land managers controlling wilderness, national monument, and national park land have banned these free flight activities.</p> <p>What strikes me as particularly tragic is that the majority of the projects' goals and values are shared by members of the free flight community. Actually many members of our community are also avid climbers backcountry skiers ultra runners and hikers engaged in actively protecting the environment and wilderness areas.</p> <p>Finally, the majority of us also are property owners in in the Salt Lake and Utah valleys with significant interest in preservation of our natural resources.</p> <p>I believe that a new draft version of the accord should include a grandfather passage that acknowledges the fact that free flight predates any changes in designation and provides us with continued access to public lands.</p> <p>I am convinced that many individuals of the free flight community and representatives of our organization, the Utah Hang Gliding and Paragliding Association would like to actively participate in the discussion about land designation changes, with the goal of securing the right to continue our recreational use of these critical public lands.</p> <p>I personally would appreciate the chance to discuss this facet of future proposals in greater detail with members of the executive committee.</p>	<p>3/12/2015</p>
<p>Mountain Accord</p> <p>After reading through the proposal ideas and going to a meeting I guess it's time to add additional comments to what I have heard so far. First I think it's a great futuristic idea to run a cog rail up Little Cottonwood Cyn but only if it's on the existing road right if way. When you look at all the unsightly road cuts up our canyons the angle of repose of soils is far from what should be done. When you look at railroads and roads in Switzerland you see retaining walls where needed and vegetated slopes with slope angles that are not constantly eroding away. Ultimately I would like to see cars completely removed from our canyons. Snowbird already has more lift capacity than their parking and current bus transportation can service and with population growth something bold needs to be done. Tunneling through to Big and PC seems prohibitively expensive and I wouldn't even want the US taxpayer to help foot that bill! Until this pie in the sky rail system actually is built the bus system could be greatly improved. Parking and ride lots at the mouths of the canyons are not even close to what is needed. Maybe in the long range future the Gravel pits at the mouth of Big Cottonwood Cyn could be purchased and a huge parking garage built. Light rail on the east corridor could greatly improve access for those of us living downtown and would surely be a plus for the entire east side as a commuter line anyway.</p> <p>So until the ultimate people mover is in place the bus system could be greatly improved. More buses and run more often year around. If wait times are shortened more people would be more inclined to ride transit with adequate parking or a means to get to the mouths of the canyons. In winter and summer it would be nice if the bus would be able to stop at all the side canyons hiked and skied by backcountry users. This would require maybe some shoulder improvements so the bus could be out of the traffic flow. Currently the S curves, Mineral Fork, Butler Fork, Bear Trap and Silver Fork have no stops in Big Cottonwood. So until bus service is improved it would be nice if UDOT could plow thru these trailheads so that cars could get further off the road! It would also be nice if the Lot at the S curves could be opened and plowed so that even more cars could park there.</p> <p>I'm apposed to any more ski area expansion in our watershed. The resorts again have proven that with all their road construction they would be failed as land stewards! Again these roads are more numerous and much wider than needed with no water bars to stop the incessant erosion and no retaining walls were ever built thus causing even more soil erosion. With all this sediment washing into our watershed its amazing our water is even drinkable! Vegetation is the key to slowing the flow, this is not only the ski areas responsibility but, UDOT and the sad state of all our roads in the Canyons, as well as the FS with the lack of virtually any trail, or road maintenance over the entire forest! Get the ATVs and motor cycles out of Mineral Fork! The watershed and it's protection is the number one concern I have for the entire Wasatch Range lets make a difference and make improvements now!</p> <p>Back to the ski areas and the new normal of the lack of snow we have low snow the ski areas need to be required to allow uphill traffic in at least one route to the top of each of the cottonwood resorts. With all the ski area boundary expansion that has taken place there is virtually no accessible early season terrain for backcountry skiers and with all the resorts making snow they close up hill traffic long before we can access any of the remaining areas. Take for example Cardiff Fork, Days Fork, and Silver Fork all require walking in a long way on dirt from Big Cottonwood or bare south facing slope accessing from Little Cottonwood. Years like 2014 -15 with virtually no low snow areas down canyon aren't even an option. I talked to Bob Bonar after the meeting at the Downtown Library and he said it's the liability that has closed off uphill access. Well it seems like with some creative ideas that could be overcome. Most of Cottonwood resorts terrain are on FS land and the backcountry crowd should have access to what is public land!</p>	<p>3/12/2015</p>
<p>Unfortunately I don't presently have sufficient time to organize my thoughts into a flowing letter. Rather, they may appear random at times but are no less sincere. I am a skier who lives in salt lake county and have skied at many Wasatch front resorts. Alta is and has been my primary resort for the past 40 years. During the past 4 decades salt lake county has likely grown over 500,000 people. The ski boundaries don't seem to have expanded dramatically except perhaps Snowbird. I enjoy a time share at the Iron Blossom lodge at Snowbird each May. I attempt to ski at Alta most Saturdays- pending reasonable or better conditions.. I purchase gold cards from Alta for my children that wish to ski, and season passes for grandchildren that are of age. In other words I have hundreds of skier days in the cottonwood canyons myself and much more collectively with the family.</p> <p>I have many concerns about the mountain accord plans, especially after attending the meeting at skyline high school. From an embossed post to Alta skiers, Mr. Onno Wieringa from Alta Ski Area hopes that the resort can still have high quality skiing at the conclusion of the project. To me those words read skepticism and doubt. And, as a local, dedicated skier over 4 decades I have much to be concerned about.</p> <p>As with many government backed or sponsored plans ideas become grandiose and elaborate and often forget about the people they are to serve. I get the distinct feeling the accord would love to place a train from sandy, Utah up little cottonwood as described. The cost of \$ billion, or more, dollars is mind boggling. I am not a conservationist r extremist by any means. However I do enjoy and utilize the great outdoors as much or more than most. I have also read and have been told that the accord would like to limit automobiles. You say it would improve air quality. Well, air quality spokespersons are always telling us to head to the mountains if we want to breath clean air. And they are right. The resorts have great air quality - due to the simple laws of physics and environmental biology You know that but are telling outright lies. The only questionable air quality up the canyons is spill over from the bad air of the valley.</p> <p>In addition the accord feels that those that elect to drive up the canyon should be the one's to help pay for the transit, whatever form is chosen. This is just like trax and front runner, and is consistent with governmental ideals. We the tax paying citizen gets squeezed from every direction. You are out of line here.</p> <p>Let's discuss transit systems. Currently we have buses which provide transportation opportunity for some that don't wish to drive the canyon Other ideas the accord has proposed include rapid transit buses, an oxymoron to me, as we all know the buses are under powered and are generally the cause of delays up the canyon. Articles previously published by UDOT state buses can move about half the volume of people up the canyon as do cars, and at a slower pace, and at greater cost to the skier. UDOT's report on trains up the canyon was even worse. The cost was much higher than buses, and hence cars, and much, much slower at moving people than buses, and hence cars. Aerial trams are the worst of all. Then, where do we come up with sufficient parking for all these commuters. Then what are the conveniences and the costs and the speed. If we are to follow the dollar, and I haven't yet, I certain we will find large contractors somewhere behind the scenes. The ski areas would like to see more customers. Well, there are very few completely full days at alta or snowbird each year. A client of mine from snowbird management was in the office today and said those days are generally around a holiday or a great ski day - in other words a large dump of powder. Those days will vary but seem to be generally 4 - 10 days per year. (That is full parking lots and full parking along the roads where permitted). So, billions of dollars for up to 10 full days per year. The rest of the time the current system works.</p> <p>Let's consider the advantages of cars over transit. It's cheaper. Skiing is expensive enough and a huge reason more locals don't ski is due to the high cost of the ski pass. We certainly don't need added expenses to go along with our rich man's sport. My friend from snowbird also told me that local skiers make up much more than 33% of skiers at his resort, and implied snowbird wants more locals and values the locals very much. I certainly believe this with the other cottonwood resorts. The automobile allows for total flexibility, and convenience.</p> <p>In fact you can't. Transits don't offer the convenience of your time, your storage, speed of the commute, and cost effectiveness. I've been to Switzerland and France. Yes the train or tram offers a unique experience, but they are slow inconvenient and expensive. WE DO HAVE COMPETITION IN THE SKI INDUSTRY. IT' CALLED COLORADO. If we don't keep it SIMPLE, FAST, CHEAP AND CONVENIENT, we may lose out to our neighbor. Don't penalize cars as a form of transit.</p> <p>The comment that the resorts want more skiers, as does any business, I believe we are maxed out hen we are presently full when considering lift lines and the high cost of the ski ticket. If we put more skiers at the resorts at our current prices we will lose local skiers because we will be losing value. WE the people actually want something for our dollars spent, and it's not long lines, crowded slopes, and inconvenient commutes. The time that transit substantially increases skier days must also be the time when resorts are allowed to substantially increase their boundaries so we the skiers can still receive value for our dollar spent.</p> <p>As you consider transit, we must also consider the surrounding lands. If we widen either cottonwood canyon we need to consider erosion of the hillsides. Look to Provo canyon as an example. Erosion has been the plague of that highway since it's construction. And what an eyesore compared to the little 2 lane road that was previously there. How will the watershed be affected with a wider road and extensions along and through the mountains to Brighton and then to Park City. We currently have rapid transit from south salt lake county to park city. It's the freeway. An accord representative told me that he participated in a "ski connect" experience. He stated that it was interesting but he was in transit much longer than he was skiing. We mused that that may be an experience for the bucket list - done once in a lifetime or once a year. His ski time was not skiing the best slopes or the finest powder our state is known for. It's simply a marketing tool or plot, just not that practical.</p> <p>Yes the population will increase. Young people today are less active, a fact we all know. Ski costs keep rising, above that of inflation and certainly faster than do our salaries. Will we really experience a much greater volume of skiers anytime soon? Is the mountain accord and city/county leaders looking beyond the mark. If we do experience large growth in numbers, then we need to be talking boundary extensions to our resorts. That really does appear to be in the cards with your blueprint. And land swaps? Is the accord proposing to give resorts more developable land for lodging, housing or some other means of profit making. Then will the resorts increase parking and convenience to the customer, or will parking growth be limited thus forcing the hand of the public when it comes to transit. We know government does this. Look at parking for customers and employees at the university medical center and the hutsman center. It' ludicrous! And, executives are the ones with the convenient spots. We the people aren't fooled here. We may not have a vote but we're not fooled. Lastly, let's keep some of the charm of our canyons, and the beauty. I would love to see more ski superior and a chairlift wouldn't really bother me. However I love the looks of the mountain and can support no growth there (I do hike and occasionally AT ski but I appreciate avalanche control). At Alta we know the early bird DOES catch the worm, and, THERE ARE NO FRIENDS ON A POWDER DAY. Thank you. ☺</p>	<p>3/12/2015</p>

<p>A friend of mine wrote you and I am writing to echo his concerns as a homeowner and active user of public lands in the Salt Lake Valley. Summarily: Please protect access to nonmotorized flying sports ie Hanggliding, Paragliding, Speedflying, Speedriding, and BASE jumping. These sports are extremely low impact and are a vital part of the local culture.</p> <p>Thank you for your work</p> <p>My friend's comment is as follows...</p> <p>Obviously a lot of hard work and imagination went into the proposed blueprint. The residents of salt lake valley are fortunate to have such a collaborative effort in place. As the plan moves forward I would like to ask that the recreational opportunities of the free flying community be protected. I am a member of local organizations representing paragliders and hang gliders, speedfliers and speed riders, and basejumpers.</p> <p>As board members may be aware Utah is a world class destination for these sports and participants travel from around the world to fly here. National distance records have been set from sites in big cottonwood canyon. Many of our sites are within the borders of areas that have been noted as under consideration for enhanced protection.</p> <p>Flying sports in the wasatch can easily be documented to be a usual and customary use and have taken place for decades. Our users are extremely low impact, lower than hikers runners skiers and bikers by far. The majority of our use occurs in the air, however we rely on access to multiple hillside and mountain tops to launch or jump and various areas in the canyon bottoms for intended or unplanned landings. We use no fossil fuels in our enjoyment of our public lands, make no noise, and leave no trace.</p> <p>However we feel a potential threat from the mountain accord project. This is a shame because most of the projects goals and values are shared by members of our organizations. Many of us are also avid climbers backcountry skiers ultra runners and hikers. Some like myself are also property owners in the wasatch.</p> <p>Unfortunately almost all of the federal land managers controlling wilderness, national monument, and national park land have severely restricted or more often prohibited paragliders hang gliders and basejumpers. Generally we are lumped in with powered aircraft. Very often our pilots are aggressively harassed and commonly criminally prosecuted for their use of our public. This does not occur with land managers who administer national forest and BLM land.</p> <p>The wasatch is unique as our use of these lands will predate any change in designation and we expect to have continued access to our land.</p> <p>Our organizations would like a part of the discussion about land designation changes and to secure the right to continue our recreational use of our lands.</p> <p>I work, recreate, and own a homestead in the canyons. I moved to Utah years ago to enjoy the recreation and quality of life. I would appreciate the chance to discuss this facet of future proposals in greater detail with members of the executive committee.</p> <p>Thank you for all your hard work.</p>	<p>3/12/2015</p>
<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I recognize this is a humongous endeavor. I also recognize the commendable interest to have an open dialogue with the community. Respectfully, I want to enounce the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) - Is there public access to the best available information for the different systems? I am especially interested in the environmental system.</li> <li>2) - Especially for the environmental system, on what basis, has it been deemed as sufficient to move forward to approve and implement the blueprint?</li> <li>3) - Is the best available information a valid criteria to make decisions, when data is nonexistent, especially for the environmental system?</li> <li>4) - Is the baseline document intended to be produced, based on such best available information?</li> <li>5) - What are, if so, the plans to fill critical information gaps, especially, on the environmental system? The blueprint is NOT to be approved before there are tangible opportunities to generate critical-data.</li> <li>6) - The proposed actions for the environmental systems are too vague. There is no clarity about how actions will be achieved. To me, this is information that the blueprint needs to provide. Currently, there are multiple initiatives to "monitor environmental health" as well as "protect and restore the environment". Much more detail is needed to answer the following simple questions: what, who, where, why, and how, as well as detailed indicators. But again, detailed indicators and priorities cannot be drawn from nonexistent data.</li> <li>7) - Watersheds have been impacted due to urbanization and other human causes. As recognized by the blueprint document, these are "harbors" for wildlife. I can only foresee more impacts to already impacted streams, especially with aggressive transportation solutions such as a train. Improvement of the current transportation options is the way to go. There is no need to create an additional problem and expense.</li> <li>8) - When the blueprint mentions "increased use" how much effort has been put to define how much change is acceptable?</li> <li>9) The fact that increased use equals increased revenue is a stale and simplistic argument. Everything cannot be seen in monetary signs simply because there are irreplaceable values, that no mitigation or money could recover</li> </ol> <p>-- What is understood by "increased use", and again, how much increased use is acceptable before it becomes an issue? There needs to be a balance between the different systems, and I currently do not see balance or containment for recreation areas. Rather, its proposed expansion. Some areas are not to be negotiated nor developed, regardless of how much the population grows. Recreation needs to be managed, and zoning plans need to be developed, if not enforced.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention.</p>	<p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>Well said Bob.</p> <p>Unfortunately I don't presently have sufficient time to organize my thoughts into a flowing letter. Rather, they may appear random at times but are no less sincere. I am a skier who lives in salt lake county and have skied at many Wasatch front resorts. Alta is and has been my primary resort for the past 40 years. During the past 4 decades salt lake county has likely grown over 500,000 people. The ski boundaries don't seem to have expanded dramatically except perhaps Snowbird. I enjoy a time share at the Iron Blossom lodge at Snowbird each May. I attempt to ski at Alta most Saturdays- pending reasonable or better conditions.. I purchase gold cards from Alta for my children that wish to ski, and season passes for grandchildren that are of age. In other words I have hundreds of skier days in the cottonwood canyons myself and much more collectively with the family.</p> <p>I have many concerns about the mountain accord plans, especially after attending the meeting at skyline high school. From an email sent to Alta skiers, Mr. Onno Wieringa from Alta Ski Area hopes that the resort can still have high quality skiing at the conclusion of the project. To me those words read skepticism and doubt. And, as a local, dedicated skier over 4 decades I have much to be concerned about.</p> <p>As with many government backed or sponsored plans ideas become grandiose and elaborate and often forget about the people they are to serve. I get the distinct feeling the accord would love to place a train from sandy, Utah up little cottonwood as described. The cost of \$ billion, or more, dollars is mind boggling. I am not a conservationist or extremist by any means. However I do enjoy and utilize the great outdoors as much or more than most. I have also read and have been told that the accord would like to limit automobiles. You say it would improve air quality. Well, air quality spokespersons are always telling us to head to the mountains if we want to breath clean air. And they are right. The resorts have great air quality - due to the simple laws of physics and environmental biology You know that but are telling outright lies. The only questionable air quality up the canyons is spill over from the bad air of the valley.</p> <p>In addition the accord feels that those that elect to drive up the canyon should be the one's to help pay for the transit, whatever form is chosen. This is just like tax and front runner, and is consistent with governmental ideals. We the tax paying citizen gets squeezed from every direction. You are out of line here. Let's discuss transit systems. Currently we have buses which provide transportation opportunity for some that don't wish to drive the canyon Other ideas the accord has proposed include rapid transit buses, an oxymoron to me, as we all know the buses are under powered and are generally the cause of delays up the canyon. Articles previously published by UDOT state buses can move about half the volume of people up the canyon as do cars, and at a slower pace, and at greater cost to the skier. UDOT's report on trains up the canyon was even worse. The cost was much higher than buses, and hence cars, and much, much slower at moving people than buses, and hence cars. Aerial trams are the worst of all. Then, where do we come up with sufficient parking for all these commuters. Then what are the conveniences and the costs and the speed. If we are to follow the dollar, and I haven't yet, I certain we will find large contractors somewhere behind the scenes. The ski areas would like to see more customers. Well, there are very few completely full days at alta or snowbird each year. A client of mine from snowbird management was in the office today and said those days are generally around a holiday or a great ski day - in other words a large dump of powder. Those days vary but seem to be generally 4 - 10 days per year. (That is full parking lots and full parking along the roads where permitted). So, billions of dollars for up to 10 full days per year. The rest of the time the current system works. Let's consider the advantages of cars over transit. It's cheaper. Skiing is expensive enough and a huge reason more locals don't ski is due to the high cost of the ski pass. We certainly don't need added expenses to go along with our rich man's sport. My friend from snowbird also told me that local skiers make up more than 33% of skiers at his resort, and I implied snowbird wants more locals and values the locals very much. I certainly believe this with the other cottonwood resorts. The automobile allows for total flexibility, is inexpensive, is a free storage locker for additional equipment, clothing and lunch. It's very hard to beat the automobile. In fact you can't. Transits don't offer the convenience of your time, your storage, speed of the commute, and cost effectiveness.</p> <p>I've been to Switzerland and France. Yes the train or tram offers a unique experience, but they are slow and inconvenient and expensive. WE DO HAVE COMPETITION IN THE SKI INDUSTRY. It' called COLORADO. If we don't keep it SIMPLE, FAST,CHEAP AND CONVENIENT, we may lose out to our neighbor. Don't penalize cars as a form of transit. The comment that the resorts want more skiers, as does any business, I believe we are maxed out hen we are presently full when considering lift lines and the high cost of the ski ticket. If we put more skiers at the resorts at our current prices we will lose local skiers because we will be losing value. WE the people actually want something for our dollars spent, and it's not long lines, crowded slopes, and inconvenient commutes. The time that transit substantially increases skier days must also be the time when resorts are allowed to suddenly increase their boundaries so we the skiers can still receive value for our dollar spent.</p> <p>As you consider transit, we must also consider the surrounding lands. If we wish to enter cottonwood canyon we need to consider erosion of the hillsides. Look to Provo canyon as an example. Erosion has been the plague of that highway since it's construction. And what an eyesore compared to the little 2 lane road that was previously there. How will the watershed be affected with a wider road and extensions along and through the mountains to Brighton and then to Park City. We currently have rapid transit from south salt lake county to park city. It's the freeway. An accord representative told me that he participated in a "ski connect" experience. He stated that it was interesting but he was in transit much longer than he was skiing. We mused that it may be an experience for the bucket list - done once in a lifetime or once a year. His ski time was not skiing the best slopes or the finest powder our state is known for. It's simply a marketing tool or plot, just not that practical. Yet the population will increase. Young people today are less active, a fact we all know. Ski costs keep rising, above that of inflation and certainly faster than do our salaries. Will we really experience a much greater volume of skiers anytime soon? Is the mountain accord and city/county leaders looking beyond the mark. If we experience large growth in numbers, then we need to be talking boundary extensions to our resorts. That really does appear to be in the cards with your blueprint. And land swaps? Is the accord proposing to give resorts more developable land for lodging, housing or some other means of profit making. Then will the resorts increase parking and convenience to the customer, or will parking growth be limited thus forcing the hand of the public when it comes to transit. We know government does this. Look at parking for customers and employees at the university medical center and the huntsman center. It' ludicrous! And, executives are the ones with the convenient spots. We the people aren't fooled here. We may not have a vote but we're not fooled. Lastly, let's keep some of the charm of our canyons, and the beauty. I would love to ski mount superior and a chairlift would't really bother me. However I love the looks of the mountain and can support no growth there ( I do hike and occasionally AT ski but I appreciate avalanche control). At Alta we know the early bird DOES catch the worm, and, THERE ARE NO FRIENDS ON A POWDER DAY. Thank you. ☺</p>	<p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>At the moment parking is the limiting factor for pressurized use in the Cottonwood Canyons; enabling as many people as possible to use the canyon will result in more user pressure. Optimizing Bus Rapid Transit will be an intermediate step to moving possibly-somewhat more people up the canyon to put only moderate additional use pressure on the canyons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I am in support of a year-round bus shuttle system for Mill Creek Canyon, but allowing dogs in the bus would make them more used.</li> <li>- I am in full support of a train/light rail system linking the Salt Lake Valley with Park City. This is a system that I feel would be used far more extensively by commuters and lower-income resort workers around the clock on a more-regular schedule than a LCC canyon train that would be associated almost exclusively for time-intensive recreation. It would help immensely with the increasing traffic, accidents, and driving pollution associated with I-80.</li> <li>- The rationale provided for abandoning the Parley's rail transit - that was favored in the Trans system group - is that it would not be competitive with the freeway; however, this rationale was not applied to the successful SLC airport Trax line.</li> </ul>	
<p>Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I am in full support of creating a trails network in the upper reaches of the two canyons</li> <li>- The trails should be a mix of hiking exclusive, mountain biking exclusive, and shared (and/or with management techniques conducive to habits; ie Snowbird's new trail being uphill til the tram runs and then it becomes downhill).</li> <li>- Any new road/transit construction must have improved road cycling facilities (wider shoulders, exclusive bike lanes, disconnected paved bike paths)</li> <li>- LCC/BCC parking areas need to be enlarged and enhanced for the major dispersed user trailheads, with optional stops for the Bus Rapid Transit at White Pine, Argenta, Butler Fork, Mineral Fork, etc.</li> <li>- I support the permanent protection of the Emma Ridges to Superior ridgeline from development.</li> <li>- I do NOT support a chairlift in Grizzly Gulch. I recognize that it is private property, but I also appreciate that much of Alta's operations are on public land and that they stand to benefit greatly from enhanced base development on a lot of lucrative land, additional water use, increased snowmaking, and improved LCC transit. Grizzly Gulch and the surrounding area should be put into some sort of permanent protection.</li> <li>- I could be supportive of a re-aligned chairlift in Honeycomb Canyon, depending on the alignment, provided there are no effects on Silver Fork backcountry</li> <li>- I could be supportive of Brighton's formal adoption of Hidden Canyon, provided any chairlift reaches back towards the Great Western chairlift.</li> <li>- I am supportive of increased connectivity between Brighton and Solitude in the SolBright area.</li> <li>- I am supportive of enhanced facilities at identified high-use nodes to both concentrate use in appropriate close-in areas and disperse use in more-remote areas</li> </ul> <p>I am in support of modifying wilderness boundaries to accommodate new and existing sections of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I fail to understand how the Mountain Accord can consider all forms of recreation in the Central Wasatch except for one of the most significant and controversial forms: Wasatch Powderbirds. To me this "oversight" of neglecting helicopter skiing in our tiny range -that was based on a Forest Service administrative timeline that was arbitrarily changed from 5 year renewals to 10 years - is an egregious omission. Helicopter skiing needs to be restricted and not allowed to grow anymore.</li> </ul> <p>Economics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I support enabling the ski resorts to utilize more water for snowmaking</li> <li>- I support adding potential land and altering zoning for additional development at the various resorts' bases. But the water rights need to be examined carefully and managed for future use and generations in light of climate change and prevent their acquisition by large developers.</li> <li>- I support enabling the ski resorts to expand their summertime activities within their existing footprints.</li> <li>- I support enhanced modern avalanche mitigation techniques (ie Gas-X) above Alta. I do NOT support a chairlift on Flagstaff peak</li> <li>- I do not support extraordinarily-expensive, taxpayer-funded "solutions" to "problems" that enable profit maximization for ski resorts corporations whose lift tickets are pricing their customers out of an already-flat-to-declining market.</li> </ul> <p>Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I am not an environmental specialist, so I cannot comment on the survey question: "does the Blueprint achieve environmental stewardship of the natural resources?"</li> <li>- I know that the EPA has determined that ski resort development has a more profound effect on watershed integrity than ANY other development. But I am cautiously optimistic that SLC Water and various other governing bodies will ensure water quality despite the threats associated with increased use, transit, and development.</li> <li>- I am in favor of a re-forestation effort on (particularly) the Emma ridge area</li> <li>- I am becoming increasingly convinced that simple people-pressure on the canyons is having a degrading effect on the watershed, and dramatically increasing opportunities to transport people up the canyons will have a commensurate effect on the watershed quality. But the building of a train in LCC would likely have a bad environmental impact.</li> <li>- I am concerned that the ski resorts are getting many of their desired "gets" and their "gives" are more along the lines of "we are not taking as much as we could take", at the expense of potential environmental and backcountry terrain preservation.</li> </ul>	

<p>I agree with everything said. They only thing I would add. Is by nature most people already car pool to go skiing. You generally see 2-4 people per vehicle. Unfortunately I don't presently have sufficient time to organize my thoughts into a flowing letter. Rather, they may appear random at times but are no less sincere. I am a skier who lives in salt lake county and have skied at many Wasatch front resorts. Alta is and has been my primary resort for the past 40 years. During the past 4 decades salt lake county has likely grown over 500,000 people. The ski boundaries don't seem to have expanded dramatically except perhaps Snowbird. I enjoy a time share at the Iron Blossom lodge at Snowbird each May. I attempt to ski at Alta most Saturdays- pending reasonable or better conditions. I purchase gold cards from Alta for my children that wish to ski, and season passes for grandchildren that are of age. In other words I have hundreds of skier days in the cottonwood canyons myself and much more collectively with the family. I have many concerns about the mountain accord plans, especially after attending the meeting at skyline high school. From an email sent to Alta skiers, Mr. Onno Wieringa from Alta Ski Area hopes that the resort can still have high quality skiing at the conclusion of the project. To me those words read skepticism and doubt. And, as a local, dedicated skier over 4 decades I have much to be concerned about. As with many government backed or sponsored plans ideas become grandiose and elaborate and often forget about the people they are to serve. I get the distinct feeling the accord would love to place a train from sandy, Utah up little cottonwood as described. The cost of 5 billion, or more, dollars is mind boggling. I am not a conservationist r extremist by any means. However I do enjoy and utilize the great outdoors as much or more than most. I have also read and have been told that the accord would like to limit automobiles. You say it would improve air quality. Well, air quality spokespersons are always telling us to head to the mountains if we want to breath clean air. And they are right. The resorts have great air quality - due to the simple laws of physics and environmental biology You know that but are telling outright lies. The only questionable air quality up the canyons is from the bad air of the valley. In addition the accord feels that those that elect to drive up the canyon should be the one's to help pay for the transit, whatever form is chosen. This is just like tax and front runner, and is consistent with governmental ideals. We the tax paying citizen gets squeezed from every direction. You are out of line here. Let's discuss transit systems. Currently we have buses which provide transportation opportunity for some that don't wish to drive the canyon. Other ideas the accord has proposed include rapid transit buses, an oxymoron to me, as we all know the buses are under powered and are generally the cause of delays up the canyon. Articles previously published by UDOT state buses can move about half the volume of people up the canyon as do cars, and at a slower pace, and at a greater cost to the skier. UDOT's report on trains up the canyon was even worse. The cost was much higher than buses, and hence cars, and much, much slower at moving people than buses, and hence cars. Aerial trams are the worst of all. Then, where do we come up with sufficient parking for all these commuters. Then what are the conveniences and the costs and the speed. If we are to follow the dollar, and I haven't yet, I certain we will find large contractors somewhere behind the scenes. The ski areas would like to see more customers. Well, there are very few completely full days at alta or snowbird each year. A client of mine from snowbird management was in the office today and said those days are generally around a holiday or a great ski day - in other words a large dump of powder. Those days will vary but seem to be generally 4 - 10 days per year. (That is full parking lots and full parking along the roads where permitted). So, billions of dollars for up to 10 full days per year. The rest of the time the current system works. Let's consider the advantages of cars over transit. It's cheaper. Skiing is expensive enough and a huge reason more locals don't ski is due to the high cost of the ski pass. We certainly don't need added expenses to go along with our rich man's sport. My friend from snowbird also told me that local skiers make up much more than 33% of skiers at his resort, and implied snowbird wants more locals and values the locals very much. I certainly believe this with the other cottonwood resorts. The automobile allows for total flexibility, is inexpensive, is a free storage locker for additional equipment, clothing and lunch. It's very hard to beat the automobile. In fact you can't.</p>	<p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>Transits don't offer the convenience of your time, your storage, speed of the commute, and cost effectiveness. I've been to Switzerland and France. Yes the train or tram offers a unique experience, but they are slow inconvenient and expensive. WE DO HAVE COMPETITION IN THE SKI INDUSTRY. If called COLORADO. If we don't keep it SIMPLE, FAST,CHEAP AND CONVENIENT, we may lose out to our neighbor. Don't penalize cars as a form of transit. The comment that the resorts want more skiers, as does any business, I believe we are maxed out hen we are presently full when considering lift lines and the high cost of the ski ticket. If we put more skiers at the resorts at our current prices we will lose local skiers because we will be losing value. WE the people actually want something for our dollars spent, and it's not long lines, crowded slopes, and inconvenient commutes. The time that transit substantially increases skier days must also be the time when resorts are allowed to substantially increase their boundaries so we the skiers can still receive value for our dollar spent. As you consider transit, we must also consider the surrounding lands. If we widen either cottonwood canyon we need to consider erosion of the hillsides. Look to Provo canyon as an example. Erosion has been the plague of that highway since it's construction. And what an eyesore compared to the little 2 lane road that was previously there. How will the watershed be affected with a wider road and extensions along to the mountains to Brighton and then to Park City. We currently have rapid transit from south salt lake county to park city. It's the freeway. An accord representative told me that he participated in a "ski connect" experience. He stated that it was interesting but he was in transit much longer than he was skiing. We mused that it may be an experience for the bucket list - done once in a lifetime or once a year. His ski time was not skiing the best slopes or the finest powder our state is known for. It's simply a marketing tool or plot, just not that practical. Yes the population will increase. Young people today are less active, a fact we all know. Ski costs keep rising, above that of inflation and certainly faster than do our salaries. Will we really experience a much greater volume of skiers anytime soon? Is the mountain accord and city/county leaders looking beyond the mark. If we do experience large growth in numbers, then we need to be talking boundary extensions to our resorts. That really does appear to be in the cards with your blueprint. And land swaps? Is the accord proposing to give resorts more developable land for lodging, housing or some other means of profit making. Then will the resorts increase parking and convenience to the customer, or will parking growth be limited thus forcing the hand of the public when it comes to transit. We know government does this. Look at parking for customers and employees at the university medical center and the huntsman center. It's ludicrous! And, executives are the ones with the convenient spots. We the people aren't fooled here. We may not have a vote but we're not fooled. Lastly, let's keep some of the charm of our canyons, and the beauty. I would love to ski mount superior and a chairlift wouldn't really bother me. However I love the looks of the mountain and can support no growth there ( I do hike and occasionally AT ski but I appreciate avalanche control). At Alta we know the early bird DOES catch the worm, and, THERE ARE NO FRIENDS ON A POWDER DAY. Thank you.</p>	<p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>I am not in favor of wasting huge sums of money to further exploit our canyons. Skiing is too expensive and that is the number one reason it is declining. Utah's weather has produced less than optimum ski conditions at park city, deervalley and canyons. That trend is going to continue. Getting to the resorts is super easy as it is now. Parking is rarely an issue. Buses work great.</p>	<p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>I am ok with the connecting as long as Alta remains skiers only Waste of money....</p>	<p>3/13/2015 3/13/2015</p>
<p>What do you think about resort connectivity? I fully support and encourage resorts connectivity. This will make traffic lessened and improve our economy through viable competition for tourist money. Would you like to see improved, year-round public transportation? I would like to see a train up Little Cottonwood canyon.</p>	<p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>It's an interesting concept to combine the resorts, but I feel it's directed toward outside tourism. However, as a local skier that also supports this industry, I feel like the price continues to rise to the point that the locals are being pushed out. I'd like to see that concern directed rather than always trying to make these special mountains known as unique and elite. Locals don't want our resorts to compete with Vail - the wealthy can have it. Let us keep our local flavor and the prices down. What about a locals discount - at a much higher discount than the few dollars currently offered for those with proof of a local zip code? That's something I'd love to explore!</p>	<p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>Thank for giving me the opportunity to comment on our ski industry and where it's headed. I generally support it - but am concerned about the environmental impact. How will it affect water for the region? Yes, better busses will help.</p>	<p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>I see no harm in interconnecting the Wasatch ski areas. It might cut down on vehicle traffic. It would also be a good idea to have another way out of Big and Little Cottonwood canyons. Interconnect could help with this as well.</p>	<p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>I think the programs detailed underneath One Wasatch, makes perfect sense. My add'l comments are below. • What do you think about resort connectivity? KO - great idea - will emulate what is done at European resorts where you can go country hopping by ski lift, gondola or ski runs • Would you like to see improved, year-round public transportation? KO - yes, assuming what being suggested has no environmental impact • Improved bus services? KO - see above • Mountain rail? KO - see above • No improvements at all? KO - not in agreement, opening this up will attract more visitors and most importantly provide a great regional experience i.e. " come taste all that the Wasatch mountains have to offer on 1 lift ticket and never have to get in your car</p>	<p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>As an avid skier who has skied all 7 of the Park City and Little/Big Cottonwood Canyon resorts over the last 10 years, I appreciate the uniqueness of each and would vastly prefer for nothing to change at all in terms of how skiers and boarders get to the mountains and get between them. I have a few reasons: 1. Backcountry access. While I've never done it, it's currently possible to get between these 7 resorts skiing the backcountry with a guide. To me this is a truly surreal experience that cannot be matched by building lifts or rail lines. So, people can currently get between these mountains by car, or if they please, by skiing or boarding the route in the backcountry. Let's preserve that backcountry experience and not build additional lifts or rails lines. 2. Currently, BCC and LCC attract a very different crowd than the PC resorts. While locals ski all 7 probably, folks that come into town ski very specific mountains for varying reasons. True expert skiers often go to the Bird and Alta. Powder skiers also prefer LCC and BCC. By connecting all the resorts, the uniqueness of each is somewhat ruined. Folks that want the amenities and comes into Deer Valley won't find those same amenities at Alta or Snowbird. The danger of someone being on a mountain where they don't know where they are and/or can't handle the difficulty of the mountain isn't ideal for beginners, intermediates or experts. 3. Natural and wilderness preservation. Even though proposed plans plan on trying to protect "more" land, they are still going to disrupt the entire ecosystem to build lifts and other modes of transit. Just because more land will be preserved than used doesn't make this ok. We need to look at the wilderness and natural benefits of the areas we are proposing to disrupt. I'd prefer to not disturb that. 4. Going to these mountains is all part of the journey, going up the LCC or BCC road in a bus or a car is an amazing experience. It's a gorgeous drive. While there are dangers on these roads with avalanches, the crew in Utah handles those quite well, and I think this existing mode of transit is just fine. I would prefer more bus routes and some "express" bus routes that stop in fewer locations. 5. I understand the financial opportunity that connecting all these mountains would offer. And I understand that is hard to pass up. Along with the uniqueness of making such a large connection of mountains, Europe-style. But part of what attracts me to Utah is all the different mountains and cultures I get by going to different mountains. Connecting them all makes it seem like some giant theme park. 6. With that said, if there has to be something built (there doesn't), I'd prefer that one lift is built - connecting Deer Valley and Brighton. That would allow for some level of connection that doesn't disturb as much wildlife and is a natural connection since you can see Deer Valley lifts from Brighton. Building additional modes of transit to Little Cottonwood Canyon is ill advised and I'd strongly argue against it.</p>	<p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>No thank you. Bigger is not necessarily better. Each resort caters to a certain client. Let it stay that way.</p>	<p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>Just leave it the way it is. Why is everyone insistent on messing with a good thing. Only a few will profit and make money off the rest and ruin what many people enjoy currently. • What do you think about resort connectivity? Sounds absolutely brilliant! I've been an annual visitor for 10 years, can't wait! • Would you like to see improved, year-round public transportation? Sure, can't hurt • Improved bus services? Doesn't apply to me, I usually drive • Mountain rail? 100% • No improvements at all? No, improve everything! make Utah the place that everyone wants to visit in the winter!</p>	<p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>First off, I'm an eastern skier, only having visited Park City and Deer Valley once each. That being said, I'm an avid skier with an equally passionate mountain sports family and someday intend to live in the Utah area, or at the very least visit often as a tourist. I think the value and convenience One Wasatch offers will be unparalleled. As skiing grows more expensive each year—and with each year more activities and technology are fighting for consumer dollars—a move like this makes a whole lot of sense. From a tourism viewpoint, resort connectivity would be top priority for me and I'm sure many others. I'm not familiar enough with the transportation situation so I won't comment on that. Best of luck in your research and development.</p>	<p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>Though the developments may improve accessibility with "sustainable transportation", the fact remains that developments and expansions involve human impact on the environment. I hate to see more people coming into the areas, selfish as it may be, but that will happen no matter what. Keep the separation of the areas, no interconnect, no more vehicular traffic or buses (which means more human impact). Protect the watershed and wildlife by reducing human involvement and encroachment on the area. Limit rather than expand how many people and their wants impact the Wasatch. That will keep this area special. In an effort to reduce traffic up the canyons (LCC, BCC), the Mountain Accord should consider promoting access to the resorts from American Fork Canyon (via Snowbird through Mineral Basin). This would reduce traffic by roughly a third (as about a third of the Wasatch Front lives in Utah County), and it's the fastest growing area in the SLC metro area. The environmental impact to build parking/lift access would be small as Mineral Basin is only a few miles from the current road at Tibble Fork reservoir.</p>	<p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>The concept of one Wasatch sounds really cool. But as a lover of Brighton and solitude, one Wasatch will kill those areas. They will be trampled by Tourists. And their mountain prices will surely be impacted. Please keep the interconnect as just a backcountry tour and not a lift serviced concept.</p>	<p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>As a local skier, I would love to see the resorts connected. It makes no sense to have them kept as islands and driving 45-60 minutes to get from resort to resort increases our traffic, inversion, and road injuries/fatalities. In my mind, improved access is a good thing and helps the entire community.</p>	<p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>Yes, connectivity is the key. It is essential for consumers to have as easy as possible access to all Utah resorts that are grouped in close proximity. The world wide draw would be intense because it would be a one in a lifetime opportunity to ski and see so many mountains and would allow people to come back and back because each experience could be customized and unique because of easy access to different areas. Often now people go to a ski area one time and check it off their list but there would be no way to experience the entire area and would need return trips. The start and end and unique experience would be a huge draw</p>	<p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>No connectivity Improved transport between resorts. Multi resort tickets with transportation option.</p>	<p>3/13/2015</p>

<p>I am in favor of the plan to link the areas economic hubs.</p> <p>It's never cheaper to do it later. As more land is developed it becomes more expensive. Eventually there will be no option but to expand our transportation options. Why kick the can down the road when it will be more expensive.</p> <p>Any options chosen though must respect our fragile environment and make things better for man and the earth alike.</p> <p>Good oversight is also needed so the process is not corrupted by unscrupulous developers and politicians.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What do you think about resort connectivity?</li> <li>• - I pay a higher price for my experience at a different resort. There are passes that allow me to visit other resorts, should I choose. I choose not too, because the other resorts are too crowded and have poor layouts for parking and lift accessibility.</li> <li>• Would you like to see improved, year-round public transportation?</li> <li>• - A definite yes. Having had to commute to PC from downtown SLC was a challenge; there were only 2 buses scheduled weekday mornings. Improving year-round public transportation should help alleviate the environmental impact of vehicles on the road.</li> <li>• Improved bus services?</li> <li>• - See above comment</li> <li>• Mountain rail?</li> <li>• -This would be great!</li> <li>• No improvements at all?</li> <li>• - Disagree.</li> </ul> <p>I am in favor of the plan to link the areas economic hubs.</p> <p>It's never cheaper to do it later. As more land is developed it becomes more expensive. Eventually there will be no option but to expand our transportation options. Why kick the can down the road when it will be more expensive.</p> <p>Any options chosen though must respect our fragile environment and make things better for man and the earth alike.</p> <p>Good oversight is also needed so the process is not corrupted by unscrupulous developers and politicians.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What do you think about resort connectivity? - This is a GREAT idea.</li> <li>• Would you like to see improved, year-round public transportation? Improved yes but it must be seasonal as well. Meaning if it is really needed in the winter time and slightly only needed in the summer then the amount of improvements needed should be commensurate.</li> <li>• Improved bus services? A good functioning bus system is a must.</li> <li>• Mountain rail? From the airport to the top three big economic hubs is a good idea.</li> </ul> <p>Thanks</p>		<p>3/13/2015</p> <p>3/13/2015</p> <p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>I am not fond of resort connectivity. But I see the need to plan for sustainable growth. It would be nice to have improved year-round public transportation to the resorts. Annette Knight</p> <p>Great place, no improvements needed keep up the good work ! I am fully supportive of resort connectivity, particularly the One Wasatch concept.</p> <p>Fully support improved, year round public transportation. I would certainly use a light rail system or something similar to access little cottonwood.</p> <p>I think the proposed concept is excellent and we must be honest with the credit of public recreational use of these areas. <sup>18</sup></p> <p>I am in favor of resort connectivity.</p> <p>I am in favor of improved, year-round public transport and bus services. We must protect the air. Public transport should be via electric vehicles.</p> <p>Mountain rail is a good idea.</p> <p>I am in favor of smart improvements that will benefit skiers, put Utah at the top of the US skiing map, and that are wisely produced and managed.</p> <p>As a regular but infrequent (annual) Utah skier I think the intermountain connectivity and increased public transportation looks fantastic. New linking trails would be great for their length and views (i love being in the mountains) but would also make it easier to stay where you want and ski everywhere you want. I'm imagining multi mountain passes and more competitive hotel rates too. Plus, I don't think I'll need a rental car.</p> <p>I really do love being IN the mountains and I think it is equally important to preserve the undeveloped lands while allowing skiers to enjoy them. These plans seem to do that. Congratulations on a great plan, I hope it becomes reality.</p>		<p>3/13/2015</p> <p>3/13/2015</p> <p>3/13/2015</p> <p>3/13/2015</p> <p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>By far the worst customer service I've ever encountered. Park city needs to get it together. I will never return here and continue my travels to colorado where they know how to smile and treat their valued customers.</p> <p>Great idea. Each day can be an adventure.</p> <p>Makes all areas more valuable</p> <p>Great getting the Bird available from Park City</p> <p>Time to solve weather problems with some type of rail system.</p>		<p>3/13/2015</p> <p>3/13/2015</p> <p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>Being an avid skier and local resident, I am excited about the proposal to connect the resorts.</p> <p>I recently had a friend come to town and stay at Park City Mountain Resort. I currently have the Big Cottonwood season pass and invited him to meet me over at Brighton for some night skiing. Turned out there are very limited public transportation options between Park City and Brighton. Buses between PC and SLC only run early in the morning or after 5 pm. By the time he would of arrived at Brighton by taking these later buses it simply was not worth the money or effort to do so. So in the end we did not meet up. I'm certain this scenario plays out more than you would think. Connecting the resorts will have many benefits and will open up new terrain for all skiers, lets get it done!</p> <p>I think this is a great idea. The FAQ's show that it would be used by many people as long as it doesn't price out the regular guy.</p> <p>I love the environment but I have always felt this doesn't hurt the environment that much anyway.</p> <p>We are killing the environment with our lack of air pollution, oil and energy controls. These people just have deeper pockets and want money. It always boils down to money, greed, control and power.</p> <p>This is good for the economy and the recreation industry. The benefit analysis and price/value proves it would benefit the entire Wasatch Front with minimal affects.</p> <p>Thanks</p>		<p>3/13/2015</p> <p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>I don't think intermountain connectivity is needed.</p> <p>I do think improved canyon transportation is needed.</p> <p>I don't know whether bus service or rail service is the answer.</p>		<p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>PLEASE do NOT connect the resorts. The ONE WASATCH proposed project is not good for Utah in my very humble opinion. I believe it will cause damage and harm to the "back county" areas it is mapped out to be on and that building these connections will actually close off many areas that are open to the public to hike on during the winter months. This is a prime example of more state land being taken over by private corporations.</p> <p>I get it, creating this connection system will bring in more money and when a developer and all those involved see dollar signs they get excited. That makes sense to me, I'm an American and I love capitalism. But what I don't understand is why we would do this when taking the whole picture into account. This sounds great on paper... and you can say that by 2050 the local population will more than double... that's all good and well, but it does not however take into account the long term damage that thousands of skiers will do to the areas that would then be easily accessible to the masses. Again, I get it, I know that greed is a powerful emotion. I would only hope that other faculties and emotions of those "in charge" would win out, such as: logic, environmentalism, seeing the big picture, having a long-view in mind, anti-greed and listening to those of us that actually live here. I am certainly no hippy, I am actually a conservative Republican, I just think this particular plan is terrible for Utah and I certainly don't want to see it covering the back country.</p> <p>We do not want this development to move forward. Please listen.</p>		<p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>I find the ski resorts to have very little negative ecological impact on the areas where they are built.</p> <p>As such I would encourage and support Resort connectivity by ski lift. Mountain Rail.</p> <p>I feel the latter is a better long term solution than additional busses.</p>		<p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>I think this connectivity is a very good idea and I believe this can be done on a fiscally and environmentally sound basis. The number one priority listed below would be #2, the improved bus service; mitigates urban issues downsides as the project develops.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I would like to see improved, year-round public transportation.</li> <li>• Improved bus services.</li> <li>• Mountain rail.</li> </ul>		<p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>Resort connectivity is a great idea, and would be unique to Utah and its resorts. Public transportation is important and improvements would be welcome, but rail would not only be very expensive, rail would disrupt the ecology of the resort area.</p>		<p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>I'm not in favor of these proposals. I enjoy the uniqueness of each resort and know this is going to raise prices so I will not be able to take my whole family skiing anymore. The price of skiing is becoming to price prohibitive. You need to find ways to make it the affordable family sport.</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p><sup>18</sup>30vacation.com in Utah</p>		<p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>My comment is the desire to have information about the impact on the environment, etc. with and without the plan to compare scenarios. The public needs to know ahead of time, with information provided by an uninvolved 3rd party of the consequences of such a plan.</p> <p>If such information is already available I would like to know where to find it.</p>		<p>3/13/2015</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What do you think about resort connectivity?</li> </ul> <p>I love the whole concept of ONE Wasatch as it will provide an unmatched guest experience and could greatly reduce vehicular traffic between the resorts, especially from PC to the Cottonwoods. So many guests take one trip over there during their vacations. The ability to ski between puts us on par with Europe.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would you like to see improved, year-round public transportation?</li> </ul> <p>At this point, Winter transportation is the key. Year round is probably not realistic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved bus services? Yes, especially between resorts.</li> <li>• -</li> <li>• Mountain rail? This would be a very unique transportation connection but I don't see how it could be funded. If we can make the buses hip and popular (programmatic changes) then that is probably the best alternative</li> </ul>		<p>3/13/2015</p>

Resort connectivity would be great and would cut down on transportation needs. I'd also like to see light rail go up big cottonwood canyon and go all the way to park city.		3/13/2015
I would like to express my whole hearted support for the mountain accord process. It is an exercise that I feel is long overdue. We humans are often resistant to change, but change we must. We simply can't continue doing what we are doing now. It is not sustainable. Mass transit of some kind has to happen. Little cottonwood canyon highway with the congestion and avalanche problems is a disaster waiting to happen. For our safety, our environment and our economic viability we must think progressively. I realize that the devil is in the details, but we haven't gotten to that point yet. There will be plenty of time to argue over specific details. Right now we should all give our support to the ongoing process of solving present and future problems. Thanks for your hard work.		3/13/2015
To whom it may concern, I've been coming to Utah to ski - every year without exception - since 1981. I've spent most of my time at Snowbird and Alta. I'm in favor of the manner in which Snowbird and Alta have made improvements over the years. They have respected the natural environment, and each area has remained almost exactly the way it was over 30 years ago. I am in favor of the plan to connect the 7 ski resorts, so long as it's done in the same way Snowbird and Alta have done their improvements. The blue print and its stakeholders/representatives need to take a step back and examine the big picture. Robert Manning has created land management techniques that have been utilized and tested for over 30 years and have been adopted by many Forest Service Agencies across the country. Choosing an overarching management strategy can help to align all four of the areas that the Mountain Accord is proposing to be supporting. All of the goals that are listed under each of these four areas are independently wonderful, BUT they are unfortunately too lofty, unachievable, and conflicting. An example of this is under the environment goals and is to, "protect and restore the environment." If I read this goal on its own I would consider it to be an excellent goal, but when I look at it in the context of the Wasatch Front it is a statement that cannot be backed up or achieved with all other areas of the proposal moving forward. This to me means that each area is trying to say what people want to hear but they don't have a path to get there, nor have they done any research into understanding what it would mean to restore the environment. Impacted areas, especially those as popular as Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons, experience the majority of impact within the first season of use. After this initial impact, the impacts increase but at a much slower rate. Regeneration may occur slightly in seasons when use is limited, but this is an even shorter season in these canyons because of the ski resort and backcountry use that occurs. So, without a significant reduction of visitors to the canyon or a multiple year shut down of these canyons, regeneration is impossible. I would urge the Mountain Accord to do some research, enlist unattached experts, or allow some students to assist them in the understanding of management strategies that exist and the potential benefits and continuity that this could create in the process. While Robert Manning from the University of Vermont has outlined his management techniques in multiple peer reviewed publications and books there may be a framework that is a better fit. But the ignorance that is occurring by jumping straight to the actions or the practices of the proposal create an obvious lack of cohesion and the potential for MORE conflict on an already hot topic is eminent.  Thank you for your time		3/13/2015
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What do you think about resort connectivity? -Great idea. Minimal impact should be priority.</li> <li>• Would you like to see improved, year-round public transportation? - Public transportation if implemented to serve all users properly is the way to go.</li> <li>• Improved bus services? - As necessary to reduce other vehicle traffic and encourage its use.</li> <li>• Mountain rail? - Very expensive but if it was a direct link from SLCC could be a boon...expect rental car companies to complain.</li> <li>• No improvements at all? - How important is the Ski industry to Utah? With the impending effects of climate change being uncertain it still behooves Utah to ensure they are proactive in attracting tourists.</li> </ul>		3/13/2015
No improvements. None whatsoever. There's too much on most of the sites as it is now. In most cases, it would take a professional skier, with the time, money, and resources available to them, to be able to thoroughly ski any of these areas in tandem. I think it's a waste of money. And I think it's a waste of the beauty of the area. One example I would give is The Canyons Resort. A beautiful ski area with beautiful homes planted everywhere. Thus...taking away from the beauty of the area. Obviously I disagree with the idea. This is not something that I would personally like to see happen. I feel that it is more a money making opportunity for a large corporation...and nothing more.		3/13/2015
As a paraglider and speed flyer [free flight enthusiasts], I completely agree with the well thought out words of my friend Virgil Davis, who wrote the following Obviously a lot of hard work and imagination went into the proposed blueprint. The residents of salt lake valley are fortunate to have such a collaborative effort in place. As the plan moves forward I would like to ask that the recreational opportunities of the free flying community be protected. I am a member of local organizations representing paragliders and hang gliders, speedfliers and speed riders, and basejumpers. As board members may be aware Utah is a world class destination for these sports and participants travel from around the world to fly here. National distance records have been set from sites in big cottonwood canyon. Many of our sites are within the borders of areas that have been notated as under consideration for enhanced protection. Flying sports in the wasatch can easily be documented to be a usual and customary use and have taken place for decades. Our users are extremely low impact, lower than hikers runners skiers and bikers by far. The majority of our use occurs in the air, however we rely on access to multiple hillsides and mountain tops to launch or jump and various areas in the canyon bottoms for intended or unplanned landings. We use no fossil fuels in our enjoyment of our public lands, make no noise, and leave no trace. However we feel a potential threat from the mountain accord project. This is a shame because most of the projects goals and values are shared by members of our organizations. Many of us are also avid climbers backcountry skiers ultra runners and hikers. Some like myself are also property owners in the wasatch. Unfortunately almost all of the federal land managers controlling wilderness, national monument, and national park land have severely restricted or more often prohibited paragliders hang gliders and basejumpers. Generally we are lumped in with powered aircraft. Very often our pilots are aggressively harassed and commonly criminally prosecuted for both intentional and unintentional use of our public. This does not occur with land managers who administer national forest and BLM land. The wasatch is unique as our use of these lands will predate any change in designation and we expect to have continued access to our land. Our organizations would like a part of the discussion about land designation changes and to secure the right to continue our recreational use of our lands. I work, recreate, and own a homesite in the canyons. I moved to Utah years ago to enjoy the recreation and quality of life. I would appreciate the chance to discuss this facet of future proposals in greater detail with members of the executive committee. Thank you for all your hard work. CC: Please consider our free flight friends in your plans		3/13/2015
I am very interested in the improvement of an efficient transportation system in Big & Little Cottonwood canyons. Congestion in the canyons is only going to get worse and an avalanche resistant rail system (NOT light rail) makes sense for the future. I don't think improved bus services is the answer. Buses are expensive to operate and maintain, never run at capacity over the total line capacity (all scheduled buses on a route on the same day).		3/13/2015
As for a One Wasatch, I don't see the real benefit of connecting all the resorts into one. I can see a combination of the PC resorts and the Cottonwood 4, but logistically a skier is not going to be able to start at the Canyons and get to Snowbird and back to their car in the same day.		3/13/2015
I think it is a good idea to connect the resorts and create year-round reliable transportation among the different ski areas as long as environmental integrity is not compromised.  I hope that we can both improve and preserve the mountains for current and future generations.  Avid Skier		3/13/2015
I think that any deal that increases federal control over both Salt Lake City's water supply and development of ski areas is a terrible long term deal no matter what the short term benefits are. A much better approach would be to remove all the affected land from the USFS and turn it over to a Utah based organization which would be much more receptive to the interests of Salt Lake City residents and much less influenced by Big Green.		3/13/2015
The backcountry of Utah is a very special place. It's still pristine and wild. In some ways I'd like to see things left the way they are, but the thought of starting at Deer Valley and working your way west then hopping over to the Big followed by the Little Cottonwood Canyons sounds pretty good. There is a road there now that hooks the eastern resorts to the Big Cottonwood Canyon but it's not maintained in the winter. If the connection is made it would be very beneficial to the Salt Lake City's economy. But I'm just a very grateful visitor and whatever the wonderful people of the Wasatch decide is fine with me!		3/13/2015
As a regular international visitor I would like to see a public shuttle service from the airport to Park City.		3/13/2015
There is nowhere else in North America that can build what we can...and it's good for the environment		3/13/2015
Also, I am an avid backcountry skier and Mountain Accord poses no 'threat' to me.  Let me know how I can help		3/13/2015
Please leave it alone. No connections between Alta and anywhere else. Solitude for Alta!		3/13/2015
I for one would not want to see mountain connectivity. I think it's a sham! The resorts will only want more \$ for a lift ticket. Just look at Vail's plan, how long would it take to go from the Canyons parking lot to PCMR Kong lift? At best an hour and a half?		3/13/2015
Bus service should be improved to help workers avoid traffic.  No rail service.		3/13/2015
Hi We did this already! We do not want it. I was just at Jackson Hole and everyone talks about it, if a resort comes up! The majority of what I heard was, no one wants it! Keep it the way it is! Keep the price low out there! That's why we all go! We will go to the individual mountains if we want. Too much \$ Put it into something else. A large adult slide that goes down the mountain road or something a big club where we can all dance? ect! A small movie theater on the mountain ect...Entertainment on the mountain ??? ( We love Snow Bird/Alta. Thanks		3/13/2015
As a frequent out of state visitor to the Wasatch area, it is exciting to see the One Wasatch and Mountain Accord plans. The resort connectivity is very important to us. We think this can be accomplished while considering all the necessary components in the USFS EIS process. Year round transit is important to reduce the impact on the roads and air. Improved, especially express bus service from downtown and Sandy would be great. The ultimate installation of mountain rail and interconnection of the resorts would be the ultimate great long term solution, with the possibility of the long term least environmental impacts.  Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the public process and provide these comments.		3/13/2015
I absolutely love your state having spent the winter season at Park City Mountain Resort as an instructor several winters ago. I feel what ever will be the best for everyone concerned- Locals and tourists alike keeping in mind that the corporate giants should not have a monopoly over the situation and rape the beauty and majesty of your beautiful state for their greedy gains. Thank-you for asking me for my opinion.		3/13/2015
It is amazing to see this type of debate, when the most important aspect of our mountains is being ignored. Global warming is real, and is accelerating at a very noticeable rate in Utah. Your focus should be on reducing our local carbon footprint, and reducing the toxins that are destroying our snow fall. Tunnels, interconnects, links are useless without snow to enjoy the recreational opportunities.		3/13/2015
The Mountain Accord is a meaningless topic without snow!		3/13/2015
Yes, One Wasatch! Let's ride lifts, instead of fossil fuel burning vehicles!		3/13/2015
The absolute worse solutions would be to widen the canyon roads and/or run trains up the canyons -we don't need to increase the amount of traffic the Cayo roads can accommodate nor do we need to make the outdoors theme park light with a b rail system		3/13/2015
Please, no connectivity between resorts. Cottonwood canyon should remain as is!		3/13/2015

<p>Please see below my comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What do you think about resort connectivity?</li> </ul> <p>Absolutely in favor. It's the only way to move forward for a sustainable management and development of the resorts in the Wasatch Mountains, and to provide a satisfactory and competitive ski experience to both in-state and out-of-state visitors. The European Alpine experience has shown that this is the way to proceed and they have mastered sustainability and protection of the environment, while allowing the ski industry, love and passion for the mountains on a four-season basis, and tangible results in terms of conservation and sustainability, while protecting also back-country (see also scope and achievements of the E.U. Alpine Space Program, Project outputs and achievements per thematic field (<a href="http://www.alpine-space.eu/projects/project-results-per-thematic-field/">http://www.alpine-space.eu/projects/project-results-per-thematic-field/</a>) and Alpine Convention for sustainable development (<a href="http://www.alpcov.org/en/default.html">http://www.alpcov.org/en/default.html</a>))</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would you like to see improved, year-round public transportation?</li> </ul> <p>Absolutely in favor. Light railways and/or gondola, to enhance accessibility, while reducing traffic congestion, pollution and pollution of mass-parking up in altitude (this of course should be accompanied by accessibility of new mountain transportation system by urban mass-transit, and by building underground parking facilities, so as not to alter the balance of areas at the mouth of the canyons. See for example also The Transport Protocol of the Alpine Convention (<a href="http://www.alpcov.org/en/convention/protocols/Documents/transportprotocolEN.pdf">http://www.alpcov.org/en/convention/protocols/Documents/transportprotocolEN.pdf</a>, <a href="http://www.access2mountain.eu/SiteCollectionDocuments/Franco%20Gaggia%20Panel%20Discussion%20Presentation.pdf">http://www.access2mountain.eu/SiteCollectionDocuments/Franco%20Gaggia%20Panel%20Discussion%20Presentation.pdf</a>, and <a href="http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/transport/transport_energy_environment/24468_en.htm">http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/transport/transport_energy_environment/24468_en.htm</a>). Limit also commercial traffic in specific time-slots so as not to interfere with rush-hour up and down the mountain (beginning and end of the ski day)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved bus services?</li> </ul> <p>Not particularly in favor. While a valuable tool in the deficient status quo, where everybody has to drive to reach the resorts. It is not efficient, does not have adequate capacity, does not efficiently and comprehensively address pollution, and would further generate traffic congestions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mountain rail?</li> </ul> <p>Yes, in some cases gondolas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No improvements at all?</li> </ul> <p>Down the road, this is a suicidal path, it would only get worse.</p> <p>Thank you for your kind attention, and the opportunity to comment</p>		3/13/2015
<p>I would like to see the one Wasatch completed. First of all it would all be private money and could be completed in one summer.</p> <p>A large number of skiers or boarders from the Park City or Wasatch back communities travel to the Cottonwood resorts requiring us to drive 45-60 minutes each way. Even tourists who rent cars stay in Park City or Heber travel to the cottonwood resorts. These tourists travel to these resorts quite frequently.</p> <p>This drive puts more carbon emissions into the our air. I understand a tunnel is being considered. However, what will it cost and how long it will take to construct once funding is obtained, my guess is at least 5-10 years for funding and government environment impact evaluations, and another 5-10 years of construction.</p>		3/13/2015
<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I would like to respond to the following questions regarding ONE Wasatch:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What do you think about resort connectivity?</li> </ul> <p>Don't do it</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would you like to see improved, year-round public transportation?</li> </ul> <p>No</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved bus services?</li> </ul> <p>No</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mountain rail?</li> </ul> <p>No</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No improvements at all?</li> </ul> <p>Correct. I believe Big Cottonwood Canyon, Little Cottonwood Canyon, and Park City are all perfect as they are today.</p>		3/13/2015
<p>One Wasatch is a stupid ideal, these people only want to cater to the tourist and not the locale skiers.</p> <p>Pass prices will increase. Where I currently ski now I don't have to deal with snowboards, it will take all day to go from one side to the other. Its a waste of money, no one will use it once the novelty wears off. It all about how much more money they can make. The mountain accord will cause more environmental damage because they want to put a stupid train up the canyon than just leaving it alone.</p> <p>How many people want to load all their gear and 2 pairs of skis on to a train or bus. I won't use the train or the bus because I have to much to carry, and there again it all goes back to the all mighty dollar.</p> <p>Leave the canyons as they are.</p>		3/13/2015
<p>My family, friends and I are in favor of the interconnectivity of the One Wasatch concept. As a group of approximately 20 people, we meet in Park City every winter for a week of skiing. Most of us travel throughout the area during our stay in an attempt to ski a different mountain each day. Interconnectivity as proposed would simplify our travels and save us time driving back and forth each day.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No improvements at all?</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As far as I'm concerned the ski resorts are all very nice already. Investment in connecting them, I fear, would cause them to increase their already-high lift ticket prices.</li> <li>• As an example of how a skiing "improvement" negatively affected me about 30 years ago: when I was a college student at BYU, during the winter months I would try to make a few trips with friends to Solitude on Thursdays, where a standing bargain was lift passes for students for only \$5. Then after a few seasons Solitude replaced or added a lift with a faster express lift. The following season the Thursday student price was raised to \$17. While both of those prices now seem ridiculously low, at the higher price I did not feel I could justify spending that amount on skiing during the rest of my college years, and so the improvement did not have the effect of transporting me up the mountain quicker (because I simply could not afford to use them). In fact, I did not ski hardly at all for quite a few years, in spite of my enjoyment of the sport. So far, I still have not made it back to Solitude to find out what that new express lift was like (though I have appreciated the express lifts at Brighton, Snowbird and Powder Mountain which do help a lot to spend more time on the mountain and less time on the lift). Fortunately, over the past 10 years or so our children have expressed interest in learning to ski, and thanks to the free passes available to them through Ski Utah during their 5th and 6th grade years I have once again justified the expense of skiing and we've had many fun outings skiing together.</li> <li>• I am also concerned that Mountain Accord be mindful of potential negative impacts that any new construction or recreation in the mountains could have upon the water supply. We must keep in mind that having clean drinking water is of crucial importance compared to greater convenience and flexibility for recreational activities. Clean water is also more important than the economic boost of attracting more tourists to Utah. The water supply is vulnerable to pollution and contamination and the recommendations of accurate studies about how to provide adequate protection of water resources should be adhered to during any development that occurs.</li> </ul> <p>Thanks for being interested in my feedback.</p>		3/13/2015
<p>I am sad you guys are considering this proposal. This area is very special and each resort is unique and wonderful in its own way. You will do more harm to the environment than any good that could come out of connecting lifts.</p> <p>Stop chasing Colorado, Montana, or Canada as having the most accessible ski area...</p> <p>Promote Utah skiing just don't do further damage to the canyons in order to make money...</p>		3/14/2015
<p>I think more connectivity would be great it would increase economic activity in the area. I don't think it would increase pollution to a great extent. It would also be great if Guardsmen Pass road was improved and open year round.</p>		3/14/2015
<p>We agree with the proposed One Wasatch concept and would definitely ski more often in Utah if this concept is realized.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>		3/14/2015
<p>Resort connections via lifts and trails is a great idea.</p> <p>Rail connection from Salt Lake City airport to Park City via Interstate 80 corridor and Rte 224 corridor is a great idea.</p> <p>NO to the idea of tunnels through the mountains to connect ski areas!</p>		3/14/2015
<p>Hi,</p> <p>As a visitor/tourist, I would enjoy having the areas connected by lifts, trails and other means of transportation improved. However, I would definitely want the residents of this fine and beautiful area to have the final or majority say in this matter.</p>		3/14/2015
<p>I'm highly in favor of increased resort connectivity via chairlifts and ski trails. This would allow skiers and riders to access massive amounts of terrain among multiple resorts while reducing traffic on local roads and highways. No matter at which resort they wished to spend most of the day, they could drive, or take public transportation, to the closest resort and then access the resort of their choice via trail or lift.</p> <p>To whom it may concern,</p>		3/14/2015
<p>I have serious reservations about the proposed project. Not only is it not cost effective at all but will not solve the issue of canyon travel. I am against the transportation proposal. The costs are completely out of line with the issue.</p> <p>We should start with the resorts all using busing to transport all their employees up the canyons and take that burden off the roads and see from there the best way to move forward. That would be a much more cost effective way to remove cars from the roads.</p> <p>Thank you</p>		3/14/2015
<p>Hello,</p> <p>If we are trying to address transportation issues, why don't we start with low-emission buses running continuously up and down the cottonwood canyons and providing adequate pickup places and parking outside of the canyons. This could apply to Park City.</p> <p>I disagree that there is a "need" to connect Park City with the cottonwood canyons. I think that benefits Vail, Inc, and not the local population or even the typical skier. One couldn't use all that territory. It seems like it is a marketing tool for the ski resorts and allows them to charge more for a ticket. Let's keep our resorts user-friendly and affordable to the local population, and serving the interests of a broader constituency than the ski industry.</p> <p>I also do not want to industrialize our beautiful canyons and national forest. Let's keep some terrain undeveloped.</p> <p>There is no need for a train and tunnels. Buses that are user friendly are a more flexible and affordable option.</p> <p>Who will pay for these proposed trains and tunnels. That should be put to the public for a vote. Is the taxpayer subsidizing the ski industry? What is the cost/benefit analysis of this? Mass transit linkups to the canyons might be a better use of our money.</p> <p>B</p>		3/14/2015
<p>"What do you think about resort connectivity?"</p> <p>I can spend two days exploring just one resort, never mind several in one day.</p> <p>On the other hand, as an out-of-towner, I could stay in a hotel at one resort and travel easily to other resorts without renting a car or much of a hassle.</p> <p>"Would you like to see improved year round public transportation?"</p> <p>Since I'm from out town, it's not that much of an issue with me. As long as I can get to a resort from the airport, I'm happy.</p> <p>That said, better public transportation is always good and helpful to those of us not from SLC area.</p> <p>"Improved bus services?"</p> <p>Sure why not. See the previous answer.</p> <p>"Mountain rail?"</p> <p>It would certainly add quite a bit of "Bling" factor to the area resorts but seems more of a luxury.</p> <p>Of course, the cost might be offset by an increase in visitors. No mountain rail in that state to the east of Utah.</p> <p>Also, see answer to the first question. Staying at a hotel at The Canyons and taking mountain rail all the way to Snowbird would be pretty cool.</p> <p>"No improvements at all?"</p> <p>Improvements keep stagnation at bay.</p> <p><del>Although Utah has the best skiing in the country and perhaps the world (except for the snow-irrupt close by, etc), improvements will keep Utah competitive in attracting the world's skiiing enthusiasts.</del></p> <p>Dear Mountain Accord,</p>		3/14/2015
<p>I am writing to express my support for the ONE Wasatch concept. Thank you.</p>		3/14/2015



<p>I am supportive of Brighton's formal adoption of Hidden Canyon, provided any chairlift reaches back towards the Great Western chairlift.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am supportive of increased connectivity between Brighton and Solitude in the SolBright area.</li> <li>I am supportive of enhanced facilities at identified high-use nodes to both concentrate use in appropriate close-in areas and disperse use in more-remote areas.</li> </ul> <p>I am in support of modifying wilderness boundaries to accommodate new and existing sections of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I fail to understand how the Mountain Accord can consider all forms of recreation in the Central Wasatch except for one of the most significant and controversial forms: Wasatch Powderbirds. To me this "oversight" of neglecting helicopter skiing in our tiny range—that was based on a Forest Service administrative timeline that was arbitrarily changed from 5 year renewals to 10 years is an egregious omission.</li> <li>Bowhunting must remain legal on public land in compliance with current regulations.</li> </ul> <p>Economics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I support enabling the ski resorts to utilize more water for snowmaking.</li> <li>I support adding potential land and altering zoning for additional development at the various resorts' bases.</li> <li>I support enabling the ski resorts to expand their summertime activities within their existing footprints.</li> <li>I support enhanced modern avalanche mitigation techniques (ie Gas-X) above Alta. I do NOT support a chairlift on Flagstaff peak</li> <li>I do not support extraordinarily-expensive, taxpayer-funded "solutions" to "problems" that primarily benefit only ski resorts.</li> </ul> <p>Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I know that the EPA has determined that ski resort development has a more profound effect on watershed integrity than ANY other development. But I am cautiously optimistic that SLC Water and various other governing bodies will ensure water quality despite the threats associated with increased use, transit, and development.</li> <li>I am in favor of a re-forestation effort on (particularly) the Emma ridgeline area.</li> <li>I am becoming increasingly convinced that simple people-pressure on the canyons is having a degrading effect on the watershed, and dramatically increasing opportunities to transport people up the canyons will have a commensurate effect on the watershed quality.</li> <li>I am concerned that the ski resorts are getting many of their desired "gets", and their "gives" are more along the lines of "we are not taking as much as we could take", at the expense of potential environmental and backcountry terrain preservation.</li> </ul> <p>In summary, I do not support the "blueprint" in its current form, but I am a strong believer in the Mountain Accord ideals and timing. We have to do all we can to reach agreement and take advantage of the chance to resolve these issues. If we don't, it may be too late to save the Wasatch five or ten years down the road.</p>	<p>3/15/2015</p>
<p>The top speed of the Pikes Peak cog rail train is about 9 mph. That means it would take a cog rail train an hour and 20 minutes to travel from 20th East up Little Cottonwood Canyon to Alta, plus the time to stop at Snowbird. No one is going to put up with that. Have you really thought this through?</p> <p>I see in the current blueprint the plan to make new fee areas and increase fees to limit traffic in the mountains near Salt Lake City. Although I am sure this would limit use the problem is it limits usage unfairly. It discriminates against those who are poor or of modest means. For them the fees are a much larger burden than they are for the wealthy or well off. Increasing fees to limit traffic basically means that you are keeping the poor out to make it a more private/less trafficked area for the wealthy. You may have a hard time conceiving that a \$6-\$10 fee would be a burden but from personal experience that kind of a fee often keeps us from being able to hike or recreate in certain areas. (Gas and campsite fees alone are prohibitive enough). We have five active boys and we want to help them develop healthy hobbies and lifestyles. Limiting recreation opportunities by fees will keep people like us out. And among the younger families with kids in Utah I think our situation of being financially strapped is a lot more common because of the increasing cost of housing and education, and more competitive employment markets.</p> <p>Thanks for considering my viewpoint</p>	<p>3/15/2015</p>
<p>It seems to me that M.A. has an agenda to push the train and highway expansion through regardless of public opinion. It only benefits Snowbird, not the people of this state. The Train is a Trojan horse for Snowbird expansion.</p> <p>Little Cottonwood Canyon is to fragile of an eco system. We need to be protecting the Canyon. Why is it that when the winter Olympics came to S.L.C. in 2002 the Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons were not included because of their fragile eco system.. what has changed?? Quite possibly greed.</p> <p>The traffic problem that exists in the Canyon is only a problem for a few hours weeks of the year and can be corrected by increasing bus service during those weeks. Avalanche conditions will always exist regardless of the transportation system. Increasing bus service meets all of the criteria in all honesty, Mountain Accord please don't sell out the people of Utah. Don't support spending billions on a problem that really doesn't exist just to support corporate greed.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>3/15/2015</p>
<p>I looked through the feedback received on the Mountain Accord website:  <a href="http://mountainaccord.com/wp-content/themes/twentytwelve/pdf/Early%20scoping%20Comment%20Summary.pdf">http://mountainaccord.com/wp-content/themes/twentytwelve/pdf/Early%20scoping%20Comment%20Summary.pdf</a></p> <p>I want to emphasize once again that Equestrian Uses (in American Fork Canyon) must also be considered. This is a heavily-used horseback riding area, and needs to be preserved as such. Please be sure to include this need and use in your plans. At present, I do not see that any thought is being given to this CURRENT use to ensure that it can remain so.</p> <p>Back Country Horsemen of Utah</p>	<p>3/15/2015</p>
<p>The Resort connectivity idea is a compelling concept, with limited investment, that would continue to establish the Utah ski industry—as the home of the "Best Snow On Earth" and now the "Best Resort on Earth"</p> <p><b>Improved public transportation plays a key role in limiting traffic into and out of the canyons—bus is the most practical, mountain rail is the "stickiest," and the most "European" if financing can be afforded. ☹</b></p>	<p>3/16/2015</p>
<p>Transportation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The transportation situation in Little Cottonwood is unsustainable on many winter days and something has to be done. I believe bus service is the best option to solve this problem and do not support light rail in the canyon. The canyon can't sustain the damage that will come from building a rail line and the public can't afford the cost of rail line.</li> <li>Adequate parking near the mouth of the canyon are critical to the success of expanded bus service.</li> <li>Expanded bus service should be tried prior to any commitments to adding lanes to the LCC road.</li> <li>Charging a per-vehicle fee - either via a daily fee or an annual pass – would help subsidize the optimized bus/parking system and provide an incentive to ride the transit system</li> <li>Incentivize ridership by making the bus fee free or only a nominal price.</li> <li>The bus system would need to have both a Snowbird-servicing bus and multiple Alta express buses.</li> <li>Current and future UDOT plans to add passing lanes on hwy 210 for private vehicles should be focused on improving bus transit systems.</li> <li>Snowsheds and/or bridges over slide paths can/should be added for increased avalanche mitigation for the highway.</li> <li>I fully support optimizing year-round Bus Rapid Transit for Big Cottonwood Canyon. Again, with adequate parking at the mouth of the canyon.</li> <li>A tunnel linking LCC and BCC is not needed. Improved public transit would alleviate the traffic issues associated with LCC, and the "safety" issues that have been ascribed to a tunnel have been overblown.</li> <li>Tunnel connections would create more defacto resort sidecountry terrain, effectively increasing the resorts' footprints.</li> <li>The tunnel would basically be a taxpayer-funded connection that would exist to benefit four businesses (ski resorts) with no validation that such a connection would actually be economically beneficial to those businesses. There are no significant "problems" that an LCC/BCC tunnel would solve, despite a considerable cost to taxpayers.</li> <li>The same argument is applied to a fixed guideway system connecting BCC to Park City. It would not necessarily save time for PC-BCC travelers, is not supported by Park City officials, and would again be a taxpayer-subsidized benefit to a handful of businesses (ski resorts) who have not proven that such a connection would even be beneficial today, much less in the future considering global warming and the flat/declining trends of the resort skiing industry (according to their own study).</li> <li>The question on the survey asking if the transit "solutions" are "environmentally-sustainable" is fundamentally flawed. The question should simply be "Is this a solution that I as a user of the Central Wasatch would actually use and be willing to pay for?"</li> <li>At the moment parking is the limiting factor for pressurized use in the Cottonwood Canyons; enabling as many people as possible to use the canyon will result in more user pressure. Optimizing Bus Rapid Transit will be an intermediate step to moving somewhat more people up the canyon to put only moderate additional use pressure on the canyons.</li> <li>I am in full support of a year-round bus shuttle system for Mill Creek Canyon.</li> <li>I am in full support of a train/light rail system linking the Salt Lake Valley with Park City.</li> </ul> <p>Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am in full support of creating a trails network in the upper reaches of the Cottonwoods.</li> <li>These trails should be a mix of hiking exclusive, mountain biking exclusive, and shared (and/or with management techniques conducive to habits; ie Snowbird's new trail being uphill until the tram runs and then it becomes downhill).</li> <li>Any new road/transit construction must have improved road cycling facilities (wider shoulders, exclusive bike lanes, disconnected paved bike paths)</li> <li>LCC/BCC parking areas need to be enlarged and enhanced for the major dispersed user trailheads, with optional stops for the Bus Rapid Transit at White Pine, Argenta, Butler Fork, Mineral Fork, etc.</li> <li>I support the permanent protection of the Emma Ridges to Superior ridgeline from development.</li> <li>I do NOT support a chairlift in Grizzly Gulch. I recognize that it is private property, but I also appreciate that much of Alta's operations are on public land and that they stand to benefit from enhanced base development on a lot of lucrative land, additional water use, increased snowmaking, and improved LCC transit. Grizzly Gulch and the surrounding area should be put into some sort of permanent protection.</li> </ul>	<p>3/16/2015</p>
<p>I am in support of modifying wilderness boundaries to accommodate new and existing sections of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I fail to understand how the Mountain Accord can consider all forms of recreation in the Central Wasatch except for one of the most significant and controversial forms: Wasatch Powderbirds. To me this "oversight" of neglecting helicopter skiing in our tiny range—that was based on a Forest Service administrative timeline that was arbitrarily changed from 5 year renewals to 10 years is an egregious omission.</li> <li>Bowhunting must remain legal on public land in compliance with current regulations.</li> </ul> <p>Economics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I support enabling the ski resorts to utilize more water for snowmaking.</li> <li>I support adding potential land and altering zoning for additional development at the various resorts' bases.</li> <li>I support enabling the ski resorts to expand their summertime activities within their existing footprints.</li> <li>I support enhanced modern avalanche mitigation techniques (ie Gas-X) above Alta. I do NOT support a chairlift on Flagstaff peak</li> <li>I do not support extraordinarily-expensive, taxpayer-funded "solutions" to "problems" that primarily benefit only ski resorts.</li> </ul> <p>Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I know that the EPA has determined that ski resort development has a more profound effect on watershed integrity than ANY other development. But I am cautiously optimistic that SLC Water and various other governing bodies will ensure water quality despite the threats associated with increased use, transit, and development.</li> <li>I am in favor of a re-forestation effort on (particularly) the Emma ridgeline area.</li> <li>I am becoming increasingly convinced that simple people-pressure on the canyons is having a degrading effect on the watershed, and dramatically increasing opportunities to transport people up the canyons will have a commensurate effect on the watershed quality.</li> <li>I am concerned that the ski resorts are getting many of their desired "gets", and their "gives" are more along the lines of "we are not taking as much as we could take", at the expense of potential environmental and backcountry terrain preservation.</li> </ul> <p>In summary, I do not support the "blueprint" in its current form, but I am a strong believer in the Mountain Accord ideals and timing. We have to do all we can to reach agreement and take advantage of the chance to resolve these issues. If we don't, it may be too late to save the Wasatch five or ten years down the road.</p> <p>Hello -</p>	<p>3/16/2015</p>
<p>I am a second home owner in Park City and visit 3-4 times per year.</p> <p>I am very supportive of the One Wasatch concept and connecting the 7 resorts in the Park City/Cottonwood Canyons. My assumptions in this support are that 1) the trams can be constructed with minimal damage to the back country, 2) the trams will be reasonably accessible so it is possible to try multiple resorts in a day without living on a tram and 3) lift ticket costs will not sky rocket due to the cost to build.</p> <p>We love Park City and the contributions from local businesses as well as big businesses. I understand it is always a risk that big business comes in and takes over, pushing small businesses out. Anything that can be done in support of local small businesses would be great, but I would not let this concern stall One Wasatch. This very well could also be the "rising tide" that raises all boats for businesses in the area.</p> <p>In terms of transportation, I do not support a train of any kind in the region but do believe the bus/shuttle system could be improved from the airport to the resorts. Also, bus service from PC to the Cottonwood Canyon resorts would also be helpful. ☹</p> <p>It is distressing to be asked as a taxpayer to provide funds for an activity in which only 7% of locals now participate.</p> <p>In the rush to push this through Mountain Accord has thoughtlessly left out any consideration of the other users e.g. horse back riding etc. It seems it must be totally focused on the ski industry and then, incidentally, mountain bikers.</p> <p>Further irritation is the plan to swap land with Snowbird to the amount of 418 acres in American Fork alone. This is so the people of Utah County can get to Snowbird quicker. And, then, Snowbird wants the water for making snow. Several problems with this: 1. according to global warming projections the ski industry in Utah is on a trajectory to be essentially non-existent by the end of this century. Then what happens to that 418 acres that I am sure Snowbird will not want anymore? Does this get broken up into building lots for McMansions? 2. Utah is in the continued grip of devastating drought. Further development increases the risk of fire in these lovely areas. We do not have the water resources to manage or control the devastating canyon fire that is surely coming our way.</p> <p>This is a land grab.</p>	<p>3/16/2015</p>

<p>I am supportive of increased connectivity between Brighton and Solitude in the SolBright area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am supportive of enhanced facilities at identified high-use nodes to both concentrate use in appropriate close-in areas and disperse use in more-remote areas</li> </ul> <p>I am in support of modifying wilderness boundaries to accommodate new and existing sections of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I fail to understand how the Mountain Accord can consider all forms of recreation in the Central Wasatch except for one of the most significant and controversial forms: Wasatch Powderbirds. To me this "oversight" of neglecting helicopter skiing in our tiny range—that was based on a Forest Service administrative timeline that was arbitrarily changed from 5 year renewals to 10 years - is an egregious omission.</li> </ul> <p>Economics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I support enabling the ski resorts to utilize more water for snowmaking</li> <li>I support adding potential land and altering zoning for additional development at the various resorts' bases.</li> <li>I support enabling the ski resorts to expand their summertime activities within their existing footprints.</li> <li>I support enhanced modern avalanche mitigation techniques (ie Gas-X) above Alta. I do NOT support a chairlift on Flagstaff peak</li> <li>I do not support extraordinarily-expensive, taxpayer-funded "solutions" to "problems" that enable profit maximization for ski resorts whose lift tickets are pricing their customers out of an already-flat-to-declining market.</li> </ul> <p>Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am not an environmental specialist, so I cannot comment on the survey question: "does the Blueprint achieve environmental stewardship of the natural resources?"</li> <li>I know that the EPA has determined that ski resort development has a more profound effect on watershed integrity than ANY other development. But I am cautiously optimistic that SLC Water and various other governing bodies will ensure water quality despite the threats associated with increased use, transit, and development.</li> <li>I am in favor of a re-forestation effort on (particularly) the Emma ridgeline area</li> <li>I am becoming increasingly convinced that simple people-pressure on the canyons is having a degrading effect on the watershed, and dramatically increasing opportunities to transport people up the canyons will have a commensurate effect on the watershed quality.</li> <li>I am concerned that the ski resorts are getting many of their desired "gets", and their "gives" are more along the lines of "we are not taking as much as we could take", at the expense of potential environmental and backcountry terrain preservation.</li> </ul> <p>Overall I have found the "blueprint" (it should have been called a "proposal") to NOT be reflective of the thousands of hours of work that people put into the system group meetings and submeetings over the summer; it confirms to me that the Exec board was made up of a lot of Important People who were not very engaged in the process and therefore created a plan that represented their impressions/interests rather than what was determined by the System Groups.</p> <p>Therefore I do not support the "blueprint" in its current form, but I am a strong believer in the Mountain Accord ideals and timing, and am very hopeful that a more equitable balance of gives and takes can be achieved to accommodate many constituents/stakeholders' desires, if they are all willing to concede on some of their desires.</p> <p>(end of comments)</p>		
<p>I would like to see mountain connectivity that would preserve the environment the best.</p> <p>The rail option seemed like a good fit, although probably costly. The European model using rail would be a great model.</p>		3/16/2015
<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>Please do not destroy our Canyons by adding extra traffic lanes or by adding a train!! Once this kind of destructive action has been taken, there's no going back. Please leave our Canyons in the pristine beauty that they are today for us and for future generations. Do not rob the world of the beauty of Little Cottonwood Canyon just to line the pockets the wealthy! Remember, <a href="http://www.cottonwoodcanyon.com">http://www.cottonwoodcanyon.com</a></p> <p>I am in agreement with the attached document, created by a fellow lover of the Wasatch.</p>		3/16/2015
<p>Thanks for the opportunity to comment</p> <p>Hello</p> <p>I have been following the Mountain Accord process with great interest and I have studied the proposed "blueprint" and attended a question and answer public meeting. I'm extremely excited with this once in a lifetime opportunity to bring some finality to the future of the central Wasatch. I'm in these mountains trail running, hiking, backcountry skiing, resort skiing, mountain biking, rock climbing, alpine climbing, bowhunting, and camping 3 to 5 times a week, every week. The Wasatch is the primary reason I live where I live. These are my formal comments regarding the "blueprint" put forth by the Executive Board.</p> <p>Transportation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The transportation situation in Little Cottonwood is unsustainable on many winter days and something has to be done. I believe bus service is the best option to solve this problem and do not support light rail in the canyon. The canyon can't sustain the damage that will come from building a rail line and the public can't afford the cost of rail line.</li> <li>Adequate parking near the mouth of the canyon are critical to the success of expanded bus service.</li> <li>Expanded bus service should be tried prior to any commitments to adding lanes to the LCC road.</li> <li>Charging a per-vehicle fee - either via a daily fee or an annual pass - would help subsidize the optimized bus/parking system and provide an incentive to ride the transit system</li> <li>Incentivize ridership by making the bus fee free or only a nominal price.</li> <li>The bus system would need to have both a Snowbird-servicing bus and multiple Alta express buses.</li> <li>Current and future UDOT plans to add passing lanes on hwy 210 for private vehicles should be focused on improving bus transit systems.</li> <li>Snowsheds and/or bridges over slide paths can/should be added for increased avalanche mitigation for the highway.</li> <li>I fully support optimizing year-round Bus Rapid Transit for Big Cottonwood Canyon. Again, with adequate parking at the mouth of the canyon.</li> <li>A tunnel linking LCC and BCC is not needed. Improved public transit would alleviate the traffic issues associated with LCC, and the "safety" issues that have been ascribed to a tunnel have been overblown.</li> <li>Tunnel connections would create more defacto resort sidecountry terrain, effectively increasing the resorts' footprints.</li> <li>The tunnel would basically be a taxpayer-funded connection that would exist to benefit four businesses (ski resorts) with no validation that such a connection would actually be economically beneficial to those businesses. There are no significant "problems" that an LCC/BCC tunnel would solve, despite a considerable cost to taxpayers.</li> <li>The same argument is applied to a fixed guideway system connecting BCC to Park City. It would not necessarily save time for PC-BCC travelers, is not supported by Park City officials, and would again be a taxpayer-subsidized benefit to a handful of businesses (ski resorts) who have not proven that such a connection would even be beneficial today, much less in the future considering global warming and the flat/declining trends of the resort skiing industry (according to their own study).</li> <li>The question on the survey asking if the transit "solutions" are "environmentally-sustainable" is fundamentally flawed. The question should simply be "Is this a solution that I as a user of the Central Wasatch would actually use and be willing to pay for?"</li> <li>At the moment parking is the limiting factor for pressurized use in the Cottonwood Canyons; enabling as many people as possible to use the canyon will result in more user pressure. Optimizing Bus Rapid Transit will be an intermediate step to moving somewhat more people up the canyon to put only moderate additional use pressure on the canyons.</li> <li>I am in full support of a year-round bus shuttle system for Mill Creek Canyon.</li> </ul> <p>Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am in full support of creating a trails network in the upper reaches of the Cottonwoods.</li> <li>These trails should be a mix of hiking exclusive, mountain biking exclusive, and shared (and/or with management techniques conducive to habits; ie Snowbird's new trail being uphill until the tram runs and then it becomes downhill).</li> <li>Any new road/transit construction must have improved road cycling facilities (wider shoulders, exclusive bike lanes, disconnected paved bike paths)</li> <li>LCC/BCC parking areas need to be enlarged and enhanced for the major dispersed user trailheads, with optional stops for the Bus Rapid Transit at White Pine, Argenta, Butler Fork, Mineral Fork, etc.</li> <li>I support the permanent protection of the Emma Ridge to Superior ridgeline from development.</li> <li>I do NOT support a chairlift in Grizzly Gulch. I recognize that it is private property, but I also appreciate that much of Alta's operations are on public land and that they stand to benefit greatly from enhanced base development on a lot of lucrative land, additional water use, increased snowmaking, and improved LCC transit. Grizzly Gulch and the surrounding area should be put into some sort of permanent protection.</li> <li>I could be supportive of chairlifts and development into the American Fork Canyon depending on alignment and scope.</li> <li>I could be supportive of a re-aligned chairlift in Honeycomb Canyon, depending on the alignment, provided there are no effects on Silver Fork backcountry.</li> <li>I am supportive of Brighton's formal adoption of Hidden Canyon, provided any chairlift reaches back towards the Great Western chairlift.</li> <li>I am supportive of increased connectivity between Brighton and Solitude in the SolBright area.</li> <li>I am supportive of enhanced facilities at identified high-use nodes to both concentrate use in appropriate close-in areas and disperse use in more-remote areas.</li> </ul> <p>I am in support of modifying wilderness boundaries to accommodate new and existing sections of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I fail to understand how the Mountain Accord can consider all forms of recreation in the Central Wasatch except for one of the most significant and controversial forms: Wasatch Powderbirds. To me this "oversight" of neglecting helicopter skiing in our tiny range—that was based on a Forest Service administrative timeline that was arbitrarily changed from 5 year renewals to 10 years is an egregious omission.</li> <li>Bowhunting must remain legal on public land in compliance with current regulations.</li> </ul> <p>Economics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I support enabling the ski resorts to utilize more water for snowmaking</li> <li>I support adding potential land and altering zoning for additional development at the various resorts' bases.</li> <li>I support enabling the ski resorts to expand their summertime activities within their existing footprints.</li> <li>I support enhanced modern avalanche mitigation techniques (ie Gas-X) above Alta. I do NOT support a chairlift on Flagstaff peak</li> <li>I do not support extraordinarily-expensive, taxpayer-funded "solutions" to "problems" that primarily benefit only ski resorts.</li> </ul>		3/16/2015
<p>Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I know that the EPA has determined that ski resort development has a more profound effect on watershed integrity than ANY other development. But I am cautiously optimistic that SLC Water and various other governing bodies will ensure water quality despite the threats associated with increased use, transit, and development.</li> <li>I am in favor of a re-forestation effort on (particularly) the Emma ridgeline area</li> <li>I am becoming increasingly convinced that simple people-pressure on the canyons is having a degrading effect on the watershed, and dramatically increasing opportunities to transport people up the canyons will have a commensurate effect on the watershed quality.</li> <li>I am concerned that the ski resorts are getting many of their desired "gets", and their "gives" are more along the lines of "we are not taking as much as we could take", at the expense of potential environmental and backcountry terrain preservation.</li> </ul> <p>In summary, I do not support the "blueprint" in its current form, but I am a strong believer in the Mountain Accord ideals and timing. We have to do all we can to reach agreement and take advantage of the chance to resolve these issues. If we don't, it may be too late to save the Wasatch five or ten years down the road.</p>		3/16/2015
<p>Hello</p> <p>I have been following the Mountain Accord process with great interest and I have studied the proposed "blueprint" and attended a question and answer public meeting. I'm extremely excited with this once in a lifetime opportunity to bring some finality to the future of the central Wasatch. I'm in these mountains trail running, hiking, backcountry skiing, resort skiing, mountain biking, rock climbing, alpine climbing, bowhunting, and camping 3 to 5 times a week, every week. The Wasatch is the primary reason I live where I live. These are my formal comments regarding the "blueprint" put forth by the Executive Board.</p> <p>Transportation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The transportation situation in Little Cottonwood is unsustainable on many winter days and something has to be done. I believe bus service is the best option to solve this problem and do not support light rail in the canyon. The canyon can't sustain the damage that will come from building a rail line and the public can't afford the cost of rail line.</li> <li>Adequate parking near the mouth of the canyon are critical to the success of expanded bus service.</li> <li>Expanded bus service should be tried prior to any commitments to adding lanes to the LCC road.</li> <li>Charging a per-vehicle fee - either via a daily fee or an annual pass - would help subsidize the optimized bus/parking system and provide an incentive to ride the transit system</li> <li>Incentivize ridership by making the bus fee free or only a nominal price.</li> <li>The bus system would need to have both a Snowbird-servicing bus and multiple Alta express buses.</li> <li>Current and future UDOT plans to add passing lanes on hwy 210 for private vehicles should be focused on improving bus transit systems.</li> <li>Snowsheds and/or bridges over slide paths can/should be added for increased avalanche mitigation for the highway.</li> <li>I fully support optimizing year-round Bus Rapid Transit for Big Cottonwood Canyon. Again, with adequate parking at the mouth of the canyon.</li> <li>A tunnel linking LCC and BCC is not needed. Improved public transit would alleviate the traffic issues associated with LCC, and the "safety" issues that have been ascribed to a tunnel have been overblown.</li> <li>Tunnel connections would create more defacto resort sidecountry terrain, effectively increasing the resorts' footprints.</li> <li>The tunnel would basically be a taxpayer-funded connection that would exist to benefit four businesses (ski resorts) with no validation that such a connection would actually be economically beneficial to those businesses. There are no significant "problems" that an LCC/BCC tunnel would solve, despite a considerable cost to taxpayers.</li> <li>The same argument is applied to a fixed guideway system connecting BCC to Park City. It would not necessarily save time for PC-BCC travelers, is not supported by Park City officials, and would again be a taxpayer-subsidized benefit to a handful of businesses (ski resorts) who have not proven that such a connection would even be beneficial today, much less in the future considering global warming and the flat/declining trends of the resort skiing industry (according to their own study).</li> </ul>		3/16/2015

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The question on the survey asking if the transit "solutions" are "environmentally-sustainable" is fundamentally flawed. The question should simply be "Is this a solution that I as a user of the Central Wasatch would actually use and be willing to pay for?"</li> <li>• At the moment parking is the limiting factor for pressurized use in the Cottonwood Canyons; enabling as many people as possible to use the canyon will result in more user pressure. Optimizing Bus Rapid Transit will be an intermediate step to moving somewhat more people up the canyon to put only moderate additional use pressure on the canyons.</li> <li>• I am in full support of a year-round bus shuttle system for Mill Creek Canyon.</li> <li>• I am in full support of a train/light rail system linking the Salt Lake Valley with Park City.</li> </ul> <p>Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am in full support of creating a trails network in the upper reaches of the Cottonwoods.</li> <li>• These trails should be a mix of hiking exclusive, mountain biking exclusive, and shared (and/or with management techniques conducive to habits; ie Snowbird's new trail being uphill until the tram runs and then it becomes downhill).</li> <li>• Any new road/transit construction must have improved road cycling facilities (wider shoulders, exclusive bike lanes, disconnected paved bike paths)</li> <li>• LCC/BCC parking areas need to be enlarged and enhanced for the major dispersed user trailheads, with optional stops for the Bus Rapid Transit at White Pine, Argenta, Butler Fork, Mineral Fork, etc.</li> <li>• I support the permanent protection of the Emma Ridges to Superior ridge line from development.</li> <li>• I do NOT support a chairlift in Grizzly Gulch. I recognize that it is private property, but I also appreciate that much of Alta's operations are on public land and that they stand to benefit greatly from enhanced base development on a lot of lucrative land, additional water use, increased snowmaking, and improved LCC transit. Grizzly Gulch and the surrounding area should be put into some sort of permanent protection.</li> </ul> <p>I could be supportive of chairlifts and development into the American Fork Canyon depending on alignment and scope.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I could be supportive of a re-aligned chairlift in Honeycomb Canyon, depending on the alignment, provided there are no effects on Silver Fork backcountry.</li> <li>• I am supportive of Brighton's formal adoption of Hidden Canyon, provided any chairlift reaches back towards the Great Western chairlift.</li> <li>• I am supportive of increased connectivity between Brighton and Solitude in the SolBright area.</li> <li>• I am supportive of enhanced facilities at identified high-use nodes to both concentrate use in appropriate close-in areas and disperse use in more-remote areas.</li> </ul> <p>I am in support of modifying wilderness boundaries to accommodate new and existing sections of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I fail to understand how the Mountain Accord can consider all forms of recreation in the Central Wasatch except for one of the most significant and controversial forms: Wasatch Powderbirds. To me this "oversight" of neglecting helicopter skiing in our tiny range –that was based on a Forest Service administrative timeline that was arbitrarily changed from 5 year renewals to 10 years is an egregious omission.</li> <li>• Bowhunting must remain legal on public land in compliance with current regulations.</li> </ul> <p>Economics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I support enabling the ski resorts to utilize more water for snowmaking.</li> <li>• I support adding potential land and altering zoning for additional development at the various resorts' bases.</li> <li>• I support enabling the ski resorts to expand their summertime activities within their existing footprints.</li> <li>• I support enhanced modern avalanche mitigation techniques (ie Gas-X) above Alta. I do NOT support a chairlift on Flagstaff peak</li> <li>• I do not support extraordinarily-expensive, taxpayer-funded "solutions" to "problems" that primarily benefit only ski resorts.</li> </ul> <p>Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I know that the EPA has determined that ski resort development has a more profound effect on watershed integrity than ANY other development. But I am cautiously optimistic that SLC Water and various other governing bodies will ensure water quality despite the threats associated with increased use, transit, and development.</li> <li>• I am in favor of a re-forestation effort on (particularly) the Emma ridge line area.</li> <li>• I am becoming increasingly convinced that simple people-pressure on the canyons is having a degrading effect on the watershed, and dramatically increasing opportunities to transport people up the canyons will have a commensurate effect on the watershed quality.</li> <li>• I am concerned that the ski resorts are getting many of their desired "gets", and their "gives" are more along the lines of "we are not taking as much as we could take", at the expense of potential environmental and backcountry terrain preservation.</li> </ul> <p>In summary, I do not support the "blueprint" in its current form, but I am a strong believer in the Mountain Accord ideals and timing. We have to do all we can to reach agreement and take advantage of the chance to resolve these issues. If we don't, it may be too late to save the Wasatch five or ten years down the road.</p>	
<p>Mountain Accord:</p> <p>I have already submitted comments via your online survey, but had some more thought/ideas that I wanted to share.</p> <p>First, I am completely opposed to the proposed train up LCC on economic, environmental and esthetic grounds. It is a horrible idea! I believe there are many other, less costly, less destructive (to the canyon) and more effective alternatives that should be considered.</p> <p>One additional idea that I came up with recently to help alleviate traffic and pollution is to ask the LCC ski resorts to implement Preferred HOV (High Occupancy Vehicle) Parking for both guests AND employees. Parking areas closest to the lifts (or work areas) and skiing access could be designated as HOV parking only. In these areas, only cars with two or more people would be allowed to park. Such a policy would not restrict anyone from traveling the canyon or put any additional financial burdens on recreationalists. Preferred HOV parking, however, would certainly encourage people to carpool, ride-share, pick up hitch-hikers (which I do occasionally near the park-and-ride), etc.</p> <p>Personally, on a busy powder day, I know I would make a couple extra calls so see if anyone would like to ride with me rather than be relegated to a parking spot far from the lifts.</p> <p>PROS: FREE! Relatively simple to implement (Snowbird has employees directing parking anyway). Easy to conduct a pilot program to evaluate effectiveness of idea. If successful, this idea can easily be expanded to other ski resorts and recreational areas.</p> <p>CONS: None</p>	3/16/2015
<p>Hey, All,</p> <p>Why would anyone including the resort management want to further develop, code word, destroy these canyons. Right now what is it that brings people from all over the world to places like Alta and Snow Bird. Not just another chair lift of condola ride. It is the mountains themselves. That is what brings people like me to the back country, the experience even often times completely alone on the mountain-- usually when a storm is hitting and it seems people are most often hunkered down.</p> <p>But whether skiing at the resort or back country it is the same the mountains have something pristine to offer. We do not need the most bodacious, huge ski area in the world to be linked by tearing down the mountains. Linking the Canyons and Park City is enough -- maybe not for some corporate greed monkeys but it is enough for the rest of us. If you wanted to ski a resort you do not need to ski all five or six, seven ten, at the same time. This is complete nonsense and corporate over-extending themselves out of pure greed and careless attitude towards what maybe the majority of people are looking to find when they venture up into these pristine places. Maybe some of the resort owners can come to some understanding that the best PR possible for their business is to leave these places with as little disturbance as possible. Their own clientele will appreciate this approach and so will others such as myself.</p>	3/11/2015
<p>I still do not understand the need to connect Big and Little Cottonwood. It appears to entail a lot of cost with little benefit. Might make a good marketing tool but I doubt many people would take advantage of it. Light rail sounds great but if you do not make it painful for people to drive up the Canyons then they will continue to do so. Like Mill Creek Canyon there should be user fees for cars and this money should go towards expanding bus service, making it much less expensive and increasing parking facilities. Tax what you do not want and promote what you do want. Light rail sounds quite expensive.</p> <p>Backcountry use has expanded tremendously and should be encouraged because it has less impact on the environment than Ski area facilities and real estate development. The ski areas already have a huge footprint and should not be allowed to expand. The concerns of the local residents should take priority over the business interests of out of state corporations. One Wasatch sounds great as a marketing gimmick but I doubt it will have much benefit for the local population. It would definitely encroach on the backcountry which is so special to so many users. People come from all over the world to take advantage of it. Many people move to the SLC area just to be able to enjoy the mountains. It should be cherished as a special resource and not degraded. David Liger</p>	3/9/2015
<p>Mountain Accord</p> <p>Please add my comments. I am sure that I echo many responses. So I will just outline my concerns, 1. Water shed contamination 2. Spoiling the pristine environment .</p> <p>3. Threatening the wild life habitat.</p> <p>4. Tourism impact on residents, disturbing their privacy, ruining the quiet beauty that envelops the Grizzley Gulch area, and Albion Basin.</p> <p>Mostly,</p> <p>1 This act is just opening the door to future development .</p> <p>2. Opponents have backed their bets on this project by purchasing their land. Hoping the " private property" trump card will allow them a longevity of open ended development.</p> <p>3. The Grizzley Gulch is the final play of the game to acquire what they see as the biggest best interconnect in the United States.</p> <p>What is next? Lifts, gondolas, restaurants , lodges? CONDOs?</p> <p>The future is not secure, not defined, not in the hands of anyone with Utah Environments in mind.</p>	3/9/2015
<p>Thank you for this opportunity.</p> <p>My comments regarding the Mountain Accord proposed Blueprint:</p> <p>1) I do not support a train up Little Cottonwood Canyon (LCC). Reliability and safety for users of LCC can be achieved by far cheaper means. Adding snow sheds and Bus Rapid Transit to the existing roadway would address reliability and safety issues.</p> <p>2) I do not believe a train up LCC is a responsible solution. LCC has a finite carrying capacity of users. The train would enable a virtually unlimited number of users in LCC. Accommodation of an unlimited number of users is NOT a plan for the Central Wasatch. Currently, parking in the canyons is serving as a limiting factor for the number of users. The Mountain Accord has not addressed this very real concern in the blueprint. Removing this cap on user number will have deleterious consequences to our watershed, the user experience, and the marketability of our state to attract talented outdoor enthusiasts to live and recreate.</p> <p>3) I do not support interconnection of any type. In other words, I do not support over-ground connections (Trams, chairlifts, moving walkways, etc.), or under-ground connections (tunnels for trains/cars/buses/skiers/hikers) between LCC, BCC, and Park City.</p> <p>4) I support preserving the unique character of our ski areas, not merging them into a single entity and experience any skier could get anywhere in the world. The CW resorts are unique. Let's keep them unique!</p> <p>5) Regarding the Cottonwood Canyons Task Force:</p> <p>a) I do not believe the CCTF solution is balanced. The resorts are getting: PRIME real estate for commercial development at their bases, water for the expansion, water for snow making, a tax-payer-funded transportation interconnect, AND expansion of their boundaries. In return, the south facing slopes from Superior to the Emma Ridges, some land in white pine, and some near Guardsman's pass is exchanged for preservation. This is not an acceptable solution. In fact, it is not supported by the MA Executive Board. Carl Fisher and Peter Metcalf do not support the CCTF recommendation in the blueprint.</p> <p>b) I would support the CCTF if and only if: property on the ridge line from Superior to Catherine's Pass (including Grizzly Gulch) was exchanged, AND, interconnection of any kind was removed from the recommendation.</p> <p>c) I do not support ski area boundary expansion of any kind.</p> <p>d) The CCTF recommendation should include a provision for avalanche mitigation on the south facing slopes in LCC. It is unacceptable for Alta Ski Lifts to hold a "trump card" that they can put a chairlift up Flagstaff if the [taxpayer] can't put in avalanche mitigation in place.</p> <p>6) I support Bus Rapid Transit in both BCC and LCC, provided the dispersed user's can board and de-board at all trailheads up and down the canyon by requesting a stop. Parking at the mouths of the canyons must be addressed in the blueprint. Cost of ridership should also be part of the blueprint. Cost to ride the bus should be less than fees (see below) to drive your car.</p> <p>7) I support an expanded trail network.</p> <p>8) I support fees for parking at trailheads and/or accessing the canyons by automobile.</p> <p>9) The blueprint is sorely lacking in actionable details regarding management strategies for the CW. This lack of detail is concerning given the amount of detail provided for major investments being made to accommodate more users. Details of SPECIFIC mechanisms to manage the CW are required. I cannot support the blueprint without them. Where will high use nodes be located? What activities and what trailheads? Proposing a train up LCC and expanded bus service up BCC while not providing information on where and how to manage increased users is not a complete plan. The Recreation Idealized System has not been adequately incorporated into the blueprint.</p> <p>10) I do not believe the Mountain Accord proposed Blueprint is a blueprint. It reads as a vague proposal with no specific deliverables. A blueprint is specific. I have been attending public meetings and continue to hear that the Mountain Accord has left 'all options' on the table to evaluate them in the next phase, the EIS study. I do not agree with this approach. I believe the MA should put together the best plan that has consensus, not 'throw everything at the wall and see what sticks'. The Central Wasatch is a precious natural resource. I do not believe that "finding out" what can be done after an EIS study is paid for and completed is a financially or publicly acceptable means for planning.</p>	3/16/2015

<p>Greetings,</p> <p>I have been monitoring and involved in the Mountain Accord process regarding the future of the Central Wasatch since it's inception. Having lived and recreated in these mountains for the past 20 years, the future of the Wasatch is very much of a concern of mine. That said, please see my official position on the Mountain Accord "Blueprint" below.</p> <p><b>Transportation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I recognize that the traffic situation in Little Cottonwood Canyon is unsustainable on some winter days, and while I understand the impetus to promote a train version of a fixed guideway, I feel that the bus system is far from optimized and with proper implementation, could service both the ski resorts and dispersed users on a year-round basis far more effectively than a train.</li> <li>- Providing copious parking near the mouths of the canyon would be a critical component of this.</li> <li>- Without trying an optimized bus system using the existing infrastructure I feel it is impossible to justify major infrastructure changes (adding lanes or installing a train)</li> <li>- Charging a per-vehicle fee - either via a daily fee or an annual pass - would help subsidize the optimized bus/parking system and provide an incentive to ride the transit system</li> <li>- Incentivize ridership by making the bus fee free or only a nominal price.</li> <li>- The bus system would need to have both a Snowbird-servicing bus and multiple Alta express buses.</li> <li>- Current and future UDOT plans to add passing lanes on hwy 210 for private vehicles should be focused on improving bus transit systems.</li> <li>- Snowsheds and/or bridges over side paths can/should be added for increased avalanche mitigation for the highway.</li> <li>- I fully support optimizing year-round Bus Rapid Transit for Big Cottonwood Canyon. Again, with copious parking at the mouth of the canyon.</li> <li>- A tunnel linking LCC and BCC is not needed. Improved public transit would alleviate the traffic issues associated with LCC, and the "safety" issues that have been ascribed to a tunnel have been overblown; there have not been any documented injuries/fatalities associated with overuse of LCC that would not be overcome with improved transit.</li> <li>- Tunnel connections would create more defacto resort sidecountry terrain, effectively increasing the resorts' footprints.</li> <li>- The tunnel would basically be a taxpayer-funded connection that would exist to benefit four businesses (ski resorts) with no/very little validation that such a connection would actually be economically beneficial to those businesses. There are no significant "problems" that an LCC/BCC tunnel would solve, despite a considerable cost to taxpayers.</li> <li>- The same argument is applied to a fixed guideway system connecting BCC to Park City. It would not necessarily save time for PC-BCC travelers, is not supported by Park City officials, and would again be a taxpayer-subsidized benefit to a handful of businesses (ski resorts).</li> </ul> <p>The question on the survey asking if the transit "solutions" are "environmentally-sustainable" is fundamentally flawed: transit systems are not intended to be "environmentally sustainable"; they are intended to transport people from point to point. Since NO ONE - including transit engineers who have looked into this project - knows if they'll actually be environmentally-sustainable (eg degrading the watershed) that point is misguided and badly misleading and irrelevant at worst. The question should be "Is this a solution that I as a user of the Central Wasatch would actually use and be willing to pay for?"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At the moment parking is the limiting factor for pressurized use in the Cottonwood Canyons; enabling as many people as possible to use the canyon will result in more user pressure. Optimizing Bus Rapid Transit will be an intermediate step to moving possibly-somewhat more people up the canyon to put only moderate additional user pressure on the canyons.</li> <li>- I am in full support of a year-round bus shuttle system for Mill Creek Canyon.</li> <li>- I am in full support of a train/light rail system linking the Salt Lake Valley with Park City. This is a system that I feel would be used far more extensively by commuters and lower-income resort workers around the clock on a more-regular schedule than a LCC canyon train that would be associated almost exclusively for time-intensive recreation.</li> <li>- The rationale provided for abandoning the Parley's rail transit - that was favored in the Trans system group - is that it would not be competitive with the freeway; however, this rationale was not applied to the successful SLC airport Trax line.</li> </ul>	<p>3/16/2015</p>
<p><b>Recreation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I am in full support of creating a trails network in the upper reaches of the two canyons</li> <li>- The trails should be a mix of hiking exclusive, mountain biking exclusive, and shared (and/or with management techniques conducive to habits; ie Snowbird's new trail being uphill til the tram runs and then it becomes downhill).</li> <li>- Any new road/transit construction must have improved road cycling facilities (wider shoulders, exclusive bike lanes, disconnected paved bike paths)</li> <li>- LCC/BCC parking areas need to be enlarged and enhanced for the major dispersed user trailheads, with optional stops for the Bus Rapid Transit at White Pine, Argenta, Butler Fork, Mineral Fork, etc.</li> <li>- I support the permanent protection of the Emma Ridges to Superior ridgeline from development.</li> <li>- I do NOT support a chairlift in Grizzly Gulch. I recognize that it is private property, but I also appreciate that much of Alta's operations are on public land and that they stand to benefit greatly from enhanced base development on a lot of lucrative land, additional water use, increased snowmaking, and improved LCC transit. Grizzly Gulch and the surrounding area should be put into some sort of permanent protection.</li> <li>- I could be supportive of chairlifts and development into the American Fork Canyon depending on alignment and scope.</li> <li>- I could be supportive of a re-aligned chairlift in Honeycomb Canyon, depending on the alignment, provided there are no effects on Silver Fork backcountry</li> <li>- I am supportive of Brighton's formal adoption of Hidden Canyon, provided any chairlift reaches back towards the Great Western chairlift.</li> <li>- I am supportive of increased connectivity between Brighton and Solitude in the SolBright area.</li> <li>- I am supportive of enhanced facilities at identified high-use nodes to both concentrate use in appropriate close-in areas and disperse use in more-remote areas</li> </ul> <p>I am in support of modifying wilderness boundaries to accommodate new and existing sections of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I fail to understand how the Mountain Accord can consider all forms of recreation in the Central Wasatch except for one of the most significant and controversial forms: Wasatch Powderbirds. To me this "oversight" of neglecting helicopter skiing in our tiny range - that was based on a Forest Service administrative timeline that was arbitrarily changed from 5 year renewals to 10 years - is an egregious omission.</li> </ul> <p><b>Economics</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I support enabling the ski resorts to utilize more water for snowmaking</li> <li>- I support adding potential land and altering zoning for additional development at the various resorts' bases.</li> </ul> <p>I support enabling the ski resorts to expand their summertime activities within their existing footprints.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I support enhanced modern avalanche mitigation techniques (ie Gas-X) above Alta. I do NOT support a chairlift on Flagstaff peak</li> <li>- I do not support extraordinarily-expensive, taxpayer-funded "solutions" to "problems" that enable profit maximization for ski resorts whose lift tickets are pricing their customers out of an already-flat-to-declining market.</li> </ul> <p><b>Environment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I am not an environmental specialist, so I cannot comment on the survey question: "does the Blueprint achieve environmental stewardship of the natural resources?"</li> <li>- I know that the EPA has determined that ski resort development has a more profound effect on watershed integrity than ANY other development. But I am cautiously optimistic that SLC Water and various other governing bodies will ensure water quality despite the threats associated with increased use, transit, and development.</li> <li>- I am in favor of a re-forestation effort on (particularly) the Emma ridgeline area</li> <li>- I am becoming increasingly convinced that simple people-pressure on the canyons is having a degrading effect on the watershed, and dramatically increasing opportunities to transport people up the canyons will have a commensurate effect on the watershed quality.</li> <li>- I am concerned that the ski resorts are getting many of their desired "gets", and their "gives" are more along the lines of "we are not taking as much as we could take", at the expense of potential environmental and backcountry terrain preservation.</li> </ul> <p>Overall I have found the "blueprint" to NOT be reflective of the thousands of hours of work that people put into the system group meetings and submeetings over the summer; it confirms to me that the Exec board was made up of a lot of Important People who were not very engaged in the process and therefore created a plan that represented their impressions/interests rather than what was determined by the System Groups.</p> <p>I am also VERY concerned about issues outside of the Central Wasatch (AF Canyon, Wasatch Backside, etc) and that they are not all being addressed collectively, but with separate task forces, committees, or other. My understanding was that the purpose of the Mountain Accord was to bring all interested parties to the table, yet it doesn't appear that way if, for example, Utah County has a different approach and process regarding access and use from Tibble Fork in American Fork Canyon with regard to how that could potentially play out with the land exchange to Snowbird in the Mary Ellen/ Major Evans gulch areas. It would make sense to me to bring all of these discussions into the mix so there is truly a cohesive and comprehensive potential for a plan going forward.</p> <p>It is with all that said that I do not support the "blueprint" in its current form. I am a strong believer in the Mountain Accord ideals and timing and am very hopeful that a more equitable balance of gives and takes can be achieved to accommodate many constituents/stakeholders' desires, if they are all willing to concede on some of their desires.</p> <p>Thank you for your efforts to attempt to make the Wasatch a place that all can enjoy for generations to come. ☺</p>	<p>3/15/2015</p>
<p>Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on the Mountain Accord Blueprint. I live in suburban Pennsylvania and go to school in Boston. Fortunately this year I had a chance to visit Utah. I came to Alta to ski. I found no problem with transportation into and out of Little Cottonwood Canyon and Salt Lake City airport.</p> <p>I fell in love with Alta. The natural beauty, the high alpine mountains and the serene, tranquil, scene gave me the feeling of a place apart. I liked walking and skiing in the canyon where I felt completely removed from my urban lifestyle. Consequently, I don't like the plans in the Blueprint which concentrate recreational hubs in Alta, installing a transit system connecting Alta with counties to the East by tunneling through the mountain to provide "faster" access, and concentrate developments near transportation and recreation centers. I would not enjoy being in Alta if it were to have an urban look and feel.</p> <p>I suggest you treasure the resource you have in Alta, and not try to put a larger human footprint thereon via a large-scale transportation system. Safety of the road could be achieved with covered structures in avalanche zones. Smaller, cheaper systems (buses, vans, carpools) reduce road traffic, pollution, parking pressures, and cost.</p>	<p>3/15/2015</p>
<p>As to the mountain accord plan there are many unresolved issues but there is one thing I am very sure of.</p> <p>The proposed land swap deal is, simply, a terrible idea. Any plan involving transfer of public lands, but in this particular case it's an invitation to disaster.</p> <p>Alta and the surrounding area is one of Utah's gems, and public access is, and always has been, a crucial aspect of that. Turning over control of that access to a private corporation, no matter what there for sure it is, it's a dangerous precedent. Not only can a private corporation change their policies at any time without public input or recourse, but the very real possibility of selling to a large corporation, such as Vail, is always present.</p> <p>A corporation like Vail would have the resources to develop and restrict public access to the area, as well as fundamentally changing the very nature of town, and thus the entire surrounding area.</p> <p>As a corporation from out of state, they will have no interest in the wishes of the residents of the town or of the citizens of Salt Lake Valley - their only interest will be in the bottom line.</p> <p>There are very few places in the entire country let alone in Utah as special as Alta. Generations of skiers and Salt Lake residents have enjoyed this area for what seems like forever. Change is inevitable, but such change as will destroy the very nature of the place is not. To remove the land from the public trust and assign it to a private corporation would be almost criminal.</p> <p><u>I cannot begin to express how strongly I am opposed to this.</u></p>	<p>3/16/2015</p>
<p>First, I would like to applaud the hard work and collaborative effort that has gone into producing the blue print for the Mountain Accord. I feel fortunate to live in an area where community leaders are taking a proactive approach to future land use along the Wasatch Front.</p> <p>My only issue with the blueprint at this point is a lack of protection for recreational opportunities for the free flying community along the Wasatch Front. As I'm sure you are aware, the Wasatch Front is a world class location for paragliding, hang gliding and speed flying. There is a large and vibrant population of free flight participants in Utah and specifically in the Salt Lake and Utah valleys. Paragliding, Hang gliding and speed flying are about as "low environmental impact" as you can get. Most of our use of the Wasatch Front is for the purpose of launching our equipment (that weighs as much as a mountain bike) and the rest of the time we are flying QUIETLY over the mountains. We burn no fossil fuels, leave no trace, and require only already established trail systems to get to our takeoff site. In fact, paragliding, hang gliding and speed flying are have a much lower impact on the environment than hiking, rock climbing and mountain biking. I can say this because I also participate in those activities and I regularly see the chalk marks and bolt scars on the climbing walls and the ruts, switchback cuts and erosion from the bikers and hikers.</p> <p>As low impact as free flight sports are, we are unfortunately often grouped into the "aviation" category by federal land managers who follow policy adopted decades before the advent of recreational free flight with bureaucratic blindness. My 20 pound paraglider, with no engine, and no means of sustaining flight other than what nature provides is considered to be the same as a noisy, gasoline guzzling Cessna 182 by federal land managers. That is why the free flight community in Utah is skeptical about a change to land designation along the Wasatch Front.</p> <p>I am a property owner, taxpayer and resident of this beautiful region we are all so lucky to call home. I share the same values that those who have put this blueprint for the Mountain Accord into place and strongly support the protection of our lands along the Wasatch Front. However, I can not support this blueprint without specific protections carved out for the free flying community in Utah.</p> <p><u>I would welcome a discussion with the Board in conjunction with our local free flight organizations on the protections that our community would require before I can support the Mountain Accord Blueprint</u></p>	<p>3/16/2015</p>

<p>The question on the survey asking if the transit "solutions" are "environmentally-sustainable" is fundamentally flawed: transit systems are not intended to be "environmentally sustainable"; they are intended to transport people from point to point. Since NO ONE – including trans engineers who have looked into this project – knows if they'll actually be environmentally-sustainable (eg degrading the watershed) that point is misguided at best and badly misleading and irrelevant at worst. The question should be "Is this a solution that I as a user of the Central Wasatch would actually use and be willing to pay for?"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At the moment parking is the limiting factor for pressurized use in the Cottonwood Canyons; enabling as many people as possible to use the canyon will result in more user pressure. Optimizing Bus Rapid Transit will be an intermediate step to moving possibly somewhat more people up the canyon to put only moderate additional use pressure on the canyons.</li> <li>I am in full support of a year-round bus shuttle system for Mill Creek Canyon.</li> <li>I am in full support of a train/light rail system linking the Salt Lake Valley with Park City. This is a system that I feel would be used far more extensively by commuters and lower-income resort workers around the clock on a more-regular schedule than a LCC canyon train that would be associated almost exclusively for time-intensive recreation.</li> <li>The rationale provided for abandoning the Parley's rail transit - that was favored in the Trans system group - is that it would not be competitive with the freeway; however, this rationale was not applied to the successful SLC airport Tax line.</li> </ul>	
<p>Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am in full support of creating a trails network in the upper reaches of the two canyons</li> <li>The trails should be a mix of hiking exclusive, mountain biking exclusive, and shared (and/or with management techniques conducive to habits; ie Snowbird's new trail being uphill till the tram runs and then it becomes downhill).</li> <li>Any new road/transit construction must have improved road cycling facilities (wider shoulders, exclusive bike lanes, disconnected paved bike paths)</li> <li>LCC/BCC parking areas need to be enlarged and enhanced for the major dispersed user trailheads, with optional stops for the Bus Rapid Transit at White Pine, Argenta, Butler Fork, Mineral Fork, etc.</li> <li>I support the permanent protection of the Emma Ridges to Superior ridgeline from development.</li> <li>I do NOT support a chairlift in Grizzly Gulch. I recognize that it is private property, but I also appreciate that much of Alta's operations are on public land and that they stand to benefit greatly from enhanced base development on a lot of lucrative land, additional water use, increased snowmaking, and improved LCC transit. Grizzly Gulch and the surrounding area should be put into some sort of permanent protection.</li> <li>I could be supportive of chairlifts and development into the American Fork Canyon depending on alignment and scope.</li> <li>I could be supportive of a re-aligned chairlift in Honeycomb Canyon, depending on the alignment, provided there are no effects on Silver Fork backcountry</li> <li>I am supportive of Brighton's formal adoption of Hidden Canyon, provided any chairlift reaches back towards the Great Western chairlift.</li> <li>I am supportive of increased connectivity between Brighton and Solitude in the SolBright area.</li> <li>I am supportive of enhanced facilities at identified high-use nodes to both concentrate use in appropriate close-in areas and disperse use in more-remote areas</li> <li>I am in support of modifying wilderness boundaries to accommodate new and existing sections of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.</li> </ul> <p>I fail to understand how the Mountain Accord can consider all forms of recreation in the Central Wasatch except for one of the most significant and controversial forms: Wasatch Powderbirds. To me this "oversight" of neglecting helicopter skiing in our tiny range – that was based on a Forest Service administrative timeline that was arbitrarily changed from 5 year renewals to 10 years - is an egregious omission.</p> <p>Economics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I support enabling the ski resorts to utilize more water for snowmaking</li> <li>I support adding potential land and altering zoning for additional development at the various resorts' bases.</li> <li>I support enabling the ski resorts to expand their summertime activities within their existing footprints.</li> </ul> <p>I do not support extraordinarily-expensive, taxpayer-funded "solutions" to "problems" that enable profit maximization for ski resorts whose lift tickets are pricing their customers out of an already-flat-to-declining market.</p> <p>Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am not an environmental specialist, so I cannot comment on the survey question: "does the Blueprint achieve environmental stewardship of the natural resources?"</li> <li>I know that the EPA has determined that ski resort development has a more profound effect on watershed integrity than ANY other development. But I am cautiously optimistic that SLC Water and various other governing bodies will ensure water quality despite the threats associated with increased use, transit, and development.</li> <li>I am in favor of a re-forestation effort on (particularly) the Emma ridgeline area</li> <li>I am becoming increasingly convinced that simple people-pressure on the canyons is having a degrading effect on the watershed, and dramatically increasing opportunities to transport people up the canyons will have a commensurate effect on watershed quality.</li> <li>I am concerned that the ski resorts are getting many of their desired "gates", and their "gives" are more along the lines of "we are not taking as much as we could take", at the expense of potential environmental and backcountry terrain preservation.</li> </ul> <p>Overall I have found the "blueprint" (it should have been called a "proposal") to NOT be reflective of the thousands of hours of work that people put into the system group meetings and submeetings over the summer; it confirms to me that the Exec board was made up of a lot of Important People who were not very engaged in the process and therefore created a plan that represented their impressions/interests rather than what was determined by the System Groups.</p> <p>Therefore I do not support the "blueprint" in its current form, but I am a strong believer in the Mountain Accord ideals and timing, and am very hopeful that a more equitable balance of gives and takes can be achieved to accommodate many constituents/stakeholders' desires, if they are all willing to concede on some of their desires.</p>	3/10/2015
<p>Environment System</p> <p>The Environment System is the most important to pay attention to. It is vital to preserve the environment of the Wasatch. We depend on it for a clean water supply. It is aesthetically important to preserve natural values. We, the local citizens love the wilderness parts of our Wasatch. We need to preserve these serene, unspoiled areas to allow us to find some peace and quiet, and to recharge our souls. Do not let these wilderness areas to become less wild, even if that means making some land exchanges.</p> <p>Transportation System</p> <p>Any development of the transportation system must be carefully monitored so it doesn't run amok. Please avoid construction of trains or aerial trams. They would overly mar the visual and aesthetic appeal of these charming canyons. To support a peaceful Wasatch, please reduce traffic, by increasing parking lots in the valley and increasing bus access. Only buses should be allowed in the Canyons, with exceptions for emergency vehicles, delivery trucks, and maintenance crews. Also, increase bus service up Parley's Canyon to Park City and Deer Valley Resorts. But make sure they go by way of Parleys, rather than slicing right through our Wasatch.</p> <p>We don't need additional parking places or roads in the Wasatch. That just robs more of the scarce open land that is left. Most of all, please do NOT allow interconnects between ski areas, especially if they link one canyon to another. That would make our precious little Wasatch Mountains seem even tinier. That shrinkage would greatly reduce their appeal. The mountains are not a toy to be tinkered with.</p> <p>Recreation System</p> <p>The Recreation System should give equal rights to backcountry users. Keep plenty of areas where we who love to travel by our own power (not using ski lifts, helicopters, or other mechanized transport) can still have an enjoyable outing. We need to have a place where we can get far away from the sights, sounds, and smells of machinery. We need this to stay sane in this noisy, fast-motion world.</p> <p>Also, please focus on building more trails in areas such as the Bonneville Trail System on the benches, so there are still plenty of places for mountain bikers to go, without overrunning the Wasatch. Wherever mountain bikes are allowed, the trails will need extra layers of maintenance due to the erosion caused by the bikes.</p> <p>Economic System</p> <p>The Economic System should focus on buying up tracts of land to preserve them from further development. It will only get harder and harder to do this as time goes by. Save the land now, before it is too late. Charge entry fees to help pay for this.</p>	3/16/2015
<p>Hello I have been following the Mountain Accord process with great interest and I have studied the proposed "blueprint" and attended a question and answer public meeting. I'm extremely excited with this once in a lifetime opportunity to bring some finality to the future of the central Wasatch. I'm in these mountains trail running, hiking, mountain or road biking, and camping at least once a week. I love Utah and the amazing recreation it has to offer. These are my formal comments regarding the "blueprint" put forth by the Executive Board. My name is Lori Harward, and I am the director of the Utah High School Cycling League nonprofit organization. The League was founded in 2011 under the National Interscholastic Cycling Association, with a vision to enable every Utah teen to strengthen body, mind, and character through the life-long sport of cycling. We have seen incredible growth and anticipate ~1500 registered student athletes participating in 2015 along with 400+ registered coaches. Please visit our website <a href="http://www.utahmb.org">http://www.utahmb.org</a> to learn more about us. Because the league is mountain bike specific, our program has had significant impact on the mountain biking trails along the Wasatch front. Our high-school based teams start season practice July 1 and finish November 1 (with 5 races taking place September through October). Most teams typically practice 3-4 times a week. We have placed significant pressure on Corner Canyon and Draper City to meet the needs of the teams. Families simply don't have the time to drive significant hours on weeknights to hold team practices in Park City. Plus, teams need areas that have trails to accommodate a wide range of skill levels (from beginner to varsity racer). Many students now ride all year long with their friends and families too. With regards to the trails portion of the Recreation Proposal, I am in favor of more trails. However, I feel Mountain Accord is not taking into consideration the significant impact our organization is having on mountain bike trails. We are statistically finding that 60% of dads and 40% of moms are getting into cycling as a result of their student being in our program. It's the only high school sport that is family friendly and many families are being turned on to this new form of family fun. Additionally, 90% of our students in 2012 were new to mountain biking. Many had never ridden off road before. We are introducing thousands into this sport that Mountain Accord did not anticipate when considering trails. The Wasatch Front mountain biking community has already significantly increased in size since you began your studies. The mountain bike trails proposed don't meet the current needs, let alone a doubling in population overall. Below are my comments regarding the overall blueprint. Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am in full support of creating a trails network in the upper reaches of the Cottonwoods.</li> <li>These trails should be a mix of hiking exclusive, mountain biking exclusive, and shared (and/or with management techniques conducive to habits; ie Snowbird's new trail being uphill until the tram runs and then it becomes downhill).</li> <li>Any new road/transit construction must have improved road cycling facilities (wider shoulders, exclusive bike lanes, disconnected paved bike paths)</li> <li>LCC/BCC parking areas need to be enlarged and enhanced for the major dispersed user trailheads, with optional stops for the Bus Rapid Transit at White Pine, Argenta, Butler Fork, Mineral Fork, etc.</li> <li>I support the permanent protection of the Emma Ridges to Superior ridgeline from development.</li> <li>I do NOT support a chairlift in Grizzly Gulch. I recognize that it is private property, but I also appreciate that much of Alta's operations are on public land and that they stand to benefit greatly from enhanced base development on a lot of lucrative land, additional water use, increased snowmaking, and improved LCC transit. Grizzly Gulch and the surrounding area should be put into some sort of permanent protection.</li> <li>I could be supportive of a re-aligned chairlift in Honeycomb Canyon, depending on the alignment, provided there are no effects on Silver Fork backcountry.</li> <li>I am supportive of enhanced facilities at identified high-use nodes to both concentrate use in appropriate close-in areas and disperse use in more-remote areas.</li> </ul> <p>I am in support of modifying wilderness boundaries to accommodate new and existing sections of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. ☺</p> <p>Transportation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The transportation situation in Little Cottonwood is unsustainable on many winter days and something has to be done. I believe bus service is the best option to solve this problem and do not support light rail in the canyon. The canyon can't sustain the damage that will come from building a rail line and the public can't afford the cost of rail line.</li> <li>Adequate parking near the mouth of the canyon are critical to the success of expanded bus service.</li> <li>Expanded bus service should be tried prior to any commitments to adding lanes to the LCC road.</li> <li>Charging a per-vehicle fee - either via a daily fee or an annual pass - would help subsidize the optimized bus/parking system and provide an incentive to ride the transit system</li> <li>Incentivize ridership by making the bus fee free or only a nominal price.</li> <li>The bus system would need to have both a Snowbird-servicing bus and multiple Alta express buses.</li> <li>Current and future UDOT plans to add passing lanes on hwy 210 for private vehicles should be focused on improving bus transit systems.</li> <li>Snowsheds and/or bridges over slide paths can/should be added for increased avalanche mitigation for the highway.</li> <li>I fully support optimizing year-round Bus Rapid Transit for Big Cottonwood Canyon. Again, with adequate parking at the mouth of the canyon.</li> <li>A tunnel linking LCC and BCC is not needed. Improved public transit would alleviate the traffic issues associated with LCC, and the "safety" issues that have been ascribed to a tunnel have been overblown.</li> </ul>	3/16/2015

<p>The tunnel would basically be a taxpayer-funded connection that would exist to benefit four businesses (ski resorts) with no validation that such a connection would actually be economically beneficial to those businesses. There are no significant "problems" that an LCC/BCC tunnel would solve, despite a considerable cost to taxpayers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The same argument is applied to a fixed guideway system connecting BCC to Park City. It would not necessarily save time for PC-BCC travelers, is not supported by Park City officials, and would again be a taxpayer-subsidized benefit to a handful of businesses (ski resorts) who have not proven that such a connection would even be beneficial today, much less in the future considering global warming and the flat/declining trends of the resort skiing industry (according to their own study).</li> <li>The question on the survey asking if the transit "solutions" are "environmentally-sustainable" is fundamentally flawed. The question should simply be "Is this a solution that as a user of the Central Wasatch would actually use and be willing to pay for?"</li> <li>At the moment parking is the limiting factor for pressurized use in the Cottonwood Canyons; enabling as many people as possible to use the canyon will result in more user pressure. Optimizing Bus Rapid Transit will be an intermediate step to moving somewhat more people up the canyon to put only moderate additional use pressure on the canyons.</li> <li>I am in full support of a year-round bus shuttle system for Mill Creek Canyon.</li> <li>I am in full support of a train/light rail system linking the Salt Lake Valley with Park City.</li> </ul> <p>Economics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I support enabling the ski resorts to utilize more water for snowmaking.</li> <li>I support adding potential land and altering zoning for additional development at the various resorts' bases.</li> <li>I support enabling the ski resorts to expand their summertime activities within their existing footprints.</li> <li>I support enhanced modern avalanche mitigation techniques (ie Gas-X) above Alta. I do NOT support a chairlift on Flagstaff peak</li> <li>I do not support extraordinarily-expensive, taxpayer-funded "solutions" to "problems" that primarily benefit only ski resorts.</li> </ul> <p>Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I know that the EPA has determined that ski resort development has a more profound effect on watershed integrity than ANY other development. But I am cautiously optimistic that SLC Water and various other governing bodies will ensure water quality despite the threats associated with increased use, transit, and development.</li> <li>I am in favor of a re-forestation effort on (particularly) the Emma ridgeline area.</li> <li>I am becoming increasingly convinced that simple people-pressure on the canyons is having a degrading effect on the watershed, and dramatically increasing opportunities to transport people up the canyons will have a commensurate effect on the watershed quality.</li> <li>I am concerned that the ski resorts are getting many of their desired "gets", and their "gives" are more along the lines of "we are not taking as much as we could take", at the expense of potential environmental and backcountry terrain preservation. In summary, I do not support the "blueprint" in its current form, but I am a strong believer in the Mountain Accord ideals and timing. We have to do all we can to reach agreement and take advantage of the chance to resolve these issues. If we don't, it may be too late to save the Wasatch five or ten years down the road.</li> </ul>	
<p>I've been dreaming about living in Utah since I first came there at the age of 4 so don't do anything that changes Utah to much</p> <p>I would like to see all the wasatch mountains given back to the public for foot traffic only, it sounds silly but to me it is as cool as zion or Bryce or any other national park, anyone that cares about natural beauty could agree that roads and lifts a...</p>	<p>3/16/2015</p> <p>2/21/2015</p>
<p>Word Doc.</p> <p>Linking all resorts via tram is dumb. Who in their best day can handle even one resort? And, who around here can afford another price hike? Improving public transit is an easy fix- it helps everyone - not only a handful of profiteers...</p>	<p>3/16/2015</p> <p>3/16/2015</p>
<p>Many people do commute between the two and improved transportation links between the two will be costly and necessary. Building either the BRT or the LRT will be enormously expensive, and adding on the superfluous tunnels will run to the billions of dollars. The big beneficiaries, especially with the tunnels, will be the resorts making this alternative as presented an unconscionable public subsidy for the resort industry and a total rip off for taxpayers. Where will the parking be located for personal automobiles of those who will be expected to use the mass transit alternatives proposed for the canyons? Parking solutions are not discussed in the blueprint, but must be an integral part of any workable alternative transportation plan. The distribution of population along the Wasatch front and the continuing role of the car makes accommodating parking essential to any transportation proposal even if the light rail system is eventually connected as a feeder for any of the canyons. The mouth of Mill Creek is already congested with vehicles of cyclists, runners, and the few who conscientiously carpool from the bottom of the canyon. Where would those expected to use a shuttle bus be expected to park? Lastly all transportation planning suffers from a similar shortcoming, what in economics is called "induced demand." If you build more infrastructure in all likelihood usage will simply (and always quickly) increase until maximum capacity is once again attained. Land Trades and Boundary Expansion: Permanent protection for Emma Ridge, Flagstaff, and Superior would be all positive developments though I question for various reasons that they would ever be subject to development anyway. All are steep and south facing making them less attractive terrain for resort expansion. I already assume Snowbird's expansion further down towards American Fork a foregone conclusion. Out of the various land trades for which Snowbird would be a beneficiary the most important to me in addition to the north side of the canyon would be the permanent protection of the White Pine drainage. Offering diverse feasibility of resort expansion in that direction would take some comfort in once and forever removing that piece of real estate from future risk. White Pine is one of the most popular backcountry skiing destinations in Little Cottonwood Canyon offering diverse and spectacular terrain on multiple aspects. The old adage about real estate is "Location, location, location..." This seems particularly apt in characterizing the benefits that will accrue particularly for Skiltude in the proposed expansion of resort boundaries. Without expanding lifts Skiltude would take direct possession of a popular backcountry area called Flannigans where I have skied for many years, controlling that piece of terrain will insure the de facto appropriation of the nearby and even more popular backcountry area known East Silver as resort side country. With possession of Flannigans which would forever be lost to backcountry skiers, traffic from the resort allowed through gates could access East Silver Fork reentering the resort at the existing Honeycomb lift. The impacts of side country appropriation by a resort was amply demonstrated by the overrunning of particularly Dutch Draw, and McDonalds Draw, but also upper Desolation and Bear Trap drainages by resort skiers from the Canyons using the 9,990 lift. Both Flannigans and East Silver Fork areas are high elevation, with substantial North facing terrain and choices for less avalanche exposed skiing. The Honeycomb area already gives skiltude a substantial amount of similar terrain that is largely underutilized. I am unequivocally opposed to expansion in this area. The impact on a popular backcountry area would be profound and permanent. The parcel Skiltude wants to acquire which I assume is parking or some base area parcel should be enough.</p>	
<p>Alta's proposal offers them much while requiring that they give little or nothing in exchange. The publicly funded transportation system would reduce their need for onsite parking freeing space for further development on the 258 acres they expect to get from public land at the base of the mountain. They want culinary water for 108 rental units yet they still expect to add a big swath of new terrain to the resort. As far as I'm concerned Alta can have those things, but if, and only if they give up something of significance in exchange. That something must be their permanent relinquishment in perpetuity of any right to build lifts in either Grizzly Gulch or alternatively up Tuscarora. Permanent protection of some kind should be extended to include all the terrain between the current resort boundaries of Skiltude, Brighton and Alta protecting the areas adjacent to Tuscarora, Wolverine, the cirque and the Twin Lakes pass. The Grizzly/Twin Lakes area is one of the most popular backcountry skiing destinations in the Wasatch. Leveraging alta's aspirations for expansion to gain something of lasting value is timely. A failure to use this moment to preserve dispersed recreation at the top of Little Cottonwood Canyon would be unconscionable. Hidden Canyon has been Brighton's "side country" since before the term came into popular use. The area can be difficult to access in the winter except from the gates at the top of the Great Western Lift or from the bottom. Still, Hidden Canyon is north facing and high elevation, and worth keeping as undeveloped. Since Brighton wants a large piece of public property at their base I question the justification for throwing in a significant permit expansion too. What they give up doesn't add up as a fair exchange for all of the proposed largesse. Snowbird's proposed trade and boundary expansion as articulated in the blueprint is the only one that might result in a net public benefit. Alta wants a lot, but wants to give virtually nothing of import in exchange. Brighton and Skiltude, especially Skiltude, also appear to get public land valuable to their operations and give up far less in exchange. In summary I feel that current recreation use is balanced and needs to be managed in its current ratios. Resort growth particularly focusing on the destination skier market is antithetical to the interests of the greatest number of users. Sustainability is achievable in their current footprints. I believe there is a peak carrying capacity for the Wasatch and if the blueprint wish list is fulfilled that capacity will be exceeded. Transportation systems should be incrementally developed to reduce the scale of personal automobile use, but done in an environmentally and fiscally responsible way.</p>	<p>3/16/2015</p>
<p>Please do NOT create any links (tunnel or aerial) between the BCC, LCC, and the Wasatch Back. Adding these links will only increase the load on the canyons. Also, do NOT have a light rail up LCC - it will destroy the beauty of that canyon.</p>	<p>3/16/2015</p>
<p>So...</p> <p>1) NO tunnels or connections between the canyons and Park City and</p> <p>2) NO train up LCC.</p>	
<p>Hi there,</p> <p>I am a researcher at the University of Utah, specializing in soil and watershed science. I just finished reading the Mountain Accord Blueprint, and I have a follow-up question as an environmental scientist. Is there a detailed plan to conduct assessment and monitoring of soil, watershed, and wildlife health in the central Wasatch, pre and post implementation of the accord? The blueprint seems to call for adaptive management, but in order to assess whether changes in land management and transportation are causing undesirable ecological/biophysical changes, we need good baseline data. Are there plans in place to gather such data? Which agencies (state, federal, university, private) will be involved?</p> <p>Thank you for answering my question, and thank you for your work on this important issue.</p>	<p>3/16/2015</p>
<p>A recent environmental report provides six alternatives, in addition to the "no build" option. As reported by Laura Nelson in the March 6, 2015, LA Times (<a href="http://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-ln-710-freeway-report-20150306-story.html">http://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-ln-710-freeway-report-20150306-story.html</a>), construction alternatives include a bus system, light-rail, freeway tunnels and upgrades to the existing surface streets. However, as the freeway is reported to be a "flavored" route for trucks between ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach and distribution centers in Los Angeles County, it is questionable whether buses and light rail meet the economic, transportation and environmental concerns at issue. Further the article reports, the freeway connection options require a 4.9 mile tunnel, at a cost of between \$3.1 to \$5.6 billion, takes 5 years to build, and might involve a use toll AND a</p>	
<p>The quickest and cheapest stated alternative, complete in 2 years at a cost of \$105 million (&lt;3% of the tunnel option), was to make existing freeways and roads more efficient through metered on-ramps, synchronized traffic signals, and flex-lanes for peak hours. Perhaps meeting the transportation congestion, but not solving the quality of life issues and environmental concerns in affected neighborhoods and the region. The Central Wasatch currently has high value as a "natural" resource. It contains limited development, is not a commercial center with high-rises nor dense populations. As more and more people settle in the Salt Lake Valley and in Summit County, the Central Wasatch's value as a "natural" resource will only increase. That value will be destroyed by allowing un-fettered use, uncontrolled transportation access, and funneling people into recreation hubs. In the end, the only "solution," will be to limit access, restrict the numbers of users, restrictions on water available for residents and visitors. Impose those limitations now to maintain the value of the "Natural Resource" we have. I am in favor of restricting flows in the Canyons; this could be metering during peak travel periods to only high occupancy vehicles and express buses to the resorts, limited by their seasonal carrying capacity (higher for Snowbird and lower for Alta Ski Lifts). This would be a cheaper solution, available more timely, and wouldn't involve increased construction, save for possible snow sheds to protect the roadbed from avalanche dangers, if Summit County residents and users need better transportation to downtown Salt Lake</p>	
<p>City and the international airport. The obvious solution is the transportation corridor of I-80, not</p> <p>However, global warming is also of very real concern, in that same planning horizon, and beyond. The winter of 2015 has thus far demonstrated a drought. While winter is not over, and certainly it is possible and even likely additional snows may fall on the Central Wasatch, the thus far, low-snow year should be a reminder to all that this snow, and the water that it turns into come spring, are not certain. Not in quantity, nor seasonally, let alone annually. Recreational opportunities should not be seen as without limit either in winter or summer. Should the Central Wasatch continue to experience winter droughts, increases in population will not be supportable; either recreationally nor residentially. Look at the problems experienced in California as persistent droughts have reduced the snowpack in the Sierra Nevada mountains and reservoirs are not adequate to supply culinary waters for all residents. This month, for example the Mammoth Lakes water district is urging residents to conserve, following a fourth year of drought. (<a href="http://www.sierrawater.net/33353/mcwo-d-urges-increased-conservation-awareness/">http://www.sierrawater.net/33353/mcwo-d-urges-increased-conservation-awareness/</a>)</p> <p>With drier seasons and extended droughts, there will be less water for both residents in the canyons and in the valleys, less water available for snow-making, culinary needs, and landscaping. Quality of life issues may become of greater importance as people move and business re-locate to areas where water is prevalent and abundant. Water and its supply has been a driving force for much of the history of the Western United States from early exploration, settlement, and initial urban expansion and beyond. But water quantity and quality have been a strong limiting factor in both location and policy.</p> <p>The Blueprint does not address these possible declines in water with its plan to put a rail line up Little Cottonwood Canyon, and then tunnel through to Big Cottonwood Canyon, and eventually beyond to Park City. The potential for further diminishing potable water is highest with a tunnel and increased construction to provide for a rail line up Little Cottonwood Canyon, tunneling through mountains, as mentioned above. Using ground water to prolong a recreational ski season by making snow, reduces the water then available for culinary use for that season. I can not address the timetable for re-stocking of the ground water aquifers, nor whether there is any net loss to local water occurs when converting water into snow through the use of snow blower machines, even if it melts again in the Spring to return to the ground water...</p> <p>Third, the Cottonwood Canyons offer recreational opportunities. But, those opportunities have limits. The boundaries encompass what the terrain can support while simultaneously providing a quality experience for the "recreate-or." People come to these canyons for the NATURAL beauty they provide. The majestic mountains, the high tarns, the creeks trickling into streams, the wildlife present due to the presence of their native habitat, be they wetlands, alpine, or sub-alpine, and the abundant summer flora, untrammeled by man or machine. Just as the National Park Service became aware of problems with a public "loving it to death" relating to many national parks, we who love Alta, should recognize and should take steps NOW to protect the treasure of the Central Wasatch from over-development and over-use.</p>	

<p>Inadequate parking, economic need for expansion of the ski resorts, and the need to transport people from Park City to and from the Cottonwood Canyons to ski are addressed by a train. However, they are also addressed, more economically, on-line faster, and more environmentally, by rapid bus transit, with expanded parking structures at the existing park-n-ride lots, and express buses. State Road 210 would continue to provide vehicular traffic up and down Little Cottonwood Canyon. The Blueprint does not recommend eliminating that road to be replaced with a train. Indeed, supplies to residents and on-mountain businesses would need to continue to be delivered door-to-door.</p> <p>Fourth, the need for more beds for guests in Little Cottonwood Canyon is not addressed either by the Blueprint's train, nor any of the other transit options. Land swaps giving Alta Ski Lifts 108 beds in the base facilities zone does provide "more" beds, but that number is insignificant compared to the projected population growth and the projected additional tourists.</p> <p>The road continues to exist and needs maintenance to keep it snow free and passable. A rail bed would need similar, but different maintenance, to allow free-flowing rail operations. Snow sheds would be needed to protect the track and cars from avalanche dangers. But State Road 210 would continue to need to be plowed, dusted and protected from the same dangers, at the same rate. Maintenance and operation of both systems means additional costs. However, a dedicated bus lane rapid transit, could be protected by the same maintenance operations in place for the road. Or, State Road 210 could be expanded to three lanes, one operating as a flex lane, depending on the needs of the time of day. Increased, express buses and routes, would reduce the need for expanded parking at the ski resorts.</p> <p>Beds are in large supply in Park City. The Blueprint rail plan would simply move the people from those beds into the Cottonwood Canyons to recreate, and return them at the end of the ski/hike day. This certainly benefits the ski resorts in those canyons and the hotels in Park City. It is hard to imagine how this benefits the people and communities of Alta, Silverfork, Solitude and Brighton. Those communities would see a wintertime daily influx of people who would come, spend little money other than at the ski resorts, yet use water resources in those communities, leave behind garbage and contribute to congestion on the mountain slopes in winter and trails in summer all to be cleaned up by the local residents.</p> <p>Fifth, while there is a proposed land swap, the swap discussed is apparently separate from Grizzly Gulch, identified in the "Proposed Cottonwoods Canyons Land package", as that area is simply noted to be "under consideration." Any proposal with significant land areas either outside the bargain, off the table, or negotiations yet to be concluded, is no "proposal". If and when there is indeed a proposal that includes all the land in question, then a "proposal" is ripe for public comment.</p> <p>Sixth, a train does not disperse recreational users. On the contrary, riders would all depart the train at the station. They would then be on foot. They would likely access the closest facility. Purchase lift tickets from the closest ski resort to the station, mandating stops at each resort, and each base area at each resort. In summer, users of a train would either all depart the train for the closest hiking trails, making them exceedingly crowded, or need to be shuttled further to more remote trailheads. Alta taxpayers currently fund a summertime weekend shuttle to move visitors from the base facility up two and three miles, respectively, to the Catherine's Pass and Secret Lake trailheads. Despite an abundance of parking at both base areas, visitors choose to drive as far as possible, and park before getting out of their vehicles. These hiking routes are very popular now. Consequently, people frequently experience long waits for shuttles that operate on a non-stop schedule for eight hours from the Albion base facility. A train would not improve this situation, and would instead lead to more over crowding on the trails.</p> <p>Limiting use is the only rational solution. Buses are present, but not enough and they do not operate with full schedules either in time or season. The buses operate in "milk-run" fashion, rather than expressly from a park-and-ride directly to a particular resort. Single-occupant vehicles are the primary road users in the canyons. That has not changed, even with a free bus provided with one's ski season pass.</p> <p>It is unrealistic to believe there would be any difference should a train be implemented. Mill Creek found that unlimited use of the canyon by some dog owners' thoughtlessness caused an abundance of canine feces. They did not propose a train to bring more people to the top of the canyon. No, the change implemented was restricting the days for dogs, and a stronger suggestion to pick up after one's pet.</p> <p>Most national parks, Zion included, have found visitor numbers to be on the rise. A train was not conceived and is not operated into the fullest reaches of the park. Nor was the goal to bring as many people as possible into the park. Building additional facilities to house all folks interested in staying in the park was not sought or achieved. Instead, one applies for a limited number of permits in order to camp, visitors park and ride a shuttle bus within the park. It is safe for bicyclists to operate simultaneously on the same roadway through the park.</p> <p>These ideas work in other recreational areas of natural beauty. The operators of those areas did not need new, large infrastructure solutions, yet they provide economic benefits to surrounding communities, and they did not permanently alter the natural, and in places, delicate beauty of the very parks themselves.</p> <p>STOP thinking that a train is necessary. It is NOT. Such a train would be costly in both first costs and annual maintenance. Building and maintaining snow sheds would be necessary to protect the track from avalanches—sheds would also protect the road, but funds have never been found for such construction. Absent a tunnel or aerial connection, getting folks speedily up the Cottonwood Canyons, solves no problems, because they must also each day, and safely, be transported back out again. Aerial connections are dangerous due to the above mentioned avalanches. Tunneling in Grizzly Gulch is absurd; construction costs would be beyond enormous, plus the environmental costs high due to the likelihood of encountering old mining shafts. Those shafts likely contain highly toxic substances, the disturbance of which could pose substantial health risks to all. The area for a proposed tunnel through Little Cottonwood Canyon into Big Cottonwood Canyon would bore through areas which now involve the natural percolation of water from snowmelt both safely and in a sound environmental process, into aquifers that eventually supply culinary water to the Town of Alta, and the residents of the valley below.</p> <p>William O. Douglas asked, "Do trees have standing?" While that question has been cited many times, I firmly believe our trees will no longer stand if we begin down a path to open up development of the canyons by allowing, facilitating, and encouraging unrestricted, ever increasing users in winter and summer with a rail line.</p> <p>Thank you for reading and collecting comments on the proposal</p>	
<p>I represented the residents at the mouth of LCC. I have two fundamental problems with this Blueprint. I'll keep it short. 1. I think that part of this aggregation is flawed. All of the individual SGs put together their ideas, expectations, concerns etc. these were bundled up and sent to the board. There was no opportunity for the SGs to interact and possibly come up with better ideas or solve conflicts. Bad way to get to any type of consensus. 2. Utah County was never part of the conversation. LCC is either the beginning of the trail or the end of the trail. The pressure on this canyon will be tremendous. I understand that there is potential to access the top of LCC through Spanish Fork Canyon. I also understand that the legislature allocated funds to UDOT to investigate the feasibility of using SFC to relieve the pressure on LCC and BCC from the south. This was never on the table.</p> <p><u>In my opinion, the fear that large portions of the recreation SSSS would be left in Utah county because there could now be access through SFC to the west side and through Brown Canyon was the driver to include Utah County.</u></p> <p>Hello, I have a few comments/suggestions related to the Blueprint. These are my personal opinions as a local resident, and not those of Western Water Assessment. On the Cottonwood Canyons Scenario, the land swap seems to be contingent on a mountain rail system, which is just one of the transportation alternatives. Also, additional water for snowmaking is pretty vague, where is this water coming from, where is it being used, how much, whose water rights etc? On the Transportation Corridor Purposes and Alternatives, The Zion shuttle model for Big and Little received significant support from the Environmental Systems group, and meets and potentially meets all but purpose #4, but was not even mentioned as alternative to drop from consideration. Meanwhile construction of a new exclusive gateway for either BRT or LRT and tunnels or aerial transport will likely have very significant and adverse impacts purpose numbers 1 and 13, especially during construction, and quite likely into the future. Related to an expanded recreational trail network, a bike path connecting the existing path at the mouth of Parley's canyon and utilizing the old highway, and frontage roads could be connected with Parley's summit and the frontage roads on both sides of the highway. Nearly all of this corridor already exists, and would allow for the connection of SLC trails, East Canyon, and Park City area trails. In addition to being a great recreational resource, it could also be utilized by bicycle commuters in conjunction with improved bus service along the I-80 corridor. On land and open space protection, I support wilderness designation areas of wilderness character that have previously been proposed. Other areas should be protected at the highest level appropriate to existing conditions.</p>	2/11/2015
<p>That sounds to me like, regardless of the final Blueprint, we'll ultimately go back to the application and protest/lawsuit model that we have become accustomed to. For the record, I need to make it clear that these are my opinions as a participant and do not necessarily represent the position of my employer, the Utah Avalanche Center. From the perspective of the Utah Avalanche Center, any actions that would put more inexperienced backcountry users in uncontrolled terrain, such as new lift alignment with gates allowing more inexperienced skiers to exit resorts and enter backcountry terrain or connections between upper canyons that would facilitate canyon-to-canyon skiing with easy return, would likely result in more avalanche accidents and would increase demand for our services, a scenario we are accustomed to dealing with.</p> <p>I'd like to update my comments, based on some recent discussions with MA participants and a greater understanding of some of the issues. Regarding the CCTF:</p> <p>I am disappointed that the process was kept secret from the Systems Groups, or at least no effort was made to let us know that the process was taking place. There is a lot of public distrust towards this process and a lack of transparency doesn't help our cause.</p> <p>I think a much better job could have been done to communicate the entire process from the beginning, to put MA in perspective and help the public understand what we are trying to achieve and how ferociously complicated it is.</p> <p>I am dismayed to see a lift connecting Park City and Brighton. I think all the Systems Groups were in agreement that an aerial lift is not a transportation solution and evidently someone in the Executive Committee felt that was important enough to ignore that portion of the Systems Group recommendations. So it appears that MA still supports pet projects with little regard for widespread support to some degree.</p> <p>I would also object to leaving Grizzly Gulch as undecided. That is a key piece of recreation terrain and a key piece of watershed. Leaving that out is a big problem and doesn't do a lot for the perception Alta's role as a reasonable group participant and community member. We can do better than that.</p> <p>I was also disturbed to see a key statement from the Recreation Systems Group regarding the value of and desire to protect some wild places accessible only by human power was deleted somewhere along the line. Again, it feels like some stakeholders have more influence than others.</p> <p>I don't think enough consideration has been given to the impact of the proposed interconnection and potential lifts on backcountry recreation. Making it easier for large numbers of lift skiers to access ridgelines to turn existing backcountry into sidecountry impacts the backcountry experience and influences user safety. This combined with anticipated impacts of climate change will seriously degrade and reduce winter backcountry recreation in its current form. I'd like to see some investigation of how users can specifically be prevented from accessing backcountry terrain from lifts in some cases if the proposed network of tunnels and aerial lifts comes to pass.</p> <p>It seems a bit disingenuous to put such a high priority on appeasing the desire for economic growth focused on resort growth, given that lift-served skiing is on a steady national decline that is highly likely to increase with climate change and economic polarization. Certainly it makes sense to address the recreation desire for more summer recreation opportunities, but to hold out the promise of more winter jobs and tourism dollars seems irrationally optimistic. It makes sense for the resorts though, given that most of the investment to promote winter tourism will be paid for by the public.</p> <p>With the above exceptions, I am generally ok with the plan, especially in the spirit of watershed protection, given the inevitable effects of climate change, the overriding worship of private property rights and economic development in this state, and the MA objectives. Providing additional trails and improving public transportation into the canyons is well addressed and this may be our best opportunity to secure long term watershed protection. At the same time, I am saddened to see the writing on the wall that the recreation and environmental aspects that I personally value steadily declining as we turn ski resorts into amusement parks for the wealthy and pack more and more people into a smaller space. I think we all try to build something of value for the future and for me personally this has become a quest to create the least bad future. That is part of the reality of climate change, population growth, and the ability of private property rights to trump public benefit.</p>	2/23/2015
<p>4. The train is an acknowledged marketing effort. Those dollars should be used to support BRT. 5. The BRT will meld well with the proposed Town of Alta base facility plan. 6. The BRT will be much less disruptive to the watershed than the train would be. 7. The BRT makes use of an existing roadway to provide a viable transportation solution while mitigating environmental and character impacts to our canyon.</p> <p>Below are links to the Mountain Accord and several articles for background.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mountain Accord Proposed Blueprint for the Central Wasatch Mountains.</li> <li>2. Cottonwoods Canyon Negotiations Taskforce by Save Our Canyons.</li> <li>3. We're Not That Special by Tom Clyde (Park Record).</li> <li>4. Slippery Slope; Canyon Conservationists have to give a little to get a little by Colby Frazier (City Weekly)</li> <li>5. Transit, recreation focus on grand plan for the Central Wasatch by Jason Lee (KSL.com)</li> </ol> <p>If you believe in our efforts to protect the Alta Experience, please show it by making a donation to help us continue.</p>	
<p>Your questionnaire, like much of the Mtn. Accord "process" was poorly designed. Below you will find my comments. However, in your questionnaire with the last question you gave the reader three choices, where were, "Very well, well, and neutral". By way of analogy from my teaching that would be like telling your teacher you can give three grades: A, B or C. I guess since we live in Lake Wobegon where everyone is "above average" your rating system makes sense. But, for those of us alien to your culture of dollars and development you really do need a D, an F, or, more preferable to be neutral, an incomplete. The corridor option does not have enough well researched options to be considered anything but incomplete. FIRST COMMENT</p> <p>The preceding questions limit the range of response and, thus, limit meaningful input. In that sense it is a perfect representation of the Mtn. Accord "process". That is, three of the four speciality group - recreation, transportation and economic development - were in harmony about their collective desired outcome. As a result the "Blueprint" represents their desired process and outcome.</p> <p>However, the fourth speciality group, environment, raised and continues to raise significant concerns about the "Blueprint", specifically the transportation options. Thus, those of us who have spent significant time in the Environmental Group are disgruntled to the point of rebellion because our scientific/analytic concerns have either not been addressed, or we are told, "don't worry, those concerns will be addressed in phase two". Another words, believe us (particularly the paid consultants, who will disappear when the money disappears) because we have everyone's best interest at heart. To quote a 20th century political icon, President Ronald Reagan, "Don't trust, verify". Where in the Blue Print, or in the long and expensive lead up to the Blue Print does the environmental group have any verification that their legitimate concerns and questions will be answered and/or addressed? They don't. So, in conclusion, the Blue Print really ought to be called a "Dollar White Wash".</p> <p>SECOND COMMENT</p> <p>See earlier comments. The public needs to know where the money is coming from, who will control how it is spent and what it is going to be spent on. As it is now, the beneficiaries of the money, i.e. UTA, the ski resorts and the developers, are saying this process is open, there are no hidden agendas, just trust us. That formulation is not a sustainable one and certainly doesn't breed confidence in the tax paying public.</p> <p>THIRD COMMENT</p> <p>The executive committee and members of the environmental speciality group need to visit Cupertino, California to see what Google and Tesla are doing with driverless buses, as well as, to Detroit to see what General Motors and Ford are doing on the same topic. To date the only research which has been conducted, to my limited knowledge since I don't work for UTA, is on the desired rail system.</p> <p>In closing, our ancestors left us an amazing environmental treasure, THE CENTRAL WASATCH. We are at a juncture, particularly with our fertility rate, where we must make some environmentally sound and expensive decisions. It is not a question of an ROI, but instead a question of what future generations will inherit. Will they question our money driven wisdom, or thank us for our conservative preservation?</p>	3/5/2015

<p>Hello</p> <p>I have been very involved in the Mountain Accord process from the inception as a member of the Recreation System Group, and these are my formal comments regarding the "blueprint" put forth by the Executive Board.</p> <p><b>Transportation</b></p> <p>I recognize that the traffic situation in Little Cottonwood Canyon is unsustainable on some winter days, and while I understand the impetus to promote a train version of a fixed guideway, I feel that the bus system is far from optimized and with proper implementation, could service both the ski resorts and dispersed users on a year-round basis far more effectively than a train.</p> <p>Providing copious parking near the mouths of the canyon would be a critical component of this.</p> <p>Without trying an optimized bus system using the existing infrastructure I feel it is impossible to justify major infrastructure changes (adding lanes or a installing a train)</p> <p>Charging a per-vehicle fee - either via a daily fee or an annual pass - would help subsidize the optimized bus/parking system and provide an incentive to ride the transit system</p> <p>Incentivize ridership by making the bus fee free or only a nominal price.</p> <p>The bus system would need to have both a Snowbird-servicing bus and multiple Alta express buses.</p> <p>Current and future UDOT plans to add passing lanes on hwy 210 for private vehicles should be focused on improving bus transit systems.</p> <p>Snowsheds and/or bridges over side paths can/should be added for increased avalanche mitigation for the highway.</p> <p>I fully support optimizing year-round Bus Rapid Transit for Big Cottonwood Canyon. Again, with copious parking at the mouth of the canyon.</p> <p>A tunnel linking LCC and BCC is not needed. Improved public transit would alleviate the traffic issues associated with LCC, and the "safety" issues that have been ascribed to a tunnel have been overblown; there have not been any documented injuries/fatalities associated with overuse of LCC that would not be overcome with improved transit.</p> <p>Tunnel connections would create more defacto resort sidecountry terrain, effectively increasing the resorts' footprints.</p> <p>The tunnel would basically be a taxpayer-funded connection that would exist to benefit four businesses (ski resorts) with no/very little validation that such a connection would actually be economically beneficial to those businesses. There are no significant "problems" that an LCC/BCC tunnel would solve, despite a considerable cost to taxpayers. The same argument is applied to a fixed guideway system connecting BCC to Park City. It would not necessarily save time for PC-BCC travelers, is not supported by Park City officials, and would again be a taxpayer-subsidized benefit to a handful of businesses (ski resorts) who have not proven that such a connection would even be beneficial today, much less in the future considering global warming and the flat/declining trends of the resort skiing industry (according to their own study).</p> <p>The question on the survey asking if the transit "solutions" are "environmentally-sustainable" is fundamentally flawed: transit systems are not intended to be "environmentally sustainable"; they are intended to transport people from point to point. Since NO ONE -</p>	<p>3/9/2015</p>
<p>(eg degrading the watershed) that point is misguided at best and badly misleading and irrelevant at worst. The question should be "Is this a solution that I as a user of the Central Wasatch would actually use and be willing to pay for?"</p> <p>At the moment parking is the limiting factor for pressurized use in the Cottonwood Canyons, enabling as many people as possible to use the canyon will result in more user pressure. Optimizing Bus Rapid Transit will be an intermediate step to moving possibly-somehow more people up the canyon to put only moderate additional use pressure on the canyons.</p> <p>I am in full support of a year-round bus shuttle system for Mill Creek Canyon.</p> <p>I am in full support of a train/light rail system linking the Salt Lake Valley with Park City. This is a system that I feel would be used far more extensively by commuters and lower-income resort workers around the clock on a more-regular schedule than a LCC canyon train that would be associated almost exclusively for time-intensive recreation.</p> <p>The rationale provided for abandoning the Parley's rail transit - that was favored in the Trans system group - is that it would not be competitive with the freeway; however, this rationale was not applied to the successful SLC airport Trax line.</p> <p><b>Recreation</b></p> <p>I am in full support of creating a trails network in the upper reaches of the two canyons</p> <p>The trails should be a mix of hiking exclusive, mountain biking exclusive, and shared (and/or with management techniques conducive to habits; ie Snowbird's new trail being uphill til the tram runs and then it becomes downhill).</p> <p>Any new road/transit construction must have improved road cycling facilities (wider shoulders, exclusive bike lanes, disconnected paved bike paths)</p> <p>LCC/BCC parking areas need to be enlarged and enhanced for the major dispersed user trailheads, with optional stops for the Bus Rapid Transit at White Pine, Argenta, Butler Fork, Mineral Fork, etc.</p> <p>I support the permanent protection of the Emma Ridges to Superior ridgeline from development.</p> <p>I do NOT support a chairlift in Grizzly Gulch. I recognize that it is private property, but I also appreciate that much of Alta's operations are on public land and that they stand to benefit greatly from enhanced base development on a lot of lucrative land, additional water use, increased snowmaking, and improved LCC transit. Grizzly Gulch and the surrounding area should be put into some sort of permanent protection.</p> <p>I could be supportive of chairlifts and development into the American Fork Canyon depending on alignment and scope.</p> <p>I could be supportive of a re-aligned chairlift in Honeycomb Canyon, depending on the alignment, provided there are no effects on Silver Fork backcountry</p> <p>I am supportive of Brighton's formal adoption of Hidden Canyon, provided any chairlift reaches back towards the Great Western chairlift.</p> <p>I am supportive of increased connectivity between Brighton and Solitude in the SolBright area.</p> <p>I am in support of modifying wilderness boundaries to accommodate the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.</p> <p>I am supportive of enhanced facilities at identified high-use nodes to both concentrate use in appropriate close-in areas and disperse use in more-remote areas</p> <p>I fail to understand how the Mountain Accord can consider all forms of recreation in the Central Wasatch except for one of the most significant and controversial forms: Wasatch Powderbirds. To me this "oversight" of neglecting helicopter skiing in our tiny range - that was based on a Forest Service administrative timeline that was arbitrarily changed from 5 year renewals to 10 years - is an egregious omission.</p> <p><b>Economics</b></p> <p>I support enabling the ski resorts to utilize more water for snowmaking</p> <p>I support adding potential land and zoning for additional development at the various resorts' bases.</p> <p>I support enabling the ski resorts to expand their summertime activities within their existing footprints.</p>	
<p><b>Environment</b></p> <p>I am not an environmental specialist, so I cannot comment on the survey question: "does the Blueprint achieve environmental stewardship of the natural resources?"</p> <p>I know that the EPA has determined that ski resort development has a more profound effect on watershed integrity than ANY other development. But I am cautiously optimistic that SLC Water and various other governing bodies will ensure water quality despite the threats associated with increased use, transit, and development.</p> <p>I am in favor of a re-forestation effort on (particularly) the Emma ridgeline area</p> <p>I am becoming increasingly convinced that simple people-pressure on the canyons is having a degrading effect on the watershed, and dramatically increasing opportunities to transport people up the canyons will have a commensurate effect on the watershed quality.</p> <p>I am concerned that the ski resorts are getting many of their desired "gets", and their "gives" are more along the lines of "we are not taking as much as we could take", at the expense of potential environmental and backcountry terrain preservation.</p> <p>Overall I have found the "blueprint" (it should have been called a "proposal") NOT to be reflective of the thousands of hours of work that people put into the system group meetings and submeetings over the summer; it confirms to me that the Exec board was made up of a lot of Important People who were not very engaged in the process and therefore created a plan that represented their impressions/interests rather than what was determined by the System Groups.</p> <p>I also feel that the survey questions are far too vague and their wording is misleading, and that using "statistics" generated from this survey will lead to incorrect conclusions regarding public sentiment.</p> <p>Therefore I do not support the "blueprint" in its current form, but I am a strong believer in the Mountain Accord ideals and timing, and am very hopeful that a more equitable balance of gives and takes can be achieved to accommodate many constituents/stakeholders' desires, if they are all willing to concede on some of their desires. ☺</p>	
<p><b>Comment to Mountain Accord</b></p> <p>From Economic System Group Member</p> <p>Dennis Goreham 3/9/15</p> <p>My comments are broken into three short sections; 1) Blue print comments, 2) NEPA comments, and 3) Immediate steps.</p> <p>1)After reading through the Blueprint, there is very little I can't agree with. I think the Executive Committee and the Cottonwood Negotiation Task Force has done a good job identifying issues and trying to negotiate solutions. That said, I am getting more uneasy about what I am hearing at the open houses and public forums.</p> <p>The Blueprint outlines general recommendations resulting from these negotiations. The details we are starting to hear now are basically the resorts will swap private land in lieu of other considerations. On the surface these trades sound reasonable but the resorts are hedging their bets by basically saying the trades will happen only if they get everything they want. What if we get through this and the transportation solution does not quite get to what the resorts want; can they then renege on the whole swap. Or would they do a partial swap that could basically leave us with the same issues we currently have?</p> <p>I don't think any of us ever thought the results of the Mountain Accord process would result in quick fix, but with the stipulations the resorts are putting on the land swaps, it may never be done. But, it needs to get done!</p> <p>The resorts want to do some expansion and development so they need private land and water at their base. They also say that the land swaps won't happen if they don't get a transportation system that gets more people to the resorts. It seems obvious the only way to enhance the economy, ensure quality dispersed recreation, and protect the environment is to design, fund and construct a long term transportation system both to and up the canyons. That solution must meet the needs of the resorts and dispersed recreationists, and must also be environmentally sound. This must be done no matter what the cost. Nobody looks back now at transportation issues like the freeway through Glenwood Canyon and says it was a bad deal. It was very expensive, but was environmentally sound and boon to the region's economy. To be environmentally sound, it must protect the water and visual quality in the canyons.</p> <p>Once the land swaps are complete, the affected local governments and the Forest Service should consider designations for these areas that would protect them in perpetuity. This should also include acquisition of parcels owned by private land owners other than the resorts.</p> <p>2)At the public forum at the City Library on 2/18 Buck requested we add suggestions for issues to be addressed in the EIS</p> <p>The visual impact of various transportation solutions must be fully evaluated in the NEPA process. GIS data is easily obtainable to allow full and detailed analysis of every transportation scenario. GIS technology, the quality of DEMs, and the power of computers allow that each and every possible solution must be analyzed to determine line-of-sight impact. For example, an aerial solution up Little Cottonwood Canyon would require several very tall towers and could have a detrimental visual effect on many other parts of the Canyon.</p> <p>All GIS data, modeling applications, and results should be available to stakeholders and the public. Not just the final decisions.</p>	<p>3/10/2015</p>
<p>The residents of salt lake valley are fortunate to have such a collaborative effort in place. As the plan moves forward I would like to ask that the recreational opportunities of the free flying community be protected. I am a member of local organizations representing paragiders and hang gliders, speedfliers and speed riders, and basejumpers.</p> <p>As board members may be aware Utah is a world class destination for these sports and participants travel from around the world to fly here. National distance records have been set from sites in big cottonwood canyon. Many of our sites are within the borders of areas that have been notated as under consideration for enhanced protection.</p> <p>Flying sports in the wasatch can easily be documented as customary and have taken place for decades. Our users are extremely low impact, lower than hikers runners skiers and bikers by far. The majority of our use occurs in the air, however we rely on access to multiple hillsides and mountain tops to launch or jump, along with various areas in the canyon bottoms for intended or unplanned landings. We use no fossil fuels in our enjoyment of our public lands, make no noise, and leave no trace.</p> <p>However we feel a potential threat from the mountain accord project. This is a shame because most of the projects goals and values are shared by members of our flying/jumping organizations. Many of us are also avid climbers, backcountry skiers, ultra runners and hikers. Some are also property owners in the wasatch.</p> <p>Unfortunately almost all of the federal land managers controlling wilderness, national monument, and national park land have severely restricted, but more often, prohibited paragiders, hang gliders and basejumpers. Generally we are lumped in with powered aircraft. Very often our pilots are aggressively harassed and commonly criminally prosecuted for both intentional and unintentional use of our public lands. This does not occur with land managers who administer national forest and BLM land.</p> <p>The wasatch is unique as our use of these lands will predate any change in designation and we expect to have continued access to our land.</p> <p>Our organizations would like a part of the discussion about land designation changes and to secure the right to continue our recreational use of our lands.</p> <p>I work, recreate, and hope to someday own a home in the canyons. I am born and raised in Utah and hope to continue to enjoy the recreation and quality of life which makes me so proud of my home state. I would appreciate the chance to discuss this facet of future proposals in greater detail with members of the executive committee.</p> <p>Thank you for all your hard work.</p>	<p>3/12/2015</p>

<p>Recreation System Group member, Mountain Accord University of Utah, Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism, NOLS Liaison Big Cottonwood Community Council-person President Evergreen Home Owners' Association / Liaison USDA Forest Service</p> <p>(the numbers on this list are not a rank order, they are used for convenience of organizing; these ideas are my personal opinion informed by my associations listed above but do not represent a consensus of any of those bodies)</p> <p>1. Resort Expansion Negotiated through a public process, the USDA Wasatch-Cache Forest Plan settled upon no ski resort expansion more than a decade back. Now, the Mountain Accord, through the nearly secret Cottonwood Canyons Task Force (CCTF) is telling us again – after the Mountain Accord is done with you – that's when will be no more ski resort expansion. Ski resorts will always want to expand, this will never end unless someone says no-more. No more was said long ago with the Forest Plan so please respect those who negotiated and those who have lived under the no-more ski resort expansion. Giving the ski resort more land by the CCTF is not a compromise, a compromise is matching new land for ski resort expansion with land removed from ski-resort use. A true compromise would be a boundary shift retaining the same acreage, not a boundary expansion.</p> <p>The CCTF land swap and ski resort expansion is a bad faith agreement. The most critical piece of land, Grizzly Gulch is not even part of the agreement – hence more room for ski resort expansion after the Mountain Accord's turn saying no-more expansion. If Alta puts chairs on private property in Grizzly Gulch, then they negotiated with the public in bad faith about agreeing to no more expansion during the Forest Plan development. Again! Brighton into Hidden Canyon makes it easier to connect to Park City – sounds like One Wasatch. Solitude into Silver Fork makes it easier to connect into Grizzly Gulch and connecting to Alta. Solitude into Silver Fork only makes sense if there is a new chair on private property up to the Honeycomb Ridge overlooking Grizzly Gulch. This CCTF is nothing more than a One Wasatch in secret; all that is missing is the name One Wasatch! Ski resort managers are a smart bunch and like smart chess players, they make small moves now with the big move still eleven moves out.</p> <p>2. Resort Property consolidation Trading ski resort owned property (or a protective easement) for Forest Service lands at the base of the resorts has potential as a viable compromise. Examining this swap is a good goal for Mountain Accord. These properties outside the resorts, if truly protected from development can be worth the consolidated base development if the base development is kept low profile. The Brighton circle is a quiet community and may not appreciate a noisier neighbor of a nightlife ski resort. Please survey the residents first. The Big Cottonwood highway is already one of the most dangerous roads in Utah and adding more, and later night traffic will only contribute to a hazardous drive through the canyon.</p> <p>3. A Train and a Tunnel Giving four ski-resorts a multi- billion dollar train is misguided. The problem of the Cottonwoods is overcrowding. The train, like One Wasatch are marketing attempts to lure out-of-state and out-of-country skiers. But we are overcrowded now, we can't handle more out of state and out of country skiers without losing in-state skiers and boarders. Long lift lines at Alta have finished driving many local people away from downhill skiing. The resorts and canyons are full. At best, a train will pack more people into longer lift lines and ski resort managers will insist on expanding yet again! This train is not a sustainable proposition. If getting cars out of the canyon is a goal behind the train, this is a disingenuous starting point toward that goal. Mountain Accord's Transportation System Group leader said at the League of Women Voter's presentation at the Salt Lake City Library that never did the transportation system group consider that public cars would be restricted in the Cottonwoods. Yet, that is a sustainable goal – that of restricting public cars out of the Cottonwoods – especially in summer.</p> <p>4. Cars and Public Transportation, shuttle buses, and trains Mountain Accord should study shuttle bus service over trains. The roads are already there. Car pool discounts, high tech toll booths with license plate scanners that allow payments on line or by phone in advance, should come long before trains are considered. Shuttle bus expansion is ready to go. Think about the absurdity of a train tunnel to Brighton. A train from Alta would drop people at Brighton, missing all the stops of picnic areas, hiking trails, and campgrounds in Big Cottonwood completely. With a train, a shuttle bus system is still required to take people down Big Cottonwood to the trails and sites, just to shuttle them back up to the train at Brighton in the evening to then ride the train all the way back down Little Cottonwood? Who are you kidding that Big Cottonwood can be serviced by a train running up Little Cottonwood and a tunnel at Brighton or Solitude? If the train runs between Brighton and Solitude, where will it go? There is a Church Camp, Nordic Track, private property, and a fire station completely blocking the way. Be honest, think it through; are you announcing an eminent domain taking of private property for an absurd train?!</p> <p>5. Snowbird, American Fork Canyon, Superior Ridge to Grizzly Gulch The notion of a land swap in American Fork Canyon for the expansion of Snowbird in trade for protected land along the Superior Ridge and Face has potential. If Snowbird can demonstrate how they can be a better steward of the land over the out of control ATV use in upper American Fork/Mineral Fork area, there is room for some negotiation. No details seem to be available, but there seems to be potential for some land swapping between Mineral Basin/American Fork and face of Superior and Superior ridge. Shame on Alta for threatening to expand into Grizzly Gulch, Patsy Marley, and Tuscarora. That is blackmail or at least hostage-holding of these areas. When Alta negotiated on the Forest Plan, they agreed to no-more expansion. If they were holding out secret plans to expand on private property, they should give back the public land to the public for back-country use.</p> <p>6. Multi-use trails equal mountain-bike trails The Cottonwood Canyons are not Summit County where the terrain is gentler and wide open. The Cottonwoods are tight, steep, and constricted. Great for narrow hiking trails, poor choice for mountain bikes. Hiking is the traditional use of the Cottonwoods in the summer and mountain bikes endanger hikers and the time-honored peaceful experience of walking safely. Millcreek's odd / even days allow hikers to be safe half the time and endangered half the time. Mountain users are not natural, their pace is not natural, their mechanical clanging noises are not natural. What in nature goes at the pace of a mountain biker? What brings bigger fear to a hiker with children than a mountain bike coming downhill? Don't pretend that multi-user trails are hiker friendly. Mountain bikers are expanding into the back-country faster than the nature goes. Mountain bikers require a wider trail and cause more erosion. Digger' and skiddin' on a mountain bike causes far more soil erosion than dozens of hikers compacting the soil. The wide, gentle terrain around Park City is a better place to develop for mountain biking, not the steep and narrow Cottonwoods.</p> <p>7. Trails to parallel the Big Cottonwood Highway This part of the Mountain Accord deserves to be looked at more thoroughly. A low, on the hillside trail running from Cardiff to Brighton could be looked at. A trail to connect each side canyon to the next Big Cottonwood side canyon could help in dropping a second car in one trailhead while driving another car to hike from the next trailhead. Many of the canyons connect at the ridge but there is only the highway at the bottom to connect them. This low trail might, I'm not sure, reduce dropping cars, for example, Mill D while another car drives the mountain bikers to Guardsman's pass. But probably not, not sure many bikers are willing to bike a trail uphill to Guardsman's Pass like road cyclists are willing to ride that climb below Cardiff the canyon has a lot of private property along both sides of the road. This property may be too great an impediment for a low elevation trail below Cardiff. Down canyon of the private property may have too many cliffs to leave room for a trail – needs a closer look.</p> <p>8. Road Cycling the Cottonwood canyons A worthy goal of the Mountain Accord is to assist paving a bike lane going up each of the Cottonwoods. Road cycling is a growing recreation activity that causes zero harm to the environment and the most likely (after avalanches) to get the participant killed as the roads, parking, and traffic now stand. Widening the shoulder/lane and reducing the number of cars, both moving and parked, are excellent goals for the Mountain Accord. "Share the road" among other cautionary signs and money for more traffic/parking law enforcement are good objectives for the Mountain Accord.</p> <p>9. Consolidating and supporting concentrated front country nature experiences (with bus stops) Silver Lake is a prime extant example of a fine front country nature experience. Doughnut Falls comes close, and the Willow Heights pond and trail could become another such, high quality nature experience.</p> <p>Willow Heights desperately needs a trail re-alignment to a lower gradient trail with benches along the way. More solid benches will be the most cost effective way to invite and support the casual hiker/walker who, judging by Silver Lake and other picnic areas, are possibly the greatest number of users in the canyon. Providing split log benches is a simple objective for the Mountain Accord. Short, low gradient trails (with benches) to or around distinct features such as water or overlooks, can provide a manageable, concentrated, high quality, nature experience within the time limits and physical constraints of a majority of summer canyon visitors. Trails to "overlooks" can be developed almost anywhere. A platform only 2 feet off the ground on the downhill side is seen as a destination for a short nature walk (you can guess that I recommend benches at the overlooks). Finding water features is harder but still possible. Give any stretch of water a unique name and people will find it a worthy destination.</p> <p>10. Wasatch National Monument National Monument designation is worth considering. Similarly to the Adirondack State Park, there would be private property within the monument "blue" line. This makes for difficult management but worth considering. The Forest Service operates several other National Monuments (Mount St. Helens, Newberry Nat'l Monument, perhaps more) so this is not precedent setting. It likely would bring in more money for management. It will definitely require more restrictions on access as it is likely to increase awareness and popularity of these already crowded mountains.</p> <p>11. Mountain Accord will recognize its areal limits Mountain Accord is focused on the Wasatch Mountains between the Salt Lake Valley and Park City. One of the loud conclusions the Mountain Accord should make is, "It doesn't all fit here!" Mountain Accord should support the concept of responsibly developing mountain recreation to the north, south, and to the west. Only restrictions can help save the nature experiences in the Mountain Accord zone, hence one of the preservation measures worthy of the Mountain Accord is to recognize the need for other entities to responsibly obtain opportunities in other nearby mountains. The Governor, Mayors, and the Legislature need to hear from the Mountain Accord that it does not all fit here. The State and County need to proactively start funding studies and providing opportunities elsewhere too. Mountain Accord needs to be a strong voice in promoting other outdoor recreation opportunities.</p> <p>12. Aerial Tram from Park City to BCC Keep the unique personalities of the different Wasatch canyons and ski areas separate. Brighton and Silver Fork are small mountain communities, not the sprawling appalling glitz of Summit County. Additionally, any aerial connection between canyons can only reduce the backcountry skiing opportunities which is already the scarsest form of available skiing. Let us not fight Ski Link all over again. The public does not want it. Get back to the Forest Plan as agreed to through a public process of no new ski resort expansion and no new chairs, tunnels, tram, gondolas; just stop expansion now. Thanks for listening! ☺</p>	<p>3/13/2015</p>
<p>I travel to the Australian ski areas frequently and would like to share an observation concerning transportation to the major resorts in the Snowy Mountains in New South Wales.</p> <p>There are 2 major canyons that are home to the major ski resorts similar to the cottonwood canyons. The resorts are in a national park which is more similar to our national forest than our national parks. Access to the canyons is controlled by the park and a fee is required. The infrastructure to handle the tolls was extensive with pull outs, toll booths, and administration buildings.</p> <p>The rate structure last season was: per person \$11 ( including all those using private or public transportation) or per car \$27 season passes are available.</p> <p>These fees are collected by the park and have nothing to do with the resorts or lift fees and are in place at all times regardless of season. The fees go to the general fund and are not earmarked for the particular park.</p> <p>The seemingly large fee did not noticeably affect the number of vehicles using the area and on weekends it was Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons all over again with cars parked on the shoulder of the roads on both sides for 10 kilometers.</p> <p>Did I mention that the Perisher Resort also has a train? It does. ☺ You should check out the Perisher Ski Tube web site and pay particular attention to the quality of the facility in the photos and also the price structure.</p>	<p>3/14/2015</p>
<p>At a recent Mt. Accord panel discussion it was mentioned that it may be hard for a family of 4 to pay the \$10 each for the train fair. Try the \$43 in Australia.</p> <p>The train is relatively close to the resort and the parking lot is huge. Is there really a community close to the canyons that would give up that kind of real estate for a parking lot that is used 5 months of the year?</p> <p>I travel to the Australian ski areas frequently and would like to share an observation concerning transportation to the major resorts in the Snowy Mountains in New South Wales.</p> <p>There are 2 major canyons that are home to the major ski resorts similar to the cottonwood canyons. The resorts are in a national park which is more similar to our national forest than our national parks. Access to the canyons is controlled by the park and a fee is required. The infrastructure to handle the tolls was extensive with pull outs, toll booths, and administration buildings.</p> <p>The rate structure last season was: per person \$11 ( including all those using private or public transportation) or per car \$27 season passes are available.</p> <p>These fees are collected by the park and have nothing to do with the resorts or lift fees and are in place at all times regardless of season. The fees go to the general fund and are not earmarked for the particular park.</p> <p>The seemingly large fee did not noticeably affect the number of vehicles using the area and on weekends it was Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons all over again with cars parked on the shoulder of the roads on both sides for 10 kilometers.</p> <p>Did I mention that the Perisher Resort also has a train? It does. ☺ You should check out the Perisher Ski Tube web site and pay particular attention to the quality of the facility in the photos and also the price structure.</p>	<p>3/14/2015</p>
<p>At a recent Mt. Accord panel discussion it was mentioned that it may be hard for a family of 4 to pay the \$10 each for the train fair. Try the \$43 in Australia.</p> <p>The train is relatively close to the resort and the parking lot is huge. Is there really a community close to the canyons that would give up that kind of real estate for a parking lot that is used 5 months of the year?</p>	
<p>Please don't allow resort expansion into Silver Fork. Honey Comb Canyon has already been developed and there is a lift in the west side of Silver Fork. Thank you.</p> <p>Will not tunneling, as did mining, have a deleterious effect on the watershed and water quality. Transportation solutions in the 2 major canyons, rails etc., are acceptable. No interconnect!</p> <p>1. First priority should be that which has smallest carbon footprint and least impact on snowpack and watershed! Nothing else matters if those areas are not protected. 2. Accessibility should consider all users, not just alpine skiers. (hikers, bicyclists, back country skiers, walkers, etc.) 3. Connecting all the ski areas via road or lifts would degrade and destroy precious backcountry that once destroyed cannot be brought back. What makes people want to live in SLC rather than "any city USA" is the access to the amazing Wasatch Mts. People don't move to SLC for the pollution/inversions and busy downtown. It is the precious resource of the Wasatch wilderness that brings people to SLC. 4. I like disincentives to driving vans up the canyons (charging for parking, etc.) We currently use the ski buses but times are not convenient or frequent enough during the day for most people to take advantage. They still prefer and choose to drive to the ski areas. Any transportation system must give non-alpine skiers access to hiking trails not just ski lodges. Areas such as White Pine, Mill B, etc. are hiking areas that need access in order for people to use public transportation.</p>	
<p>Reducing vehicle traffic with rail in an environmentally responsible way is good. Increasing traffic of any kind through the canyons would not be good. Do just enough to compromise with ski resorts to achieve land swap/protection.</p>	
<p>Have a straw vote @ conclusion. Thumbs up, thumbs down on Blueprint.</p> <p>I was originally from South Florida. I believe that the transportation aspects to bring more people into the Park City district and area will be detrimental to the lifestyle of the Park City residents and their lifestyle. I think that there's a fundamental question that needs to be asked, not how do we bring more people into Park City in an environmentally safe fashion but why should we? There's no way to bring more people into Park City, whether it be in totally environmentally safe methods, without compromising the small town an idyllic countryside feel that we have in Park City. And I think that there's a fundamental lifestyle question that really should go to a referendum of the voters to see whether they want more people transported to Park City or do they want their current lifestyle. Thank you.</p>	<p>2/23/2015 2/24/2015</p>
<p>I just want them to address the issue of water publicly. I heard no comments about water, and I heard one comment about wildlife, and I would like them to have a plan for - as long as we're going to join everyone together, I would like to be sure that the wildlife issues are included because at least here in the county we have a program in effect trying to make it easy for the wildlife to move about, and I would like that incorporated in the larger plan.</p>	<p>2/24/2015</p>

Water, again, already precious. Climate change making it more precious. More information about water and how it's going to be protected.	2/24/2015
If projects are going to be put into their master plan and they are going to ask the people of Summit County for their input on those plans, then there needs to be a price tag on those plans because otherwise you're voting for or against something and you have no idea what it's going to cost. And I think it's important to understand somebody is going to have to pay for all of this. It's going to have to come from sales tax or income tax or real estate tax, and I think we need to understand - if we're going to support something we need to understand the financial impact on us and I don't see that happening right now.	2/24/2015
I live in Silver Springs. If you build it, they will come. As soon as we start making access easier, it will attract not only people, but the attention of big business. As soon as we get corporate entities and corporate mentality on the trail, they are going to push through development and expansion and business and houses whether we like it or not. My experience has been that it's almost impossible for a small elected council like the people we have to stand the way of big business interests. So I would urge extreme caution about any easing of access. Second thought, mass transit is terrific, but it requires centralization. There has to be a concentrated hub of businesses and a hub of, say, residences or maybe a hub of parking so that it will make sense for people to use mass transit. If everything is spread out, it doesn't work so well, so the concentration at Kimball Junction is potentially a great example of what could be a mass transit hub. I think the way Kimball is getting expanded is probably not working in that direction. Things are a little too far. There's no central - no bus station walkability. So that kind of micro planning is really important. Growth is inevitable. So what we need to do is make sure that as growth progresses slowly, it beautifies the built environment, it makes our living areas more attractive and more beautiful an dmore appealing and more humanistic. So I think we really expand, it's going to happen no matter what. I think the government bodies need to find ways to make the growth a wonderful thing and make it a beautiful and better place to be.	2/24/2015
Don't kill the goose	2/24/2015
Have one trail at each recreation point where it can be ADA/wheelchair accessible - not just from the parking lot to the start of the trail, but a whole trail/elevated wooden ramp the whole way.	2/24/2015
Pursue a light rail loop including eastern summit county SLC, PC, Coalville, Provo, Heber, Ogden.	2/24/2015
Convenient bus transportation. Lockers at ski areas	2/24/2015
Better seasonal weather lodges in Park City so the seasonal commute from SLC/Heber/Kamas could be mitigated.	2/24/2015
I believe that this whole Mountain Accord idea is good but what I don't understand is how you expect to pay for it. I know that you have your ways but as Julie Hooker said - it took that much to pay for studying it. It seems that it is too much of a reach to finish this project. Please talk about this more. Hannah Little - 9th Grade Student	2/24/2015
We're here because of population growth, water availability, and sustaining our viability. Why aren't we stressing this??	2/24/2015
We are all in denial. We have 4 choices and we don't want any of them. 1 - traffic jams 2 - widen roads 3 - ride buses 4 - pay for light rail. We need to choose to accept traffic jams or one of the other choices. I personally do not believe many of my neighbors will ride buses. I would pay for light rail, turn off guardmans okay and any other route to SLC is fine.	2/24/2015
Who are you looking for best practices to provide incentives to both residents and tourists to use public transportation in a resort community?	2/24/2015
Val's gondola linking PCMR and canyons is an excellent example of the premise of Mtn. Accord. Park City states it has a traffic problem. Vail proposes to build a gondola so that one can park WAY outside of town and yet use skis and lifts for transportation. I'm surprised that the city AND county AND Mtn Accord aren't jumping on the opportunity to advertise this as a future alternative to driving all the way in to Park City to ski. It's a transportation solution that is privately funded and is happening NOW.	2/24/2015
Getting fixated on transportation, recreational user groups, economics - it's understandable. It's short term and familiar ground. However, we're here because our snow-pack/reservoir availability is projected to diminish, while our dependent population is projected to grow. We need to emphasize our predicament and the inevitability of this. We've come to the table because of our water and its intimate relationship with the success of our future endeavors. Why aren't we stressing this?	2/24/2015
The current Mountain Accord blueprint currently doesn't provide environmental restrictions on Grizzly Gulch and Flagstaff Mountain, according to Wasatch Backcountry Alliance. Why haven't these areas been brought up as protected areas? And, are there restrictions on other "interconnect" ideas? It seems very vague to the public at this juncture	2/24/2015
Transportation - Convenience is key! I live in PC, work in SLC. I want to take the connect bus but it is so inconvenient! Price & times. Make it a better option!	2/24/2015
Recreation - Don't ever let give in the watershed! Don't give in! Capacity issue - implement odd/even days or something similar - designate biking vs. hiking vs. etc. days. This way one trail system can operate for/accommodate more users, just more spread out.	2/24/2015
Transportation - At what point do you stop allowing people to drive in - take away the possibility for traffic. This was implemented in 2002 with the Olympics - ipark outside of town and take public transport in - bus systems/light rail is great, but at what point do you MAKE people use it?	2/24/2015
Economy & Transportation - eat resorts involved! Make them pay for/aid in cost of alternative transport. There are a huge stakeholder so get them involved.	2/24/2015
I believe frequent buses servicing the canyon bases and coming every 10 minutes would greatly alleviate traffic at a feasible cost. Also charge a toll for big and little cottonwood canyons that scans license plates and charges credit/debit cards automatically (like the Golden Gate Bridge). Use the tolls to fund more frequent and cheaper!	2/25/2015
It's vital to improve transit connections from surrounding municipalities to effectively increase connectivity to users. Further BRT would need to come more frequently to get people to actually choose BRT over driving. Charge cars and make incentives to use bus.	2/25/2015
To environmentally sensitive for Olympic Venue development. Nothing has changed!	2/25/2015
We need to thoroughly analyze the geohydrology of the Grizzly Gulch area before any tunnel should EVEN be discussed. The proposals seem heavily in favor of the ski resorts - not the users.	2/25/2015
Improve the transit/bus system and leave the rest of the land and mountains alone. Preservation for preservations sake. We don't have a duty to create more access or income for future generations. We have the chance to keep the mountains/canyons as natural and wild as possible.	2/25/2015
Water is more important than any other item. Protect quality and quantity.	2/25/2015
I SUPPORT THE recreation plan	2/25/2015
I would love to see more trails in foothills, in more areas in the canyons instead of such a focus in a few sports - if you want to improve recreation give us more trails, so we can spread out and not impact so heavily the existing trails. Yes, I have spent many hours volunteering on trail building, maintenance, etc. and many people would if advertised.	2/25/2015
My concerns for recreation largely relate to transportation. If mass transit will be improved, there needs to be a system for all users to be able to access all recreation areas. The current bus stops only service ski resorts. I would worry about construction of a train in LCC since it could limit access to climb areas. I also would worry about extensive trail development. Trail maintenance is important, but we do not need a bunch more trails.	2/25/2015
I worry about the increase of mechanized travel and multi-use trails in the Wasatch - having bikes, etc. on hiking trails is more damaging.	2/25/2015
Ski resorts say they will develop their land if they don't get a train up the canyon! Huh! Leave the roads as they are! That is the best way to preserve our canyons, keep the resorts from developing if they can't increase ski #'s they won't expand. 93% of Utah residents DO NOT SKI!!!	2/25/2015
Sounds like you	2/25/2015
Well, I think this would benefit our society on both sides. For the children!	2/25/2015
Tying land swaps to other conditions that are not readily transparent is not an effective way to garner support. The entire process needs to be transparent! If public lands are being traded to the ski resorts, the public must be involved and privy to the specifics of the deal!	2/25/2015
I do not support a fee for use scenario. This limits access for all. Only those with \$ will be able to use our canyons.	2/25/2015
Recreation - I think Grizzly Gulch is a very important part of the recreation options in LCC, by having it become part of a resort cuts out a big draw for backcountry recreationists. Backcountry skiing is really the only part of the ski industry that is growing. We should do more to cater to a growing market instead of throwing money at a shrinking market.	2/25/2015
Recreation - In terms of creating more trails, I really like the idea of an interconnected trail system, but would like to see more trails built for specific user groups, bikers, hikers, horses. Bike trails aren't really fun to hike, hiking trails aren't fun to bike, and mixed use trails just seem to promote user conflicts. I would like to see a network of bike trails and a network of hiking trails.	2/25/2015
The economy is the weakest link in this process. Why should the mountains make \$? Stop development. Wild places are the future. If you want to see econ-development go to Sandy-Draper.	2/25/2015
I know many people who have left Salt Lake because of air quality. The economy won't matter if this place becomes inhabitable during its peak season. ELECTRIC BUSES with restricted driving access is the simplest solution. A train is a marketing ploy and not a feasible solution to a local transportation issue.	2/25/2015
Bad idea!	2/25/2015
I oppose aerial connection between ski resorts. Plans such as One Wasatch and Ski Link would significantly diminish the natural and primitive character of the Wasatch. I support a bus/shuttle system similar to the one used on the South Rim of Grand Canyon NP.	2/25/2015
Train less Wasatch	2/25/2015
A train would negatively impact the canyon. Much more study needs to be done before any "Blueprints" can be chosen. We need to see a robust analysis of several alternatives.	2/25/2015
The idea of rail lines up Little Cottonwood is unnecessary - just run more frequent buses on the existing roads and provide parking - there is no need to dig huge, expensive tunnels through the mountains - let people enjoy the open in each canyon, parking at the bottom of each canyon instead of the huge amount of parking needed to park one spot for all canyons - Please don't tax me to take away my access - Any construction is a multi-year mess with a huge price tag - Use what we have and simply run more buses on existing lanes - If you provide frequent buses and ample parking and possibly charge cars you would cut cars, crowding and pollution.	2/25/2015
Unbalanced towards transit.	2/25/2015
No! An incredible lost for a largely non-existent or prospective problem. This will greatly hurt the canyon settings.	2/25/2015
1. Change fee to get up canyon. 2. More people in car less cost. 3. Change park at ski resorts. 4. Buses up canyons in summer. 5. More buses.	2/25/2015
I like the idea of a train but it is affordable. Wouldn't expanded bus service, snow sheds for avalanche and automobile tolls be a better use of money to alleviate cars in canyons.	2/25/2015
Do not concede any backcountry to resort expansion. Base expansion in exchange for private lands in an acceptable trade but the Wasatch is too small for it. In bound ski area expansion and subsequent side parking access.	2/25/2015
Transportation - I think before widening the road or looking at a train, tunnels protecting the current assets from avalanches, improve current infrastructure, the bus is so inconvenient due to lack of parking, full buses, late buses that its not encouraging to use, we should maximize what we have before adding more - where will people park for Millcreek shuttle? How often will it run?	2/25/2015
Any first grader knows that "THREE into two won't go". Greed and short vision always trumps permanent vision and viable solutions.	2/25/2015
Who is going to develop the transportation system up LCC? NEVER use our UTA/TRAAX system because it is unreliable.	2/25/2015
Maybe try and increase bus services first? Current schedule is clearly ineffective.	2/25/2015
Opposed to a train. Opposed to any kind of line interconnect. Who would pay? Who benefits? Seems like an excellent way for ski tourists to get to the resorts. SLC residents will inevitably foot the bill.	2/25/2015
Against light rail. Increase the number of buses up the canyon. Implement a shuttle system up the canyons with no cars except for residents.	2/25/2015
Transit options from the cities along the Wasatch Front are important and need to be strengthened. However, transit between Alta/Brighton and Park City is completely irresponsible. We do not need to compromise the sensitive environment of these upper elevations to accommodate access. Transit options thru Paria's Canyon are sufficient links to the Wasatch back.	2/25/2015
The solutions proposed are more in line with making LCC more of an attraction than solving a local transportation issue. Expand bus service to run consistently and throughout the entire day! Currently you can't go up for a 1/2 day of skiing before work or stay late for dinner and drinks. More parking and electric buses are simpler solutions than widening the road or building a train.	2/25/2015
I worry about improving transit systems without giving equal attention to parking. As a local, taking the bus is difficult because there is limited parking. Also - as a local, I would like to take transit from my house. Improving overall transit systems would be helpful. No train! We already have a road!	2/25/2015
1. We need a National Recreation Area (NRA) for the Central Wasatch or we have a uniform planning process. 2. We do not need a train. We need a Rapid Bus Transportation system.	2/25/2015
I believe that a rail system is a huge overkill for the area. Multiple buses, restrictions or private vehicles, and better valley parking could all be put in place with the existing road system. Little Cottonwood should NOT be considered as a transportation corridor to Park City. Keep all access to access within the canyons. Do not sacrifice the canyons to provide easier access between Park City and SLC.	2/25/2015
I support frequent bus services up the Cottonwood Canyons and elimination of all cars. Like in Zion National Park. Keeps environment pristine and water quality for generations to come. Create a rail system from the airport to Park City and up to the base of Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. create parking areas also at the base of canyons.	2/25/2015
Automobiles are the most damaging element in a watershed environment - salt, smog, oil and grease. Trains are superior - clean, energy efficient, no emissions.	2/25/2015
Trains would run into the same problem as buses currently do unless parking is addressed! What are the ideas to alleviate parking issues at the bottom of the canyons.	2/25/2015
There is no possible way to expand development in the watershed without damaging the watershed. I do not support this proposal.	2/25/2015
In the short term - can we improve the current bus schedule? The buses are often full and the departure and arrival times are inconvenient.	2/25/2015
Improve and increase existing bus service to Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon ski areas. It is impractical as it is presently. I prefer to drive.	2/25/2015
The concept of NO SKI AREA EXPANSION was determined at the last mountain planning effort in the 80s. SO no ski area expansion!	2/25/2015
No, I want to keep nature	2/25/2015
Reports need to take care of their own problems. Leave the road to a rapid transit bus system. Do not destroy a very popular trail for rail lines. This would create a hard boundary for dispersed users and wildlife.	2/25/2015
What is "increased environmental protection"? Wilderness? National Monument? It must receive Federal protection status. This is a wonderful opportunity to negotiate the end of development in the Wasatch. Give the resorts and developers some of what they want (buildable land at resort centers) but not ski area expansion. Better canyon transportation but ALL parties must help pay for it. No over the ridge lifts or trans - NO One Wasatch! Fees - add it to the property taxes in Salt Lake County, Utah County and Summit County. We all own it in many different ways. We should all own for it. Train would be better thought out - making intermediate stops, funding on private route.	2/25/2015
Will the train stop all the rock climbing, hiking and backcountry skiing? Will it be safe from avalanches? When will we stop expanding? How much is your support? Do you think bribing me with trail mix worked? Bears are coming back to the area, have they been considered?	2/25/2015
DO NOT CONNECT Alta with Park City. More roads and lifts mean disturbing the natural scene.	2/25/2015
I am concerned about how the One Wasatch/interconnect fits into this plan. I oppose connecting the ski areas and this plan doesn't address those connections. I hope that all decisions are made with environmental protection the #1 priority.	2/25/2015
Canyon traffic is terrible on the weekends. I think creating an efficient use/friendly alternative is in the best interest of economy and environment. I am pro transit expansion, but not if it means expanding into undeveloped land. I think light-rails are the best solution, as people in the valley don't trust bus times and rails are sexy, fast, and will be efficient as they speed past bumper-to-bumper traffic for 1st trades. What would be best is if the rail belongs in the communities and economic hubs. No one wants to load up their sky gear in their car, unpack at the bottom of the canyon, load up a bus/train, unload eventually at their stop, get out, go to the lodge, gear up, then wait in a line. I want to walk to the train from my apt at the U of U, and stop off at Alta Lodge, ski pow in Grizzly Gulch w/o a crowd, the load a light rail and get off at my house, then do it all again the next day. I also support the protection of our watershed as a resource that is vital to the existence of the Greater Salt Lake Valley and it's residence. Expansion of the ski resorts truly steals from the poor and gives to the rich, one day soon making water a scarce resource for the valley consumer, and allowing the resorts increased water rights. Currently access to much of the Wasatch is free and it ought to stay that way. It is important for everyone to be able to access public lands and nature, not only those who have enough money to pay for access.	2/25/2015
Its vital to improve transit connections from surrounding municipalities to effectively increase connectivity to users. Further BRT would need to come more frequently to get people to actually choose BRT over driving. Charge cars and make incentives to use bus.	2/25/2015
To environmentally sensitive for Olympic Venue development. Nothing has changed!	2/25/2015
We need to thoroughly analyze the geohydrology of the Grizzly Gulch area before any tunnel should EVEN be discussed. The proposals seem heavily in favor of the ski resorts - not the users.	2/25/2015
I would love to see more trails in foothills, in more areas in the canyons instead of such a focus in a few sports - if you want to improve recreation give us more trails, so we can spread out and not impact so heavily the existing trails. Yes, I have spent many hours volunteering on trail building, maintenance, etc. and many people would if advertised.	2/25/2015
My concerns for recreation largely relate to transportation. If mass transit will be improved, there needs to be a system for all users to be able to access all recreation areas. The current bus stops only service ski resorts. I would worry about construction of a train in LCC since it could limit access to climb areas. I also would worry about extensive trail development. Trail maintenance is important, but we do not need a bunch more trails.	2/25/2015
Recreation - I think Grizzly Gulch is a very important part of the recreation options in LCC, by having it become part of a resort cuts out a big draw for backcountry recreationists. Backcountry skiing is really the only part of the ski industry that is growing. We should do more to cater to a growing market instead of throwing money at a shrinking market.	2/25/2015
The economy is the weakest link in this process. Why should the mountains make \$? Stop development. Wild places are the future. If you want to see econ-development go to Sandy-Draper.	2/25/2015
I know many people who have left Salt Lake because of air quality. The economy won't matter if this place becomes inhabitable during its peak season. ELECTRIC BUSES with restricted driving access is the simplest solution. A train is a marketing ploy and not a feasible solution to a local transportation issue.	2/25/2015
A train would negatively impact the canyon. Much more study needs to be done before any "Blueprints" can be chosen. We need to see a robust analysis of several alternatives.	2/25/2015
The idea of rail lines up Little Cottonwood is unnecessary - just run more frequent buses on the existing roads and provide parking - there is no need to dig huge, expensive tunnels through the mountains - let people enjoy the open in each canyon, parking at the bottom of each canyon instead of the huge amount of parking needed to park one spot for all canyons - Please don't tax me to take away my access - Any construction is a multi-year mess with a huge price tag - Use what we have and simply run more buses on existing lanes - If you provide frequent buses and ample parking and possibly charge cars you would cut cars, crowding and pollution.	2/25/2015
No! An incredible lost for a largely non-existent or prospective problem. This will greatly hurt the canyon settings.	2/25/2015
I like the idea of a train but it is affordable. Wouldn't expanded bus service, snow sheds for avalanche and automobile tolls be a better use of money to alleviate cars in canyons.	2/25/2015

Transportation - I think before widening the road or looking at a train, tunnels protecting the current assets from avalanches, improve current infrastructure, the bus is so inconvenient due to lack of parking, full buses, late buses that its not encouraging to use, we should maximize what we have before adding more - where will people park for Millcreek shuttle? How often will it run?		2/25/2015
Any first grader knows that "THREE into two won't go". Greed and short vision always trump permanent vision and viable solutions.		2/25/2015
Transit options from the cities along the Wasatch Front are important and need to be strengthened. However, transit between Alta/Brighton and Park City is completely irresponsible. We do not need to compromise the sensitive environment of these upper elevations to accommodate access. Transit options thru Barley's Canyon are sufficient links to the Wasatch back.		2/25/2015
I worry about improving transit systems without giving equal attention to parking. As a local, taking the bus is difficult because there is limited parking. Also - as a local, I would like to take transit from my house. Improving overall transit systems would be helpful. No train! We already have a road!		2/25/2015
I believe that a rail system is huge overkill for the area. Multiple busses, restrictions or private vehicles, and better valley parking could all be put in place with the existing road system. Little Cottonwood should NOT be considered as a transportation corridor to Park City. Keep all canyon traffic dedicated to access within the canyons. don't sacrifice the canyons to provide easier access between Park City and SKC.		2/25/2015
Automobiles are the most damaging element in a watershed environment - salt, smog, oil and grease. Trains are superior - clean, energy efficient, no emissions.		2/25/2015
Trains would run into the same problem as busses currently do unless parking is addressed! What are the ideas to alleviate parking issues at the bottom of the canyons.		2/25/2015
There is no possible way to expand development in the watershed without damaging the watershed. I do not support this proposal.		2/25/2015
In the short term - can we improve the current bus schedule? The buses are often full and the departure and arrival times are inconvenient.		2/25/2015
This terrible idea will destroy what Utahns love about their canyons. GO TO HELL.		2/25/2015
My thoughts are on the economics, limit it to the existing space that's there. And on transportation, there needs to be bus transportation, and there needs to be big parking lots at one location and more frequent bus services like every 15 minutes or every half hour and complete the trail system as proposed. Environment, that will protect the environment if they do that. Environmental standards with the water quality needs to stay the same. That's my thoughts. As far as connecting the road through Guardsman Pass, you might consider paving that for bus service so that they can use the bus over through Park City, but I wouldn't go beyond that.		2/25/2015
As a lifelong user of the Wasatch mountains I'm wondering about selling our children's future short with focusing just on economic advantage. We need solitude, quiet, rough edges in rugged landscape close to the city. I love skiing the ski resorts, but at the same time the numbers and focus of just economic development really concerns me about my children and my grandchildren's future.		2/25/2015
One of primary concerns with particularly the transportation aspect is I'm not sure the case has been sufficiently made to merit the connection between Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon and Park City in particular. But certainly up and down canyon access needs to be improved. However, it seems like a fair trade-off to add an additional lane to Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon in terms of watershed impacts to improve air quality and transit in particular. The trade-offs in terms of the land swaps for greater protections at elevation of the water sheds are - they seem fair provided that the scale and the nature of the development base is sufficiently controlled through culinary water use or access. We've been able to build an international brand providing a unique experience within each canyon, and necessarily linking them up. I don't see that as improving our marketability when compared to other resorts.		2/25/2015
I live in Salt Lake City, and I don't like any of this. The canyons are too crowded already, and all you're going to do is add more people. The water resources are limited. It's a bad idea. Less people. There are too many people already. Go to any resort on a sunny day, to many people. All you're going to do is mess it up by bringing in those Park City people. That's what Salt Lake County mayor wants, more Park City money. Look at the cost and the amount of money that is allotted for education in the Park City County - I think it's Summit County - compared to other counties in the state. All those people are going to come over here to our side of the mountain and screw it up. I'd like to keep them out. I've seen it happen already. I'm against it.		2/25/2015
I just wanted to suggest maybe a transportation only gondola that goes to Park City to Brighton to Alta with stops just into town so that there's no further development of the wilderness or back country areas but people are able to get from Park City to Brighton to Alta again in a very easy transportation method and not have to go through tunnels, trains or anything. They get to showcase some of the best of the state - snowmobiling, telemaking and helicopter skiing and snow cat skiing - all along the way with backcountry skiing. People can see that but not disturb the land that's there and the recreational access, back country access, especially at a time when back country interest is growing and a lot of tourists who want to come and have easy access to back country which what Utah is known for as part of their vacation experience. To preserve that it is a very integral to Ski Utah, their mission of attracting more visitors to the state. And then it would also allow people staying at Snowbird, say, or Cottonwoods to get to Park City if they want to go dining or shopping much easier than it would via lifts where they would have to wear ski clothes whereas with gondola they can wear street clothes, go shopping, and bring whatever they purchased back with them easily. And then the skiers can go from Park City to Cottonwood and return and not have to ski all the way back. Kind of tired at the end of the day, they can hop on the gondola and ride back to Park City and - or Cottonwood skiers can be brought back to Cottonwoods and not have to ski their way all the way back.		2/25/2015
First wonder why there was no one here from Salt Lake County to discuss the environmental and business impact the canyon use has on the county. There's someone here from Salt Lake City and someone here from the Forest Service, but no one from the county, so I think the county should have had a representative here tonight. My concern that the county is not here is I'm an equestrian, and there's very limited equestrian use in any trails in Salt Lake County. There's only a few places left for trail riding for horses. That includes in Herriman riding in Rose Canyon. In Draper you can ride in Corner Canyon, and in Sandy you can ride in Dimple Dell. And even those areas are shrinking for horse use or competing with more and more other users - motorcycles, dirt bikes, mountain bikes. So equestrian use is nearly extinct in Salt Lake County, and I'm here tonight as an equestrian to say that equestrian use should be protected in our canyons and not only protected but also encouraged and supported because equestrians are an important part of our local economy and also a very important part of our history in the west. So we should keep equestrian use at the forefront of our thoughts and planning and encourage horse use in the canyons.		2/25/2015
They have already shown that they aren't willing to work with local companies and people! By the time they are finished our mountains and canyons will be sacrificed and destroyed for their millions of dollars leaving our canyons and people with nothing! Skiers want fresh untouched powder. Our mountains can only hold so many skiers and ski resorts. The only way to get more ski area would be for the Forest Service to allow them to expand beyond their current boundaries into our National Forests and wilderness areas which would destroy them. These National Forests belong to all of us not just skiers! Where else can you find peace, tranquility, in wilderness areas where you can ski, camp, hike, rock climb, snowshoe, bike, run etc. all 20 min. from home? The next question is Salt Lake City Water Dept. willing to sign off on all the damage and destruction that would be done to our watershed area? If our watershed is allowed to be damaged and destroyed what quality of drinking water will we even have? Last time I checked water is a necessity not a luxury!! Skiing isn't! When I was reading all the wonderful proposals I would estimate that about 98% would all benefit financially! That is definitely a conflict of interest!! Where is the US Forest Service and Salt Lake City Water Dept. and the people that actually care about our canyons and forests? Putting a light rail up Little Cottonwood Canyon would totally destroy this magnificent canyon. Putting tunnels through the mountains from Little Cottonwood Canyon to Big Cottonwood Canyon to Park City would destroy both these totally different magnificent canyons!! There is no way that you could mitigate all the horrific damage that would be done to these canyons so that we can have more skiers! By the time you make 3 or 4 runs down one ski area you would have to take the light rail through the mountains you would be lucky to get in maybe one or two runs more. Most resorts close at 4:30 p.m. unless you wanted to night ski. Then you would have to travel all the way back to where you started from. That's a lot of extra time just for a couple of runs! All mass transit would require more new parking areas in the mouths of these canyons to accommodate all the people using mass transit. Also the transit areas would require platforms outside the mountains and inside the tunnels. don't forget all the blasting, new track lines, new electrical lines. That's just the beginning! The damage and destruction to the mountains inside and outside would be horrific!! I don't care what you try to do to mitigate this destruction it would be impossible! It's too high a price to pay just so we can have more skiers and have all the resorts connected. If ski resorts are allowed to expand there will also be more damage to the environment because of all the new waterlines that of course must be put in so that they can make snow. Next they will all have to have buildings built to eat, rest and get warm in. Where does it end? Don't forget about all the damage that will be done to the environment installing all the new ski lifts between all the resorts and the roads to repair and maintain them. Does it ever end? One thing you need to think about is that several things could happen to people in tunnels inside mountains and ski lifts crossing canyons. Avalanches are possible, power outages are possible, severe wind and snow storms could trap people inside tunnels and on ski lifts. Then of course we could have an earthquake or some idiot could decide to blow up a tunnel or just take people hostage. With all the idiots in this world you never know. People now more than ever before are seeking more wilderness experiences. The last thing you want to see in wilderness areas are ski lifts, ski transit tunnels and tons of people! I've lived my life in Cottonwood Heights and at Wasatch Resort in Little Cottonwood Canyon. I've also driven over Guardsman Pass many times and I'm so appalled at all the commercial and residential development that has been allowed. Park City is for only the rich and famous to live in! They should be ashamed of themselves for what they have allowed to be done to those valleys and mountains!! Little Cottonwood Canyon and Big Cottonwood Canyon need to be protected so that this doesn't happen to them! If you have money you can live and build your house on whatever ridge to you want! Who is protecting our beautiful mountains? Will our children and their children have a place to go into our wilderness areas? What about the wildlife where will they go? They way it is set up now almost all the skiers come down and spend their money in the local restaurants and hotels. That benefits our local economy not Vailis! In Zions Nat. park they have a shuttle that you can pick up in Springdale and they drop you off and pick you up at all the different spots. This works very well for the park. In California by Muir Woods they also provide a shuttle on the weekends and during the week there are only 2 parking lots. One lot is for buses and the other for cars. The road is only 2 lanes wide and there are no tunnels for short cuts. Even in Yellowstone most of the roads are only 2 lanes wide and the speed is 45 mph. The wilderness experiences are protected!		2/25/2015
This works very well for the park. In California by Muir Woods they also provide a shuttle on the weekends and during the week there are only 2 parking lots. One lot is for buses and the other for cars. The road is only 2 lanes wide and there are no tunnels for short cuts. Even in Yellowstone most of the roads are only 2 lanes wide and the speed is 45 mph. The wilderness experiences are protected! Our canyons need to be protected and preserved not sold out to the highest bidder!! You can make anything look wonderful on paper, however when you do it to our canyons and forests it will have a totally horrific consequence! These canyons, mountains and Nat. Forests belong to all of us and not just to one group that can destroy them all for millions of dollars. Don't sell everyone else out just for yourself. If someone else decides to build a road through our Nat. Forests and canyons.		2/24/2015
I do not understand this push to connect Alta, Brighton and Park City. A skier has all the terrain needed at any one of the resorts. If variety is what is desired then ski at a different resort each day. If they stay in Salt Lake City they have access to all the resorts in the Wasatch Front and back. Connecting the resorts adds little for a very high price. True a skier staying at one of the resorts would be limited to either that resort or one of the adjacent ones but the combinations of Alta-Snowbird, Canyons (with Park City) and Deer Valley and Solitude + Brighton each provide a lot of varied terrain. Also, extending TRAX from Sandy to Alta is a good idea but to then bring it through the mountain to Brighton and Park City would make the price of a ticket exorbitant. Also, TRAX does not and for the foreseeable future will not provide service on Salt Lake's east side making travel from downtown to say Alta or any resort a very time consuming trip. Thank you.		2/24/2015
I am strongly opposed to the expansion of ski resorts/interconnect/skilink/One Wasatch. This proposal does not appear to be directly addressing this topic. Is it not an option anymore?		2/25/2015
I really like the approach so far and what I saw as a preliminary plan this morning at the Ski Utah meeting. I do really like the trains connecting all of the canyons as this has proven to work really well in Europe. The head person said this morning that they aren't sure about a train in Parley's as it would be tough to incentivize people since it would take twice as long as a car. Unless we make a complete connection with PC, Little and Big with trains I don't see the point. There are trains out there that could go close to 60mph which would make it worth going up Parley's. Please continue to think of a way to make sure Parley's is included in the train discussion or else as a group, industry, state, etc we aren't doing everything we can to help our cause.		2/24/2015