

Proposed Blueprint Open Ended Survey Comments Feb. 4 - May 1, 2015			
Question	Comment	City	Date
Please provide any additional feedback on how the proposed blueprint could better meet the purpose of Mountain Accord.			
	Carving a rail track up Little Cottonwood Canyon in no way represents responsible stewardship of the natural resources. While it is clear that a solution is needed to provide better access to LCC, this is not the solution. A highly dedicated bus system would move the parking down into areas better able to handle it. I'm not talking about the existing Salt Lake transit bus, but something similar to what Breckenridge has done for their valley level parking. Secondly, connecting all of the Cottonwood Canyon resorts together should not be a priority. Instead of trying to copy a European concept of connectivity, maintain the uniquely American one that is already in place.	Albuquerque	03/04/2015
	I think the train could be a good idea in the right areas. I don't like connections from little cottonwood to Brighton to Park City. This is environmentally too intrusive unless they were tunnels (even an aerial approach would be better.) Grizzly Gulch is a wonderful place to hike and a train would ruin what makes it beautiful. I also think that trail system enhancement may be too intrusive. These are mountains and we don't want them to feel like parks with bulldozer tracks and retaining walls. With that much human activity, much native wildlife, elk, bears, other predators, will leave and we will feel much like we do in the city. Lets build the trains in certain parts keeping disturbance to a minimum but leave everything else the way it is. If people want to hike, let them hike on the trails we have. Maybe even start a permit system for certain trails	Alpine	02/08/2015
	The canyons and mountains should be protected in their natural state. Development and growth should be stopped. Future generations should be able to enjoy the mountains in an undeveloped and unexploited way.	Alpine, UT	04/30/2015
	A rail system serving Alta/Snowbird from the mouth of the Little Cottonwood canyon worked well during the mining years ---Do it again but modeled after the European structures! Absent installing a rail system, consideration should be given toward providing cost savings incentives for skiers who arrive later and leave earlier than the full day, thus avoiding the "rush hours."	ALTA	02/09/2015
	A train up Little Cottonwood Canyon is a bad idea both financially and environmentally. A much better option would be a dedicated rapid bus lane.	Alta	03/04/2015
	comments below	Alta	03/10/2015
	Honestly, I think this entire proposal gives us a chance to catch up with the rest of America. We are asking the many (the taxpayers) to transfer huge sums of money to the few (ski resort owners). By funding a huge, expensive, invasive train system we will enable those few owners to make loads more money. By approving the land swaps in alta, we can get rid of all those pesky small business owners (all the lodges and shuttle companies) and create lots more entry level seasonal jobs in alta. Maybe we can even move to a system that is forced to use foreign work exchange employees like most of the rest of the big ski areas in the U.S. For some reason, it's hard to find local workers that can earn minimum wage for a 3 or 4 month full commitment, then are cut loose. With all the newly developable land transferred to alta ski lifts, maybe we can move towards the kind of "vibrant community" we find at deer cove in deer valley. Or maybe even attract a big money buyer, like the well known and always respected by the locals or their empathy and generosity and land stewardship, like maybe valley resorts, inc. I respect any businesses right to do as they wish within the law, but I resent the fact that we as taxpayers need to fund their growth. How about as a simple start to finding a solution to the traffic problem; instead of letting cars come up the canyons free and charge to take the bus, we simply reverse it. Bus riders come up canyon free. Improve the road by expanding to a dedicated bus lane. Increase parking at the bases. Tweak the schedules and routes to make them more user friendly. Have we used up the entire 4 billion budget yet? Thank you for your work on this project	Alta	05/01/2015
	I have sent a separate email detailing an initial reaction.	Alta	04/03/2015
	I would like to see usage of the roads limited/toll road if there is an alternate (train) available in the canyons.	Alta	02/24/2015
	Not sure if train system connects LCC to Park city. If tunnel system is being incorporated then the light rail needs to be extended to Park city. I also would love to know the hours of operation for light rail systems I feel best boost economics for areas it is essential to have trains providing safe transport into later night time hours to boost bar and restaurant sales.	Alta	03/07/2015
	Short version The Mountain Accord has made some admirable progress, but at the same time it has failed to mediate the compromises among the different interest groups needed to publish a real Blueprint. To be credible as a twenty-five year plan, the Mountain Accord must balance the inherently competing interests of economic growth with environmental impact by creating specific targets for future growth of day use visitors, residential housing stock, and tourist facilities. These hard numbers are missing from the current Mountain Accord Plan, making it into a marketing document - for those in favor of public funds for transportation systems that are in favor of creating more land for commercial development - rather than a proper Blueprint that balances competing interests. Without hard numbers it is impossible to tell what the Mountain Accord really means for any of our communities and I hence feel all responsible citizens will oppose it until those issues have been resolved. Long Version The Mountain Accord is an ambitious effort. It has done a good job of bringing together diverse groups and creating a regional dialogue. It has published baseline information and inspired the sort of community interaction that underpins any effective planning process. I feel the "Vision, Goals and Metrics" document is an excellent framework to measure the efficacy of the Mountain Accord process and actions. That said I have two main, significant, concerns. The first is that many of the goals and metrics outlined in the Mountain Accord are inherently in conflict, and the goals are not in fact goals (or objectives) but rather a taxonomy of metrics that allows one to capture data. For example, it is obvious that some of the economic goals - like hotel utilization or total day use visits - are in opposition to some of the environmental goals like impact on watersheds or impact upon core areas. Mountain Accord has done a great job of classifying the areas of a community dialog that we need to resolve in balancing these important interests and concerns, but heretofore has done little or nothing to make concrete quantitative statements about the desired future state. Mountain Accord talks about a 25 year plan, but a 25 year plan without any defined quantitative objectives (hard numbers) feels more like a marketing effort for those who want to see significant economic growth enabled by a new transportation system. Metrics without defined objectives are, in my estimation, an abdication of civic responsibility. Mountain Accord has created a framework for the dialog, but has not taken the next step in balancing the competing interests and publicly declaring the results of that balancing effort. The whole point of a planning effort should be to make definitive statements about what future state we desire. These statements must be specific and quantitative to have any meaning. Talking about different objectives is not a plan, it is rather making a series of statements that are designed to ensure that different groups feel they have been heard. Without resolving the differences between those groups, Mountain Accord has bypassed any definitive statements in that regard, instead relying on extrapolations of current trends without asking the fundamental question of what each of our individual communities wants to see in terms of specific growth figures. The Mayor of Alta, Tom Pollard, recently commented at a public forum that he felt the community of Alta would like to see "reasonable growth". From my conversations with various community stakeholders, I agree with his assessment. Yet, by itself, this is a meaningless statement, for one man's reasonable growth is another man unbridled and destructive economic development. I urge Mountain Accord to actually create a real "Blueprint" that has some of the important goals described as 25 year targets or target ranges. My second objection is that to the extent one can find specific numbers for growth or historical use, these are usually at the level of Wasatch aggregates. The Mountain Accord has consistently claimed it was seeking local community input, but at the same time it has failed to provide a baseline of historical information that is relevant to the local communities. Growth over the last 25 years for the Wasatch region is useful background, but as a member of the Alta community I find Alta specific figures regarding the growth in the number of skiers, summer visitors, hotel room and housing stock in the Town of Alta much more important to a 25 year future plan for Alta, than the Wasatch numbers that have been provided. To ask for community input without providing baseline figures that are relevant to that community is tantamount to asking for uninformed opinions. That is irresponsible. In summary, goals and metrics without quantified objectives are marketing campaigns, not 25 year Blueprints. The hard part in such planning efforts is balancing the competing demands of different interest groups, and in my estimation, Mountain Accord has sidestepped the difficult step of driving specific compromises among those groups.	Alta	05/01/2015
	The notion of a railroad being built up LCC seems crazy. Where would it go? If on Hwy 210, there will be disruption to automobile access for years and severe avalanche danger all along the route probably requiring sheds to be built over both the rail line and the roadway. Sheds over the roadway will lead to severe black ice problems for drivers which will lead to a great deal more salt spread on the roadways which will in turn contaminate the watershed. If the railroad is on the south side of the canyon it will have to be carved mostly out of pristine nature and where does it go once it leaves Snowbird? Up the Bypass Road? There isn't enough room for two tracks and all the homeowners will violently object. Tunnel under Pueruvian Ridge? Good luck! Across the Creek to the Hellgate Condos and then up Hwy 210? Severe avalanche issues and all homeowners along 210 will fight it. It makes absolutely no sense when a high-speed tram or gondola could move the same number of people just as rapidly with a minimal impact on nature and the existing infrastructure. It is very clear the UTA just wants to build a railroad and is dismissing the tram/gondola solution without even considering it. All the "we are going to protect nature in the canyons" stuff is hypocritical nonsense if the solution to transportation issues is to construct a railroad (which will need 2 tracks) up through a wilderness area. I'm disgusted.	Alta	02/10/2015
	There has been too much emphasis placed on business interests and not enough on stewardship and reversing the mistakes of the past. Billions of Dollars on tunnel and railway lines that will never be recoverable over a 100 year timeframe. How does that create a sustainably vibrant economy? More spending to a ski industry that has already benefited so much from exclusive use of public land. Look at the maps! Designate whites left for human powered. Require the ski areas to swap their key parcels of land (Grizzly, Emma, Flagstaff) for the land under their ski lifts, or pull out those lifts! Don't allow the ski areas more land for base area development. Just congestion charge/price LCC road. The market will find solutions (Uber, ride share vans, etc.)	Alta	05/01/2015
	With the exception of tunnels between Little Cottonwood, Big cottonwood and Gardsmans, which seems like too much, I think this is a well thought out and viable plan.	alta	02/05/2015
	My suggestion would be to outsource specialists in this area who have mutual concerns of protecting what is currently in place.	ALTA, UT	03/07/2015
	I believe it to be a good plan for the recreational user. I worry that it is too restrictive from a commercial development point of view. Saying now that only 100 more lodging unit will be built in Alta ever???	Alta Utah	04/30/2015
	I am highly concerned about the environmental impacts of construction and presence of expanded roadways, rail lines, and/or gondola/tramway in Little Cottonwood Canyon. Further, I believe construction of a tunnel when have especially detrimental environmental impacts, including effects on water quality, soil erosion, and widespread growth of invasive plant species that would threaten beloved wildflowers in the Cottonwood Canyons and the greater Wasatch. A tunnel would also forever change the character of Little Cottonwood Canyon and its end of the road charm. I don't believe the proposed Blueprint meets the goal of responsible stewardship of natural resources. I also am concerned that it does not meet the goal of providing recreation experiences. The Wasatch is already very crowded, and I'm not sure it can support all of the people that expanded transportation might bring.	Alta, UT	04/30/2015
	The growth of Annual Visitors (pg 5) from 5.7M to 7.2M over 27 years calculates to 0.86% per year of growth. Surely this growth can be managed with incremental improvements in road, number of busses, avalanche diversion so the road can remain open 24/7. This rail project will be a fortune to build (\$10B) and will serve so few people now or in the future that this cost is not only unjustified, but obscene. And during the 10 or 15 years of construction, the damage to the environment and enjoyment of the affected areas will be huge. More important, in the next 5-10 years, a revolution in personal transportation will render the options presented in the ACCORD to be unnecessary, irrelevant, economically unsustainable and ironically unused. Why? Much more convenient options will emerge that will be far more economical to operate and far more effective than driving to any train station, parking one's car, waiting for a train, and then taking what will by then be an impossibly expensive fare.	Alta, UT	02/26/2015
	I truly feel that the two Cottonwood canyons need to be connected, preferably by ski lifts and skiing terrain.	Alta, Utah	04/29/2015
	Funny how mountain accord deadline is May 1, 2015 and afcvision is unheard of in Utah county. Your own study admits mountain accord is salt lake, Wasatch and summit counties "project area" but other areas will be affected. Does that mean you are showing snowbird down American fork canyons throat because you have your agenda done? It seems to me that the entire Wasatch range should be included. Maybe Brigham called SLCC the place because you want your crap here in Utah valley. I have not had a chance to read all of your documents but interesting almost 70percent of ski industry from out of state. Should us "happy valley" folks give up our canyon to make all the pretty people happy and the salt lake people pleased with clean drinking water? Wow	American fork	04/30/2015
	The Light rail transit (LRT) proposal is preposterous as it would make Little Cottonwood Canyon a transportation corridor which would further degrade the natural resources and beauty of the canyon. Providing more access to the Cottonwood canyons is not the answer to protecting the land and watershed for future generations. I agree with more eco-friendly transportation alternatives but a rail system into the canyon is not the answer. Further, environmentally sustainable transportation doesn't protect the land itself if the transportation itself dramatically increase use to the areas. Connecting Park City and Salt Lake valley via Little Cottonwood canyon in any form is a mistake. By installing a rail-line we are essentially making this wildland a glorified park. The Wasatch Front rail system (TRAX, FrontRunner and the Sugar House Trolley) has improved the transportation system in the Salt Lake Valley. However, I believe that rail based systems in the Cottonwood Canyons (or Mill Creek) would have unacceptable impacts to the environment and the wilderness character of these canyons. The construction of rail lines in the canyons would more than double the infrastructure footprint and likely impact sensitive riparian zones. Extensive cut and fill excavations would likely be required for rail construction resulting in widespread scarring of the landscape. An elevated rail system would have unacceptable visual impacts. Rail lines also restrict access, forming "hard" barriers for hikers, skiers and snow shoe travel. A rail system in the Cottonwood Canyons is "overkill," and that current and future transportation demand in the canyons can be met with a properly designed shuttle system.	American Fork	04/14/2015

	More honesty (currently called transparency) would help the public digest the pros and cons of Mountain Accord. The public is told a 2 mile tunnel disturbing and excavating 156,44 cubic yards of Mt. Superior protects the watershed, but a 3,000 square foot cabin's footings in Alta disturbing 97 cubic yards of material damages the watershed. The public is told a boring tunnels is good and tunnels are used to store water and protect the watershed. How can one store water in a 2 mile tunnel and have a train going back and forth in it at the same time? It appears UDOT uses 600 tons of salt in Little Cottonwood Canyon to support commercial skiing, hotels, and tourism which is ok for the watershed, but a cabin with no salt loading is out. What will 10,000 people per day do in Alta when they get there? Snowbird barely has enough attractions to keep 10,000 tourists happy for 1 day a year at Oktoberfest. The public is told massive public development costing billions protects the watershed, but a small private cabins in Alta destroys the watershed. \$20 million taxpayer dollars promoting massive public development and \$2 million for lawsuits to stop microscopic private cabins. The public statements are not credible and in fact laughable. While officials spout the watershed story, eyes roll in the audience, textings of haha messages are occurring as the official speaks. 20% of the canyons are private property. Massive public development on 80% protects the watershed but minimal private development damages the watershed. This is not an honest conversation. Why not say the truth? We can have massive public development and watershed protection simultaneously. We can have private development and watershed protection simultaneously, we just don't want private parties to develop. It's not a watershed issue. There is no legal, science, or public policy to support private development, the folks at the table just don't want. Let's have the public PR story match the backroom actions. That would be helpful to Mountain Accord. Mountain Accord is a great process. More honesty would make it mega great.	American Fork, UT	02/22/2015
	I don't think the "accord" takes into account climate change. Yes, this might have been the right solution 50-25 years ago but it is certainly too focused on skiing for the reality that snow might not be as plentiful for the next 25-50 years.	Berkeley	04/30/2015
	comments submitted by email	Big Cottonwood Canyon	05/01/2015
	I think this is a terrible idea. I think the mountains need to be left alone. I think people from Park City just don't want to drive down Parleys and over to Little Cottonwood. Which they should have to.	Bluffdale	03/16/2015
	you people are only looking after what you want. Have you even considered or even invited any of the back horsemen groups that have used these canyons for longer than skiers have ever used them? You are not considering all who use these areas. Your agenda to me is very expensive and will destroy what people like me have used this public land for, for decades upon decades. Stop just thinking about your agenda your it the only ones who have rights to this land	Bluffdale	03/15/2015
	I applaud the concept of the Mountain Accord. I would like to see priorities established and clearly stated that put conservation, protection, and stewardship as top priorities. In the event of multiple parties not reaching agreement, the default choice must be the one that offers the highest level of environmental protection, watershed protection, preservation, and conservation of resources. I believe it is not feasible now, and will be less feasible in the future, to develop more and more with the intention of enhancing visitor's experiences in Utah and attracting ever-increasing numbers to the Wasatch. Stability is more important and sustainable than continued growth. The REAL stakeholders here are the citizens who rely on the Wasatch for water, solitude, wild terrain and the benefits they bring. The economy must be the lowest priority in the Blueprint. Much of what makes Utah a ski destination can not be improved by more roads, hotels, condos, restaurants, etc. The natural terrain, untrammeled snowfall, and unparalleled scenery are the reasons people come to Utah. Why this is not apparent to more people baffles me. The Wasatch is a small mountain range. Resorts in the Wasatch must not be allowed to compare themselves to, or aspire to be in the same league as resorts in other states or countries. The grand resorts in major ranges such as the Alps, Sierra Nevada, and Rocky Mountains have an advantage the Wasatch can never match - their sheer breadth and expanse. HOWEVER, the Wasatch have unmatched assets mentioned in the previous paragraph, that can not be improved upon.	Bluffdale, UT	03/31/2015
	Please see the comments of Winter Wildlands Alliance and Wasatch Backcountry Alliance. As someone who helped compile that input, I am fully vested in the position taken by that letter - just as the thousands of other individual backcountry skiers, snowboarders and snowshoers who enjoy the Wasatch are. We trust in these groups to listen to us, and provide a collective voice. As one of the few who actually gets to pursue my vocation and avocation simultaneously, I take this quite seriously. Hopefully all members of the Mountain Accord Executive Committee will read and consider those comments in full, and work with us to find solutions as this effort moves forward. Thank you for all of your efforts thus far.	BOISE, ID	05/02/2015
	The blueprint seems to lean toward development and transportation. I would like protection of the back country to be given more consideration. Thx, mm	Boise, Id	03/06/2015
	I don't think the ski resorts need to be expanded. There is tons of terrain that can be accessed by the current ski area boundaries. I feel like the blue print focuses on four months of the year (December and March). And if these changes happen it greatly affects the areas for the other eight months of the year. Don't expand the ski resorts and don't expand the transportation system. People come to Utah to ski what we currently have.	Bountiful	05/01/2015
	In terms of dollars, the proposed blueprint is heavily skewed toward the ski resorts. The transportation option amounts to a large taxpayer subsidy to the ski resorts. Preservation of existing natural areas in the Wasatch could be had for practically nothing.	Bountiful	04/29/2015
	more details really needed to begin to have opinion. like concept, and we definitely need to address what is going to be a much larger problem in the future.	Bountiful	02/05/2015
	My primary concern with regards to those canyons are drinking water and preserving natural beauty. I would like as much wilderness as possible. The other concerns are secondary.	Bountiful	02/13/2015
	The train and tunnel idea is good and will provide a good long term solution for transportation, while also achieving protection of iconic areas of the Wasatch	Bountiful	02/18/2015
	The Wasatch Mountains are essentially a metropolitan area, as compared to the Uinta Mountains which are primarily a wilderness area. Making this distinction clear would help frame the discussion more clearly.	Bountiful	04/30/2015
	As a retire tunnel engineer, I am especially interested in the fixed-rail connections to Brighton, Alta and Park City. Is upgrading for rail service of the existing Park City to Alta drainage tunnel part of the thinking? Are 360 degree tunnels in the canyons to overcome the steepest parts of possible lines (like those in Switzerland built in the 1850's) part of the thinking? If yes to either question: where do I find out more, where can I be of help with free advise?	Bountiful and Mt.Haven	02/06/2015
	It seems to me that our beautiful mountains should be kept in a pristine and sustainable condition to be maintained as they are for many future generations. The Mountain Accord seems to be focused on a "for profit" agenda. This is not what I have envisioned for our beautiful mountains.	Bountiful, UT	04/28/2015
	More advanced travel systems, super fast modern trains along existing corridors Logan to St George. Less development in our canyons and better protection of USFS, BLM and state trust lands in our state. No state take over of federal lands... Utah ownership of federal lands is not viable.	Bountiful, UT	05/02/2015
	So far, you have done a really good job of collaboration by all stakeholders.	Bountiful, UT 84010	03/31/2015
	I feel that any discussion about the future of the canyons is a benefit. Planning will help avoid haphazard developments and provide a guideline as pressure on the canyon resources continues to increase. The mountain accord should not be set in stone, but should instead act as a guideline with flexibility as public pressure which will ultimately result on key decisions is gauged. Just like the Legacy parkway, which after fits and starts was finally built in a much improved form than originally conceived, the Mountain Accord should be sensitive to future input and allow for some modification.	Bountiful, Utah	03/14/2015
	Just avoid trains. Please, no trains.	Breckenridge	05/01/2015
	Balancing the four systems or interest segments is the key goal of this proposal. As a cabin owner at Brighton I would appreciate modest economic upgrade of services and renewed vigor to the offerings for locals as well as visitors. I am also fervently in support of careful preservation of our natural landscape and backcountry ski access on USFS and other public lands. Movement toward a more efficient means of transporting visitors to the areas via a mass transit European style mechanism would greatly enhance attractiveness of the resort areas while limiting emissions, traffic bottlenecks and parking constraints. Of special interest to me is the view of MountainAccord in proposing alternative people movers from one side of the Wasatch to the other one day, far reducing the I-80 problem.	Brighton	04/14/2015
	Hill I have not had the time to review this information in detail, that being said I would like to thank you all for jumping into this population dilemma. I have lived at the top of Big Cottonwood since 1974 and have seen the changes. I have seen ski area operators thru cash and politics advance their own agenda for personal profit and I have seen the state with similar tactics ie, building permits & inspections, taxes, police, trash, pets etc. The USFS has had a confused hand in all this over the years also. The combined effort of all has alienated residents and visitors. I am anxious to study your proposals and for now I would put my confidence with Laney. Thank you again for this opportunity	Brighton	04/30/2015
	The blueprint does not provide specific plans for preservation of the ridge line between Guardsman's Pass and Mill Creek Canyon. This should be a priority area due to the High usage for recreational activities in both summer and winter, and the current pressure from development. Preservation of this area is key to meeting the environmental objectives of the plan.	Brighton	04/23/2015
	This plan is short sided and is addressing Tourist mind use. Let's put Our monies and Fed Money into mass transit for people who Need and use it DAILY.	brighton	05/01/2015
	Ski Area Expansion does not "preserve" OUR National Forest Lands. Ski Area expansion just turns OUR Beautiful, Unique, Wasatch Mountains into a DisneyLand Experience. Leave more wilderness and untouched lands for the Future Generations. Once it is gone, it is gone forever.	Brighton UT	04/13/2015
	A train/light rail system with limited stops from downtown SLC/SLC airport, up LCC (stopping at Alta and SB), through a tunnel into BCC (stopping at Brighton parking lot) through a tunnel to Park City (stopping in downtown PC) is the best option for transportation, the environment, preservation, recreation, and all of the interested economies. With a rail system you will discourage driving, and better control mountain Access with limited stops, not only for skiers but for all recreation and mountain enjoyment. People do not like to ride busses and will not use them. Trains are comfortable and reliable and people will use them. Tunnels have minimal environmental impact and preserve natural aesthetics. The European countries which share the Alps also care deeply about their mountains and preserving the environments, rely on the mountains for recreation - and they are completely dependent on well thought-out train systems that very delicately transport millions of people through a very well preserved environment. Recreational demand on these mountains will only increase - so let's do it right and manage the recreational pressure with a rail system.	Brighton Utah	03/17/2015
	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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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! 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. 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.	Brighton Utah	03/16/2015
	I only say poorly as connecting both canyons and park city is pointless and opens the door to adding wasatch county, heber etc. In essence this proposal is full urbanization of the mountains. Otherwise, light rail from SLC to PC for sure. SLC to LCC, perhaps. BUT the line is crossed with PC to LCC interconnects in any form. If the goal is to preserve and to protect, then why make it an Urban Mountain range via a massive increase in transportation???	Brighton, UT	02/09/2015
	My main concern is the future environment of the canyons. The transportation proposals, as I understand them essentially ignore environment almost entirely. If you make the Cottonwood canyons accessible from the Park City side, you might as well court on the canyons becoming nothing more than an extension of the developers' developments and that is wholly unacceptable to me as a canyon resident. Publicity plus accessibility always lead to over-development. These mountains belong to the people, not the developers. Developers, such as Talisker, Vail Resorts and Deer Valley are concerned with one thing and one thing only and that is MONEY. It is obvious that when you combine such companies with the plans of the UTA and DOT, whose business is to build the biggest and most expensive transit system possible (again MONEY), environment takes last place. I'm in favor of a much scaled down version of the mass transit proposal. Why the discussion is dominated by the entities mentioned is ridiculous. I thought this was to be an open process for and from the people. UTA and the DOT work for us, we do not work for them! Nor are we beholden to them.	Brighton, Utah	03/06/2015
	There are many great goals and ideals represented in the overall Blueprint. Yet, many of the options appear to be totally unrealistic cost wise. There needs to be more direct attention to the funding sources that will be benefiting from this increase in supposed tourism. This means at the very least that the ski resorts, the Summit County Property Tax Base, Second and Third Homeowners and all Real Estate entities need to be footing the bill for these proposed improvements. Missing is the expansion of Permit Users in the NFS that are dedicated to educational opportunities. These include both summer and winter interests. Avalanche Education is primary in the Winter. Watershed concerns heads up the Summer interest category. The Canyons Protection needs to be the foremost concern, and this should not be restricted to the upper areas of the Canyons.	Brighton, Utah 84121	05/01/2015

	I support ONE Wasatch!	Carlsbad, CA	04/29/2015
	I would need to study it more, but it appears to be an excellent plan.	Cedar City	03/01/2015
	Any connecting roads or transit systems that connect Park City to the Cottonwood canyons will destroy some of the most pristine and accessible wilderness areas. These areas are easily accessed which makes them enjoyable for all those who cannot venture deeper into the mountains without assistance. There is very little benefit to allowing access through the cottonwoods. Those canyons are already overloaded with people and traffic. Allowing through traffic will only increase the problem of ski resorts that are at capacity on busy days.	Cedar Hills	04/29/2015
	Over the snow connections need to be protected to allow the seven resorts to connect.	Centerville	02/05/2015
	The sooner you do this, the better.	Charleston, Utah	02/09/2015
	I would like to see more transit from the airport to Park City or a PC bus stop	Chattanooga TN/ Park City	02/07/2015
	As an out of town skier, I could be more impressed with proposals of the mountain accord. I believe it strikes the correct balance of protecting the beauty of the cottonwood canyons while also enabling continued development of the resorts. It would be amazing to visit Utah for a week and never to step foot in a car. The thought of staying in Park City and being able to ski Alta with a quick train ride is wonderful.	Chicago	02/09/2015
	It seems to me that the obvious and easiest way to reduce the impact of recreation upon the Wasatch Mountains in Salt Lake County would be to encourage and incentivize Kennebec into opening sections of the Oquirrh Mountains up for recreational opportunities. Well obvious to me but apparently not anyone involved with the stakeholder group. Opening the Oquirrh Mountains to recreational activities would also alleviate the future traffic concerns with everyone trying to get across town from the west bench to the east bench.	Copperton	04/30/2015
	Please include more mountain biking in the Cottonwood Canyons.	Cotton Wood Heights	04/30/2015
	1) Guardsman's Pass has been a right of way in the state of Utah. It can not be a holding for a ski resort. As with the roads in San Juan county, it should be taken to court. This road needs to be used as the roads around Colorado i.e., Vail! 2) Same as above with Cardiff road, Mineral road, Silver Fork. 3) Water is Gold. Water is more important than air pollution. No more water for snow making. I have seen several oil spills caused by cabin owners and ski resort private shuttles, and US Forest service snow mobiles. There is no monitoring of this in the mountains. 4) We need to protect our water. 5) No more expansion to lands. The resorts can build a new resort in the West mountains near the cooper mine for eagle mountain and other residents of the west si	Cottonwood Heights	03/12/2015
	A key legacy of the Central Wasatch that MUST be preserved is that each canyon provides a unique experience. This unique "brand" has attracted tourists just fine for decades. We are not Colorado nor are we the European Alps. By connecting Big/Little Cottonwood Canyons to Park City with invasive infrastructure, we are only homogenizing the experience in each canyon while destroying the local character. Not all locals nor tourists want a glitzy, overdeveloped "Park City" experience. The economic side of this blueprint seems to only focus on developing resources for tourists (big spending, infrequent users) rather than further developing more sustainable local markets (smaller spending, year-round users).	Cottonwood Heights	02/05/2015
	After working and recreating in Little Cottonwood Canyon for the last 35 years transportation has become one of the big challenges. On busy days all parking can be taken up and the current bus system doesn't keep up with demand. There is a need for better transportation and incentive to use it.	Cottonwood Heights	03/12/2015
	Almost any change to the transportation is a good thing. Shuttles, Trams, tunnels and rail all are expensive but very needed.	Cottonwood Heights	02/05/2015
	As an Environmental Planner and resort employee, I fully support the stated objectives of the Mountain Accord blueprint. Although, I have concerns that the Mountain Accord is not placing enough emphasis on environmental protection. Preserving open space and limiting development of any kind should be the top priority. Once open space is developed, it's gone forever. I am concerned about how developing year round roads between Park City and BCC will affect traffic and crowding in BCC. I do not support an interconnect of any kind. Please consider putting more limits on development while working to improve public transportation systems. Public opinion, over the years, consistently supports conservation over development. Please revise the blueprint with this in mind.	Cottonwood Heights	05/01/2015
	Aside from the little cottonwood/ park city corridor, I think that the current blueprint is an acceptable set of tradeoffs between conservation and development. Unfortunately, as long as the train and tunnel are still in the plan I cannot support any proposal. Grizzly gulch is one of the most iconic areas of the Wasatch and cannot sustain any more development. how many visitor days does ceact lake get every year?	cottonwood heights	04/24/2015
	Be more concerned about the Environment.	cottonwood heights	04/29/2015
	Bus service year round to all ski resorts is preferable to all alternatives.	Cottonwood Heights	04/30/2015
	Congratulations on the tremendous amount of work and thought that went into this blueprint. The devil is in the details however. The ski resorts are the overwhelming problem since their emphasis is on connection and expansion. They are correct in assuming that population growth must be addressed, and so it is important to implement transportation solutions that will more quickly bring recreationists to their destinations. But the resorts are big enough. Resort-skiing numbers are down. In the face of climate change, the snowpack may be seriously affected in the coming years. Connecting resorts will look good in advertising, but traveling by lift or tunnel is time consuming and an unnecessary invasion of pristine areas and watershed lands. The important thing, in the end, is the protection of the wild ecosystems of these mountains. When Man destroys these, he will have destroyed the value of the Wasatch. To develop, to expand, to build is so easy, but would result in tragedy. The travesty would be permanent.	Cottonwood Heights	04/30/2015
	Destroying Little Cottonwood Canyon seems to be the main goal of Mountain Accord. It will destroy it, to put in a Train or more Lanes. It will destroy a quality experience in the Canyon. It is responsible to even entertain the idea of more Lanes or a Train up Little Cottonwood Canyon.	cottonwood heights	04/29/2015
	Don't destroy Little Cottonwood Canyon by putting in more Lanes or a Train.	Cottonwood Heights	05/01/2015
	Don't ruin an amazing backcountry area. Tunnels don't make sense, it's only an hour drive from snowbird to park city. Just build trains up the cottonwood canyons and a big park and ride at the base.	Cottonwood Heights	05/01/2015
	Don't ruin Little Cottonwood Canyon by more Lanes or a Train.	cottonwood heights	04/29/2015
	Drop the tunnel idea. Very expensive, does little more than provide ease of access for tourists who could take a bus without such a vast investment. The cost to build and maintain would be difficult to sustain. The potential to adversely impact the area with tunnel construction is very real. The energy and resources spent could well be spent in many other ways to protect and preserve the area for access to all Utahns, not just elite visitors from out of state.	Cottonwood Heights	03/09/2015
	Higher resolution maps, with topographic lines.	Cottonwood Heights	02/12/2015
	I agree with the Blueprint for transportation alternatives in Big and Little Cottonwood canyons. However, the demand just isn't there to connect BCC and LCC directly to Park City. A tunnel system is extremely expensive. The usage wouldn't justify the cost (or the damage to the watershed during construction activities). Leave the Wasatch Front and the Wasatch "back" as separate entities. Only the extremely wealthy are pushing to connect the two. The tunnels (or tram connections) throw a red herring into the process, that will cause the entire project to fail. I can not support connecting the Wasatch Front and back. Even nature doesn't want them connected. There's a reason that our orographic storms leave a lot more snow in BCC and LCC than in PC.	Cottonwood Heights	02/27/2015
	I am a resident of Cottonwood Heights, and a skier and hiker to Little Cottonwood Canyon on most week-ends. I have never had an issue with traffic, other than when there's an avalanche that closes parts of the road. An avalanche would still affect any buses and/or trains that travel up the canyon in the winter, so building a train line or a bus lane would not help at all in weather related instances. On busy ski days, there may be more traffic at certain times in the morning and afternoon, but it's steady and is for only a short period of time. Also, building a train line or a bus lane would destroy the quiet and beauty that people LOVE about Little Cottonwood Canyon. The residents are happy with the way things are, and tourists appreciate the beauty as well. This appears to be a political and financial driven project.	Cottonwood Heights	03/16/2015
	I am afraid that too much weight will be given to the economics of this and too little to the environmental and recreational aspects. There is a limited capacity to the wasatch that no amount of additional transportation will change.	Cottonwood Heights	03/06/2015
	I am not convinced the Mountain Accord will meet its stated purposes. Stewardship: As an ecologist, I know that increased use of the canyons will cause wildlife and natural services (e.g., water quality) to suffer. Increased expansion of ski areas and trains will further reduce the ability to find peace and solitude within the Wasatch and will reduce habitat available to wildlife. Expanded lanes for buses and/or train system will further reduce the ability of the creeks to function naturally due to loss of floodplain habitat that helps to mitigate flood events and which serve as buffer areas that preserve water quality. Train use through tunnels could potentially disrupt wildlife use of adjacent areas (due to noise) and/or fragment migration corridors. Recreation: As rock-climber, hiker and backcountry skier, I am in favor of land swaps that consolidate public lands in backcountry access areas, but I strongly believe that Grizzly Gulch must remain undeveloped. I am also not in favor of further development of Silver Fork. The mix of backcountry access and low-glitz quality ski resorts are a draw for locals and tourists alike. If trains connected the majority of ski resorts within the Wasatch, it might severely strain the hell ski business. Environmentally-friendly transit: As an instructor of sustainability, I am not convinced that a train system is really the best option. There is very high cost of such a system at a time when there is great uncertainty regarding the future of snowpack in the Wasatch due to climate change, which translates into great uncertainty regarding tourism to ski areas. A very large amount of materials and energy is required to construct and maintain such a system, as opposed to expanding/improving bus service and encouraging carpooling and low-emission vehicle use via greater incentives. Construction is sure to have immediate and lasting impact on the landscape (see above comments). The lack of adequate transit stations along the proposed train route will do little to reduce hiker and backcountry skier use of personal vehicles, thus doing little to reduce air quality. (Recommendation: if trains are implemented, then increase transit stations along route and provide seasonal passes to public transit and/or major discounts on public transit when season ski passes are purchased.) I think a better option are electric buses (run on electricity generated from wind and solar) with increased incentives for use (see recommendation above) as well as a year-round in Big Cottonwood Canyon. I am not in favor of linking the Wasatch front and back via tunnels because I believe it will make traffic worse, not better.	Cottonwood Heights	03/16/2015
	I am very opposed to any further development in the Wasatch, particularly regarding the rail service. The more you give people the more they want and it will result in the entire range being developed with very little undisturbed areas for the protection of natural resources. More people drink more water skiing or otherwise and where will the water come from. This state needs to work on POPULATION control!	Cottonwood Heights	02/04/2015
	I believe that any plan for the Mountain Accord has to be integrated with the transit plan in the SL valley. I strongly support finding alternatives to the current travel options up the canyons. I believe a rail option is the best for LCC and that an electric or natural gas bus system up BCC and an electric or natural gas shuttle in MCC all make sense, but you need to link it to a plan other than parking garages at the mouths of each canyon.	Cottonwood Heights	03/09/2015
	I do not see how any of this would help our current condition, I only see this having negative effects. Why not invest in cleaner more fuel and emission efficient buses?	Cottonwood Heights	03/16/2015
	I like the blueprint - although it seems to be predetermined to utilize a train as the major transportation solution in LCC.	Cottonwood Heights	03/05/2015
	I like the idea of rail in the cottonwood canyons. I've tried to utilize the current bus setup from my home in Cottonwood Heights. On a moderate powder day the bus was over an hour late - and very difficult to get a seat in on the way home. I also truly support the hiking/biking trail that would connect Emigration Canyon to Summit Park. THIS makes sense. There is already an old road there to utilize. This sort of recreation expansion would benefit the Utah Outdoor Community year round - not just for a few months during winter.	Cottonwood Heights	04/29/2015
	I selected "don't know" on all of these questions because the proposed blueprint seems a bit too vague. At a high level, I like what the 10 page blueprint has to say, but when I drill down into the details I'm not sure I understand what is going to happen. Will our watershed really be protected? Will the environment really be protected? I like the idea of acquiring private land in order to retain accessibility, expanding the trail systems, etc. I cannot tell how mountain biking would be affected by various land designations, if additional opportunities would be available, or if we would lose trails.	Cottonwood Heights	03/06/2015
	I strongly oppose putting a light rail up Little Cottonwood Canyon and tunnels to connect the canyons. I also oppose any ski interlink between the resorts as proposed by One Wasatch. Transportation development should have a minimal impact on the environment, which these would not. I support using increased bus service for summer access to the canyons and use of Guardsman Pass to connect Big Cottonwood Canyon with Park City.	Cottonwood Heights	03/29/2015
	I teach paragliding and would love to see more access and more landing options for our pilots. With Wilderness areas we are not supposed to launch and land foot aviation which seems silly, would like to see some changes to encourage and allow non-motorized free flight.	Cottonwood Heights	03/12/2015
	I think it will be important to more explicitly state how the areas impacted by the transportation expansion will be protected into the future. Without such assurances and acknowledgments up front it seems these lands will be open to future development around them that could particularly harm the natural environment important to both wildlife and outdoor enthusiasts, particularly if they come from acquisition of private land. Whether real or perceived concern, it should be more adequately addressed.	Cottonwood Heights	02/04/2015

	<p>I was extraordinarily disappointed in the information given on transportation during the February 11th meeting. The information on hiking and biking trails was fine, albeit limited. It should have included which trails/trail sections were new versus which were being rebuilt and an example of what the new access points for all those trails will look like. When I learned that the keystone of this proposal was transportation I was excited. I was excited to hear that we were finally doing away with land swaps and right of ways across the mountainside and ridgelines and were instead going to replace it with a light-rail type of system. But then I thought, This system is going to be extraordinarily expensive at about \$100 M per mile and about 8 miles of boring to do that is \$800 M plus the 15 miles of rail line to connect to the light rail station in Sandy to Park City. Back of the napkin math brings the price of this piece of the line to \$1,000,000,000. This puts the per year bond cost at about \$67 M. Alta estimates that it has 2500 people per ski day and I will assume that it has 1250/day the rest of the year. I will also assume that the rest of the resorts have similar traffic levels. This means that there are approximately 2.5 million resort users up Big and Little per year. This means that every ticket would have to cost about \$26.50 to cover costs. So to take my family of three up the canyons for a day of skiing or hiking it will cost me \$80. THIS IS NOT REASONABLE. Thus, everyone will balk at the cost. We will then get the wilderness areas with some major subtractions. The Trails. The bus up Millcreek (should be done anyway). The building permits. The land swaps. And the Major Subtraction Ski-Link. Finally, I don't think that light-rail can handle the populations coming down the mountain in the afternoon. 236 people per car at absolute max and probably 165 skiers. On a peak day we will need about 60 cars up each canyon to bring the skiers down. Can rail handle that population? Can it do it safely? Can it handle peak loads in an affordable fashion? (i.e. minimum fall and spring loads will be around 1000 people per canyon with maximum winter loads of around 10,000. The traffic isn't near as stable as city traffic.) I would propose that ski-link (tunnel or gondola) gets banished from public discourse and the dream of linking the seven ski resorts (i.e. the public boondoggle) gets set out to the Great Salt Lake. If the ski resorts want an inter-connect they need to do it out of 100% private money and without affecting ANY public lands. If this involves a tunnel (and it must) then they need to pay 100% of the tunnel cost. A ski lift or gondola up both Big and Little (but not connecting any of the resorts) should be able to handle the traffic loads. If it has multiple drop off points then it can get all the other users (bikers, hikers, flower hunters, artists...) to within a reasonable distance of their destinations. Regarding Salt Lake giving up its water rights to snow making, I hope that SLC looks at this proposal under a 1/1000 year drought scenario. Over the 50 years this holds sway we will have a 1/20 chance of having that 1/1000 year drought. This means that the ski resorts need to be listed as the last in line on the water right.</p>	Cottonwood Heights	03/02/2015
	<p>I'm generally pleased with the research and planning efforts to this point. My concern is that the emphasis to date has focused almost solely on the future. I understand this is critical, but I believe there needs to be equal emphasis on the immediate concerns and issues (i.e. parking and transportation concerns). I believe it would be more beneficial to plan and make recommendations for the short term as well as long term.</p>	Cottonwood Heights	02/27/2015
	<p>It is not environmental stewardship to deteriorate our backcountry areas by ill-conceived connecting lifts that destroy watershed, wild land, hiking/biking terrain and natural habitat. A true "transportation solution" would not involve ski lifts - but would instead involve high-speed train transport up I-80 to Park City as well as up Fort Union to the mouth of Big Cottonwood and up 9400 S to Wasatch and the mouth of Little Cottonwood.</p>	Cottonwood Heights	02/06/2015
	<p>It seems like the Blueprint would work just fine for the people who stand to make the big bucks. I want to know how you propose to run light-rail transit up Big and Little Cottonwood canyons without sacrificing the integrity of the landscape? How do you propose to get light rail up the S-curve, for example, and how much footage on the side off to the side of the road, specifically, do you propose to take?</p>	Cottonwood Heights	03/09/2015
	<p>It seems to me that the Mountain Accord is prioritizing economic opportunity first, and then recreation QUANTITY. Other environmental and transit elements appear to be incorporated as a way to facilitate those first two priorities. The problem I see is that the existing trail infrastructure can only accommodate so many people before the quality of the experience and the environmental impacts become too great. The solution is not to create more connections between places (thus increasing the rate of people entering an area, but not the actual capacity of that area), and the solution is DEFINITELY not to take existing high quality wild areas and develop them. Those approaches only suit economic needs at the expense of the kind of long term stewardship that is required in the face of excessive population growth in Utah. The solution is to reduce vehicle traffic to existing recreation areas by implementing well-designed mass-transit, and to cap daily visitation rates to recreation areas to a level that can preserve the quality of the experience and minimize environmental and ecological issues. Remember, our drinking water comes from these canyons, and over developing these areas to increase economic potential will have the byproduct of increasing waste and pollution. Remember also that these wild areas are critical habitat for fish and wildlife, and that these populations are already constrained by urban-wildland development on all sides of the Wasatch Canyons. As we are faced with an increasing population in Utah, we cannot perpetually sacrifice our natural areas and our natural resources to accommodate limitless growth. The result will be that the very recreation opportunities that put Utah on the map will be degraded to a point that people won't want to compete with endless reserves of whatever remains of our resource. A skiing example is relevant here. Utah, hands down, has the greatest snow on Earth and everyone who skis or rides knows it. But what happens on an excellent ski day? Crowds descend on the resorts, and even with limits in place that resorts stop selling tickets when the parking lots fill, every slope becomes crowded and the experience is degraded. Does increasing the rate of people arriving at resorts (through mass transit and connections among ski areas) help preserve the quality of Utah ski resorts? Not at all. Nested around our developed areas are some absolutely incredible backcountry ski areas. Grizzly Gulch, in particular, is a skiing oasis. I am particularly concerned about the proposed connection between Alta and Brighton that would cross through all the backcountry areas between these resorts. These areas are one of a kind, and once developed, cannot be reclaimed. They also represent a very limited and precious resource. Utahns, in particular, collectively "own" these common wild areas and they are part of the heritage that defines the spectacular backdrop to our city and the amazing reputation Utah has as a recreation destination. Let us not lose sight of the value of these undeveloped areas as we struggle with the reality of population growth. If someone today were to propose that the canyons become endless housing developments, it would be immediately clear what a huge loss that would be for the state. Yet when small developments are proposed that slowly creep into wild areas, we are barely aware of what we are losing. Unfortunately, those small developments have cumulative effects and once the ball gets rolling, it is difficult or impossible to return to previous undeveloped conditions. With this proposal, we are the frog in a pot of water that is slowly being brought to a boil. Because changes happen so slowly, we don't even know we are in trouble until things have gone too far. The canyons and surrounding areas will always provide economic opportunities for the state of Utah. Therefore, rather than prioritize economic development in the blue print, it would be better to prioritize maintaining those high quality, currently undeveloped areas first, ensuring that ecological considerations are a top priority, and then fit in further development around those two main priorities. Stewardship of wild areas and natural resources provides a long term benefit. Development of those areas provides a short term gain (diminishing when crowds degrade the quality of the experience) and a long term loss (because recovering wild areas is infinitely more expensive than developing them in the first place).</p>	Cottonwood Heights	03/10/2015
	<p>It will not, simply put, accomplish anything positive.</p>	Cottonwood heights	03/17/2015
	<p>Just keep meeting and collaborating. Thank you for all this work.</p>	Cottonwood Heights	04/29/2015
	<p>Just leave the canyons wild!!!!</p>	Cottonwood Heights	04/30/2015
	<p>More frequent buses up the Canyons Not more lanes!</p>	Cottonwood heights	04/29/2015
	<p>Overall I am happy with the blueprint. My concern is with the transportation proposals.</p>	Cottonwood Heights	04/26/2015
	<p>People have to use it for it to be environmentally sustainable. I need more information before I can decide whether or not people will literally and figuratively get on board.</p>	Cottonwood heights	03/13/2015
	<p>Please, please, please, please do not put anymore infrastructure in our canyons. Even small changes, like the addition of cell towers in LCC, is disruptive and takes away from the reason we go in the mountains in the first place, to get away from it all. Adding roads, trains, infrastructure, etc. does not enhance this experience. The Wasatch is very small and making it smaller detracts from the experiences that are rapidly being taken away by expansion as it is.</p>	Cottonwood Heights	04/07/2015
	<p>restrict lift-served back-country/side-country/etc access. adding a tram to solitude from PC will seriously degrade back-country recreation for all by overloading traditional back-country areas. there is already a road that connects PC to BCC. run a bus for those that need to access BCC or LCC from PC. Keep lift served skiing in the ski resorts!</p>	Cottonwood heights	05/01/2015
	<p>Stop building stuff on the mountains. They are to remain rugged and beautiful, unless of course we as humans scar and ruin them.</p>	Cottonwood heights	03/27/2015
	<p>Thank you for all of the hard work. I am in full support of the light rail transit in LCC to/from Park City via tunnels. This option is head and shoulders better than other similar proposals. With regard to the light rail, I'm assuming this is a weather-independent solution: when powder panic hits, will this system prove to be the best possible transportation option? How will this system be designed to accommodate powder traffic volume while still being financially viable on typical days? As a mountain biker, I'm concerned with the access limitations we've created by transitioning extensive acreage to wilderness. This is particularly challenging along the lower elevation foothills. As we consider transitioning more land into the hands of the public, I support preservation but I think mtb access should be supported and expanded. The relatively small size of the central Wasatch allows for some amazing ride options to/from the Wasatch Front to the Wasatch Back. I have some concerns about the transportation system in the valley. I don't think we should expect folks from the UofU and/or Park City to drive and/or train it to State St. In Sandy in order to catch the light rail up LCC. The pickup station at the entrance to LCC will be a high volume station. We should be realistic with natural migration trending toward the shortest distance between points A and B. Generally speaking, I support mtb trails wherever possible. The Central Wasatch is the perfect size for epic-style rides to and from the Wasatch front/back/A/F/Provo Canyon. Similar to the situation with skiing, we have the potential to further develop and capitalize on the world-class nature of the area in regards to mountain biking.</p>	Cottonwood Heights	04/08/2015
	<p>The questions above do not seem to fit as the blueprint offers a plethora of ideas but hasn't YET solved anything.</p>	Cottonwood Heights	04/30/2015
	<p>The blueprint appears to put a priority on "economy," with changes that will financially benefit the few ski resorts. With the anticipated drought conditions and evolving weather patterns, it strikes me as irresponsible to underwrite new roads, tunneling, etc. to benefit a few businesses dependent on snow pack. I fail to see the benefit to skiers, other than saving some an hour's drive. You can only ski so many resorts in a day (i.e., only one). I personally enjoy the canyons for hiking and photography with the beauty, solitude, and cleaner air that they offer. Toward that end, I support public transportation and/or usage fees to limit individual cars. These approaches appear to work well at such places as Millcreek and American Fork Canyons (usage fees) and Zions National Park (public transportation available at parking lots).</p>	Cottonwood Heights	04/15/2015
	<p>The Blueprint could do "very well" in Recreation, Economy and Transit if we implemented the ONE Wasatch resort concept. Don't let this opportunity pass. It's been discussed for decades - Now let's do it. Get it on the table and on the Blueprint. We have used and abused the Wasatch for economic gain and basic needs since the pioneers. It always bounced back. With a few lifts and careful planning we can improve the recreation, economy and the transit while still protecting the natural resources.</p>	Cottonwood Heights	02/12/2015
	<p>The blueprint needs to answer to the people not to Mountain Accord. The people want better transportation but no expansion. I don't think a train is the answer. I think a canyon parking pass and a better bus system could solve the problem and not cause more impact to the canyons.</p>	Cottonwood Heights	03/02/2015
	<p>The connecting trails is a great to see, and in particular the BST is a huge part of the daily life of residents, and extended/finishing it would be fantastic. The additional transportation development obviously poses environmental concerns, but if they can be done with minimal impact, that would be desirable.</p>	Cottonwood Heights	02/05/2015
	<p>The current plan lacks detail to comment. Especially where lands are concerned. Before going any further that needs to be spelled out ASAP.</p>	Cottonwood Heights	02/04/2015
	<p>The destruction of Little Cottonwood Canyon for a Train or extra lanes is unacceptable. It would destroy the environment of the Canyon! Responsible stewardship of the land is NOT destroying it for extra lanes or a Train that very few will ride. A quality recreation experience is not going to happen in LCC with a Train coming through it or extra lanes creating hard barriers for dispersed users in places. A vibrant economy can not be achieved by destroying the Canyon they come to see, or saddling taxpayers with a huge bill for a Train. An environmentally sustainable transit system is more frequent buses.</p>	Cottonwood Heights	03/16/2015
	<p>The legacy of one of Utah's most important resources will be lost with this plan. Protection of our watershed for future generations will be jeopardized with the addition of rail on a new route up Little Cottonwood. I hear the goal of preservation of our watershed but a new corridor is a major disruption of the ecosystem. Connections of all the resorts will make us a copy of Europe instead of unique. I am a season pass holder and daily I hear Europeans praise the local feel of our resorts. This will be lost with the proposed expansion. Smart express buses on existing routes with parking solutions and transit hubs will enable growth with conservation.</p>	COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS	02/09/2015
	<p>The plans for a Train or widening the road in Little Cottonwood Canyon would destroy it. L.C.C. was too Environmentally Sensitive to hold events in the 2002 Olympics. Its a main source of water for many. The Little Cottonwood Canyon Trail is a very popular and has heavy use eight months out of the year. This Trail belongs to the people and is not to be destroyed to make Ski Resorts richer or give job security to UTA or Udote. Bus service in Little Cottonwood Canyon is not frequent enough and does not go into late spring, more buses is the answer. Employees of Ski Resort need to be required to ride a Bus.</p>	Cottonwood heights	03/13/2015
	<p>The prime objective of the accord should be to preserve and strengthen the watershed. The mountains are already overused for skiing. Improvements should be made in providing non skiing recreational use - better trail access and improved trails. Natural gas or electric bus access should be FREE with multiple stops for trail access during ski off season. Make car access expensive except for canyon residents or resort guests.</p>	Cottonwood heights	04/30/2015

	The stated purpose is not, in my strong opinion, even approached, much less met. A real plan to protect the canyons would have had a HUNDRED YEAR focus. This is a 40 year real estate professional's development plan for our mountains—not a protection plan of any kind, for any place, much less the mountains, in my assessment. Twenty years from now, we'll be back at the same tables wondering what happened, because neither wilderness nor watershed is addressed, in any substantive way, in a permanent fashion in this "blueprint." Let's also acknowledge the fact that "rail" is a 19th century solution to a 21st century problem. If this were anything other than a real estate scheme, you shouldn't have been DISCUSSING rail at any point; it's well established to be prohibitively expensive, particularly for "small" urban areas with almost no existing rail service. If this were anything other than a real estate development scheme, you would have been talking about designing rights of way, not "rail lines." A protection plan would have focused on developing a proper transportation "network" across all the counties in question, with much less emphasis on "getting to the X canyons" in particular, and more on a plan to make it possible for anyone to walk out of their home (regardless of "density") and walk to a transit stop within a block of that home, and be able to go to work or play anywhere on the Wasatch Front/Back, for either work or school, without getting into a car. A properly working network of that kind would serve the tourist trade JUST as well as it would Utahns, and it would do so year round. However, a "network" of that nature wouldn't push "dense development" in specific places. It would allow denser development to evolve naturally over time; and it wouldn't make developers much money. It's nice that so many people sat down at the table together, but in the end? The mountains are still at the mercy of those who would exploit them for short term financial gain, and those of us who rely on the mountains for water, etc. are left sitting at the end of an empty pipe.	Cottonwood Heights	03/03/2015
	there is zero need to connect the back with the front (by lift or tunnel), anything summit county (deer valley, vail) is doing is strictly for tourism. i'd gladly pay \$345 per year per person to NOT bring more tourists to the cottonwood canyons.	Cottonwood Heights	02/24/2015
	This is very interesting. I'm not sure that the transit system as proposed is financially sustainable. I don't understand the concept of looking for a solution in a vacuum that does not include what that solution would cost, or how that cost would be funded.	Cottonwood Heights	02/27/2015
	Too many concessions to resorts at the expense of the wilderness.	Cottonwood Heights	03/19/2015
	Too much concession is given to ski resorts. There should be no physical expansion outside physical boundaries in the Cottonwood Canyons.	Cottonwood Heights	05/01/2015
	Too much emphasis on the Cottonwood Canyons to Park City connection. This should be way down on the priority list of the transportation solutions.	Cottonwood Heights	04/27/2015
	Utilizing the existing transportation alignments as proposed makes the most sense. I don't think busses up the canyons with the exception of Parleys will be utilized. Rail or Aerial Tram/Gondola up Little with Aerial or tunnel to Big & PC makes the most sense to me.	Cottonwood Heights	02/11/2015
	We don't need more roads. We need viable mass transit. Trains and tunnels would be the best, albeit not the cheapest. The backcountry land would remain intact, and transportation would be solved. And if it eventually connects to the East side of the Range toward Heber, the mountains local population could now chose to live in a way cheaper community and help govern the population growth in the SLC Valley.	Cottonwood Heights	04/29/2015
	While I cannot say in regards to a "vibrant economy", what we have in the Wasatch Mtns /Cottonwood canyons / Park City area is priceless. Over the past 25 yrs however I have personally witnessed more traffic, more building, more congestion especially in Park City, but also in Big / Little canyons too. Preserve and protect should be the first priority. Clean, sustainable natural resources are why we moved here in the first place. Sadly that is slowly slipping from our grasp, and this winter is a precursor of what is to come with the advancement of Global Warming. An old line from a movie is fairly prophetic: "If you build it, they will come."	Cottonwood Heights	03/12/2015
	While I think the environmental analysis uses the best available scenarios for global warming, I'm concerned that too much planning is based on what the analysis admits is "uncertainty" for future precipitation amounts and forms. First of all, I think there's been too much linkage between regional population growth prognostications and growth in the skiing/snowboarding industry. My guess is that skiing and snowboarding user numbers are going to be essentially flat, if not decline, over the next fifty years. A lack of naturally falling snow and increasing difficulties in manufacturing artificial snow due to warmer nighttime temperatures are going to make skiing and snowboarding less appealing. Hence, we might not need dramatic transportation infrastructure. The Accord seems to assume the ski industry's rosy growth figures, which are self-serving, and which don't look at global warming with enough sobriety. I also question the overall regional population growth estimates: more difficult to find in northern Utah and as the public acknowledges that withdrawing Bear River water from Great Salt Lake would create more problems than benefits, water is going to limit population growth due to its dramatic increase in costs. Granted, we can generate a lot of "new water" via conservation, but there are limits to that resource. My guess is that a dramatic decrease in available water will not only dampen population growth. It's also going to upend centuries-old water law maxims that simply won't make sense. I realize how difficult it is to plan for "uncertainties" and I think the Mountain Accord is about as good as one could hope for in trying to balance competing interests. I do think, however, that it places too much emphasis on growth. I'm afraid that there's too much "if we build it, they will come" approach to transit projects; i.e. putting the cart before the horse. That growth might not materialize, and I'd suggest putting the most fanciful transit options (tunnels and rail) on the back burner. They might not be needed, and if we went ahead too soon, the environmental and financial costs would be tragically spent.	Cottonwood Heights	04/29/2015
	It seems like there is more concern to increase recreational use with the hope of generating additional revenue with only a nod to environmental concern. Perhaps it would be a better plan to limit or decrease winter mountain recreation, develop new economic opportunities from other sources and in the long run maintain, develop, and improve vital, life-giving resources of clean air and water. After all, tourism is a finicky, soft industry...bad air quality, adverse snow conditions, poor water supply, over crowded conditions (to name just a few) result in a poor tourism economy.	Cottonwood Heights City	02/20/2015
	The Blueprint will shift transportation from one overcrowded corridor system which will strain other transport corridors and put unsustainable numbers of people on the mountain tops. This is a very poor, if not disastrous, idea.	Cottonwood Heights City	04/21/2015
	The Mountain Accord fails to prioritize the various competing interests. For example, surely water resources take a higher priority than ski resort development.	Cottonwood Heights City	05/02/2015
	This is a real pretty brochure, but doesn't say much about the impact to the land, the existing trails and current residents. Some of the arguments in favor of running light rail up LCC include avalanche road closures, traffic, parking, pollution, etc. Unless you put this thing underground (which would be an exciting ride up, unless you consider intermittent windows or views into the canyon) then it doesn't do anything different than a CNG bus would do, which aren't crowded now. If you're going to do a project of any scale, do it right and spend the money to build a tunnel and have the train/components engineered correctly so you don't fup the canyon. LCC is amazing, don't ruin the trails (especially the quarry trail). This needs to be low-profile, low-impact (including quiet), etc. or leave it alone. Are you going to close the road to vehicles? Is the train going to be mandatory? If not, what is different than CNG buses ... think and plan beyond a marketing scheme, please	Cottonwood Heights, San Francisco	03/12/2015
	Highest priority must be given to protection of the watershed and what remains of our natural environment, with a much lower priority for increased economic development (i.e. inter-connected ski areas). Improved bus transportation, subject to seasonal demand is important and appears to be properly addressed. All existing federal lands should remain federal lands to receive the best protection for the natural environment.	Cottonwood Heights, UT	04/18/2015
	It is very important to me that the remaining natural environment be preserved in the Cottonwood canyons and that actions be taken to limit further degradation.	Cottonwood Heights, UT	04/18/2015
	The details are missing, but that is probably to be expected at this stage. It's not clear how the grand plan will be implemented, enforced, funded. I have three primary concerns: Watershed, watershed, watershed.	Cottonwood Heights, Utah	03/05/2015
	Regarding traffic, I support the approach of incentivizing public transportation (free) and de-incentivizing auto traffic. That is a bullet point, so obviously it is being looked at, but changing the habits with the most damage. Regarding Little Cottonwood Canyon, any plan which negatively altered climbing access would be poorly received. It is such a part of the jewel which is Little Cottonwood and too much is already restricted (or blown apart). Thank you!	Cottonwood Heights, Utah	05/01/2015
	The "blueprint" fails to define where the tracks component would be located within little cottonwood canyon. I have read it several times, I have attended meetings, and I have never had this question answered by anyone associated with this proposal. However, I have learned through extensive research that the answer of Mountain Accord is to build a rail line up the south side of Little Cottonwood Creek. No wonder Mountain Accord does not include that information in its "report". Sandwiching the creek between the existing road and a tracks line on the south side of the creek entirely ruins the outdoor get-away nature of the unique access the valley residents have to our wonderful mountains. The mountain experience will be entirely ruined forever. Decedful! The multiple choice questions are a carefully calculated facade designed to trick the public into answering generic feel good questions in a way that supports a hidden agenda without revealing the truth so that an informed public survey will garner real responses. I entirely reject the proposal of a rail system going up the south side of little cottonwood creek. Such a rail system will entirely end the canyon I visit at least 2 weekends and 2 weekdays of every month. Reveal the truth, publish the truth, and start over. If you do not want to reveal the truth, it is because you know the public reaction will be overwhelmingly negative. Suggestion: Put the rail system under the existing road. A double deck approach. You get your rail under an avalanche protection cover, and we keep our canyon reasonably accessible.	Cottonwood Heights, Utah	03/15/2015
	Any proposal that promotes more visitor days is counter productive. The Wasatch is a resource limited environment. It is already over capacity in terms of use. The current Wilderness areas provide limited Wilderness Experience, the remaining is beat and over run. Promoting further use will only exacerbate the current problems. Maintaining or enhancing the economic potential is the real rub. My experiences in the Wasatch do not need enhancement to benefit someone else's pocket boot. That includes State Government. Further development or build out of the Wasatch will not achieve the stated goals, as noble as they sound. This proposal is an attempt to have our cake and eat it too. What I propose is far more draconian, user limits need to be put in place. This will become more necessary as the use increases. Major Rivers already have a lottery system for permitting access in which users seem to support. As it stands, the Mountain Accord proposal is only kicking the can down the road.	Cottonwood heights	02/05/2015
	As Background, I moved to Cottonwood Heights from Boston because the access to both backcountry and resort recreation could be so quick and easy. I Backcountry, I hike and Bike in the canyons 4-5 times per week and also have a pass to Snowbird/Alta and ski there 1-3 days per week. I am also a financial analyst and understand the economic implication of this study Overall I think the blueprint is a decent compromise where all parties give up some ground so that the canyons can succeed for everyone - Tunnels with bus/train service would be the ideal way to transport from LCC to BCC to PC and I suggest they be implemented first. This would relieve some traffic from the road up the canyon without having to add additional lanes - Preserving grizzly gulch should not be a "maybe" and must be part of the land swap to make it an equitable exchange. There are times I am on Patsy Marley and can see more people recreating in Grizzly than on lifts at alta. Keeping grizzly will keep BC skiers coming to LCC and SLC - Its unclear to me how rail/2 dedicated lanes of bus service would fit in LCC without having a major effect on the landscape of the canyon. I do not think a 4 lane highway or raised rail is "responsible stewardship of the natural resources" and would be a visual detriment to the beauty of the canyon - Mary Ellen should be preserved with the true wilderness that the greater american fork canyon is. This is a 4 season recreation area for many people seeking a more true backcountry experience that cannot be had in the cottonwoods due to the high level of development and traffic. LCC in particular already has significant development and that development should be contained to LCC and not sprawl into American fork. There are also many snowmobilers who are not allowed in LCC/BCC - Additionally, Snowbird is already a massive resort and no visitors I talk to see any need for it to be bigger. Most tourists hardly scratch the surface of their terrain. Additionally Snowbird already has a hard time keeping its existing terrain open due to avalanche danger and would likely have a very hard time opening Mary Ellen on top of their current terrain. - I think a plan to relocate the powderbird heli operation out of the LCC/BCC ridge line should be included in the plan long term. As the population and backcountry use increases there is just not enough room along that specific ridgeline for touers and helicopters. The Helicopters can easily fly a bit further while touers cannot, yet the huge touring population contributes significantly to the local economy and they should not be deterred from the canyon For more detail my cell is 617-459-8789 and my email is nicholasvasquez2@gmail.com	Cottonwood Heights	02/10/2015
	Given experiences in other areas, I believe that simply providing light rail and other transit options will not be enough to change behavior. I would consider park and ride options using the "congestion charge" technology used in London or Oslo. This would mean that cars still wishing to drive up the canyons would have to pay a fee to do so. This is done on line with no toll booths. Automatic license plate recognition systems monitor the car entering the canyon and a charge made. The owner would have to pay the charge before the end of the day or set up a auto credit card payment, which is what most people do in London. You only pay when you enter the charging zone. Administration is kept to a minimum. It does force drivers to consider the cost of taking their car or parking and riding. The cost of parking and riding needs to be lower than taking the car. The income from the "congestion charge" can be used to subsidize the transit price. You retain the flexibility for people who need the car, young families, people with mobility problems. Without it, transit facilities will not get economic use.	Deer Valley part of year. Otherwise London	02/05/2015
	I don't think that environmental protection is being achieved when the proposal calls for huge transit up the Canyons.	Denver	03/03/2015
	As a tax paying snowboarder, I find any expansion of Alta extremely offensive. How dare you try to even further limit accessibility in the Wasatch. This plan is a direct attack on snowboarders and shows the extent that discrimination is accepted in Utah.	Don't worry about it	04/30/2015
	Buses are not a solution. They sit in the same traffic delays. Plus they stop running at 5:30. Can't have dinner after skiing. Can't socialize. They are ridiculous in their current use. I would like to see an ELEVATED electric monorail similar to Disney world so the impact on the ground is minimal. Little noise to disturb the animals, safer from avalanches, does not clog road. Something that can even be used by commuters in PC and Heber to quickly reach technology jobs in Draper and Lehi	Draper	04/30/2015

	Forest Service designation of public lands is adequate - additional designations are not appropriate given the proximity of these lands to a major population center and increase in demand to use these resources. Current Blueprint does not adequately how to address the expected increase in population and demand to access the public lands ... an improved trail network is good, but it does not address increased demand on picnic areas, campgrounds, ski areas, parking and backcountry uses. The blue print should address how to responsibly accommodate the expected increase in demand through identifying areas for additional parking, picnic areas, acceptable ski area expansion areas, improved access to backcountry areas, campgrounds, etc. The current blueprint seems slanted to placing more restrictions on public lands rather than providing a plan to provide more access to public lands in a way that minimizes the impact and helps to preserve the wonderful resource we have. Public lands belong to the public and the blueprint should be facilitating public access and use in a responsible, sustainable way. More restrictions are not in the best interest of the public at large, but the few who do not desire to share the backcountry in particular with others. We have great resource here. People come from all over the world to use it. In my opinion the blueprint needs to strive to make it convenient to access and use, but do so in a manner that minimizes the impact on the resource. Improved transportation linked to Park City and improvement of infrastructure to support the coming increase in demand need more of a priority than acquiring the private lands and placing more restrictions on public lands.	Draper	04/30/2015
	Full disclosure: I don't ski. But the idea of great driving routes through the central Wasatch is exciting. I would travel between Park City and the Salt Lake metro more often because the drive would be fantastic. More people would visit the mountains year-round, bringing business to the ski resorts. Instead of being out-of-the-way, the central Wasatch could become the most beautiful part of a well-connected Salt Lake City metro.	Draper	02/04/2015
	How is it that relatively recent changes in resort ownership happen to benefit so positively from exploiting our natural resources? Like many concerned citizens I fail to see any benefit from the transportation proposal in this plan.	Draper	05/02/2015
	I can't imagine this valley without it's little cottonwood canyon just as it is.	Draper	05/01/2015
	I would love to see large park n rides at the bottom of the cottonwood canyons with increased bus service, more stops at trailheads, and avalanche bridges.	Draper	02/04/2015
	In the whole Mountain Accord process locals need to be realistic that intensive development in the alpine watershed has a real impact on the watershed and that Wasatch Front population will grow and snowpack will become increasingly unreliable. The NY Times article at the bottom is worth a read because the Wasatch Front will start hitting California style water limits in the next couple of decades. We need to do all we can to preserve our watershed. Linking Big and Little Cottonwood to the Summit Co city style intensive development and million dollar lots will pressure the watershed greatly. What Canyons Resort did to destroy their watershed should be a big red flag for the 600K people who rely on Big and Little Cottonwood for water. We can afford the same mistakes in the more critical watersheds. Take a look at the quality of East Canyon Stream over the past 2 decades. It went from a high quality fishery to a EPA impaired waterway. The headwaters are in Canyons Resort and intensive alpine development crushed that stream. Take a look at before and after photos and some snippets from water quality studies on East Canyon. <a href="https://www.facebook.com/pages/Stop-Skilink/188174407941048?sk=photos_stream">https://www.facebook.com/pages/Stop-Skilink/188174407941048?sk=photos_stream</a> Specific feedback is that SL County Watershed managers ought to have a huge voice in the entire process. I think that smarter parking policies in Big and Little Cottonwood can go a long way. 3, 4 or more in a car get good parking while solo drivers park in distant spots or pay a fee like JHMR. LPG or CNG powered buses in combo with more expensive and restrictive parking can solve much of the traffic issues. A train on a separate alignment is too expensive and too impactful to the watershed and viewed in LCC. Linking LCC and BCC creates risk and development pressure in the critical watershed. "The idea, at least until the latter part of the 20th century, was that water would be cheap and plentiful and the focus was on developing new supplies," said Heather Cooley, water program director for the Pacific Institute, an environmental research group based in Oakland. "Folks realize we have now reached the limits of supply, so the focus is on demand." <a href="http://www.nytimes.com/.../california-drought-tests-history-...">http://www.nytimes.com/.../california-drought-tests-history-...</a>	Draper	04/05/2015
	None, but I did want to comment on the transit up Little Cottonwood to Park City. I think that this is a genius solution and totally support it.	Draper	02/05/2015
	Schoonover no trails and no tunnels in our canyons. you can get more buses. thanks	Draper	03/12/2015
	Stewardship of our Watershed Health and Recreation Resources vs Killing the Goose that laid the Golden Egg. Elements of the Wasatch Accord "proposed blueprint" are very good, but some of the options still under consideration represent significant short sighted folly, in my view. Notable positives include the transfer of private land to public in exchange for specific, discreet and thoughtful ski area base camp development makes sense. It provides certainty for the preservation of both watershed health to important holdings, and certainty to the resorts for base camp support facilities that can be developed with best management practices in mind for protection of water quality (rather than ad hoc and less planned dispersed development). However, several options on the transportation table will almost certainly exceed the carrying capacity of a healthy watershed, resulting in degradation of the mountain recreation experience and healthy watershed. While the Wasatch Accord and blueprint study notes the trips to the Wasatch are nearly 2x that of Zion NP and population pressure is expected to increase many times over in the future, all but one of the transit alternatives are based on the premise that added transportation of more people is better. Quite the contrary. Look at the heralded success of Zion. Leadership and stewardship of the Wasatch would emulate that successful approach of managed access to retain the recreation experience and health of the ecosystem. Notably, Zion does not have the same pristine drinking water supply water quality resource to protect, yet the value of a reliable and high quality water supply in the Wasatch will increase dramatically to supply the growth in the region. The only sustainable transportation options are those which recognize and honor the healthy population carrying capacity of the mountain watershed, both in terms of vehicles coming up the canyon, but also in the safe number of people who can and should be "extracting" recreational resource value from the area. Do we want an experience that boasts 80,000 persons on the mountain a day with respective "footprint" of deleterious impact on the recreation and local environment, or a healthy experience which boasts a quality recreation and quality watershed health? The transportation decision we make will dictate the protection or diminution of our resource, and respective value we receive in return. What is the healthy carrying capacity, and what is the transportation management scheme which assures that? That is the question and strategy we should follow.	draper	02/15/2015
	The proposal relieves economic congestion to the Park City area, in exchange for land protections surrounding the Park City area. It 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, developers will benefit wildly with large property/business owners, while local, Salt Lake Valley people stand little to gain.	Draper	03/06/2015
	There's a good existing trail connect from Big Cottonwood canyon (at the elbow on the Guard Road) to the top of PCMR. Including this option would improve your regional/recreational trail connections solution	Draper, Utah	02/10/2015
	Outstanding, comprehensive solution - well done!	Draper, Utah	02/09/2015
	Less development the better for canyons. Continue to work on trails and transit to reduce impact.	East Millcreek	05/02/2015
	I absolutely support the blueprints proposal of a train providing access to the canyons. Taking as many cars and buses off the narrow canyon roads would decrease pollution, lower the number of accidents, decrease congestion in the canyon and provide Utah with a unique approach to mountain access that doesn't exist anywhere else in the world. Being able to take a train from downtown to so many world class resorts would be a huge differentiation from other competing winter sports venues across North America and the globe. Let's make it happen!	East Millcreek Township	02/05/2015
	Untouched areas are what I want to see more of. Less transport and especially less over to Summit County. Don't ruin Summit County like you already have to the Canyons and SLC.	Echo, UT	04/16/2015
	The maps are a little difficult to read. More interactive maps (like ski areas have) would be helpful. There are features through ESRI and others that allow you to hover over a portion of the map and have something that is geo tagged to pop up a detail that gives more information. I know these are intended to be very general but some of the ideas like transfer of private land across the Hwy from Alta could easily be depicted this way. I did not see a cost analysis any where in your presentation. Even a just some general figures like How much is Rail per mile? How much is dedicated bus lanes per mile? How much are gondolas per mile? tunnels? Where will the money come from is where the rubber meets the road. Feds, State, resorts, general public (locals and tourists) all play a huge role in how we pay for this.	eeefrum	02/05/2015
	I feel a transit corridor with light rail or something similar is essential to this plan	Fruit Heights	04/21/2015
	A realistic, more economically feasible solution for Little Cottonwood Canyon needs to be implemented. Connecting canyons via tunnels is unnecessary and very expensive. The exact same statement can be made for the construction of a light rail. Utilizing natural gas powered buses that can respond to the demand is a much more environmentally and economically responsible. The purpose of Mountain Accord seems to be striving for economic development and less interested in conservation and minimizing impact. To be honest, I am disappointed in what has been proposed thus far. I had hope that Mountain Accord was well aligned with my goals for the Central Wasatch. Now it seems clear that it is just another proposal to make money for the state in the long run.	Granite	02/12/2015
	Current signage indicating avalanche-related canyon closure is insufficient to inform idiots and enthusiasts alike.	Granite	03/15/2015
	I am concerned about the environmental impacts of a rail line going from Sandy or Cottonwood Heights up Little Cottonwood Canyon. This seems to allow economics to trump the environment and I believe that there are more effective as well as cost-effective ways to achieve the same results.	Granite	04/05/2015
	I have grown up in the shadows of Little Cottonwood Canyon. When I went through my divorce I found a lot of peace and solace on the trails I grew up on. My friends and I have done group dates or hikes up those trails. I went trail running with a good friend on the quarry trail. The community loves those mountains, please don't ruin them by increasing traffic and destroying the landscape with more man made items. One of the things that keeps Utah unique is our beautiful mountains, I can get to Park City in 45 minutes from my house. I have been rock climbing in both Parley's and Little Cottonwood and there is a huge difference between the two. One is peaceful and beautiful and one is loud and busy. Please don't ruin one of the best things about Utah to save people 15 minutes of driving time.	Granite	03/15/2015
	The blueprint is truly ridiculous. I live at the mouth of Little Cottonwood and I have rarely seen the canyon as crowded as you say it is in the photos contained in the blueprint. I drive up weekly and there is never any traffic. Did you take the photos on days the canyons were closed due to storms or avalanche control? It's almost comical. BCC and LCC just simply aren't crowded. I strongly oppose any building of tunnels or byways through to Park City. Stay out of some of the most beautiful canyons in the country.	Granite	02/04/2015
	You're hearing from an 88 year-old skier who has skied all over the world. I applaud the Mountain Accord initiatives. Only pro-active intelligent analysis will preserve the extraordinary Wasatch natural resources. In particular I would like to focus on the Albin Basin and Alta complex. With the authority of my world-wide experience I can proclaim that there is nothing like it anywhere. It should be preserved as it is. It could easily be developed in ways that would destroy its unique character. Please preserve this jewel for future generations. There are plenty of other locations that are willing and able to support development.	Greenwich, CT	02/06/2015
	the term "responsible" is subject to ones interpretation depending on ones view point. It is possible for some one not in tune with our historic view to say that what is proposed is not responsible in light of a view point which says there should be more development of the Alta Town area.	Greenwich, CT. 06831	02/05/2015
	Digging tunnels is NOT the solution!! We need to incentivize people to use the already existing transit, ie if you ride the bus to ski you get X off your ticket/pass...or creating a lane that is strictly bus access so if we drive we can see the obvious benefit to taking the bus. A tunnel to Park City is not cost or environmentally effective...why not work to create a routine all day bus system up/down Parley's that would not only serve skiers but also people that work in PC/SLC. Bottom line, unfortunately, we are a very "ME" focused society, so we need to find a way to convince people that using public transit is beneficial to "ME", ie. I can do work and respond to txt and email on my way to ski and take care of business so my ski day can be that much longer, and I don't risk being a distracted driver!	Heber	05/01/2015
	The Accord addresses a number of Wasatch Back goals concerning development Vs stewardship. To me that language is optimistic in Park City and a dream for Wasatch County. I do not have the feeling that Wasatch County currently posses the ability to implement anything but unlimited growth. Which I was wrong...	Heber	04/01/2015
	Forget about it and don't waste tax money. There is more than enough bureaucracy already.	Heber City	02/10/2015
	I feel that the human footprint in wilderness areas has already encroached on wildlife to an unacceptable level. Even though I am an avid skier, I am not in favor of ski resort expansion into any additional area, regardless is the area is already "side country". The loss of Grizzly Gulch to Alta is unacceptable. My recommendation for mass transit and private transit up the canyons is to increase the availability of the ski bus to run all year long. Can we convert the buses to use propane or in the future, electricity? As for private transportation... lets ban single passenger vehicles from the canyons and charge a fee to any car pool that is not using an electric or hybrid vehicle. We need to get serious about air quality and decreasing greenhouse gas emissions before it is too late.	Heber City	04/09/2015
	I like all aspects of the proposed action. However, I suggest revising the format of you document to make it easier to read. I use a 23 inch monitor on my desktop. Your choice of a very wide format for each page is very difficult to read when I get the font to a readable size (11 to 12 point). I am constantly scrolling from side to side. On any screen of a smaller size, it is going to even more difficult. Do not make potential proponents ignore your message due to this format.	Heber City	02/10/2015
	On the face of it, it is a compromise, not necessarily bad, between the resorts versus taxpayer burdens and encroachment on limited wild lands near SLC. If the build out of new developments (these will inevitably become towns and perhaps small cities) can be kept in check, a centralized condo/hotel area is not a bad tradeoff. The high alpine areas will not support more of the mega-home development that this plan is a precursor to.	Heber City, Utah	04/14/2015
	I think it looks good as is. I prefer the current blueprints and I am happy that there is little housing and a lot of protected lands, increased transportation and recreational use areas.	Herriman	04/30/2015

	The blueprint uses misleading terms to describe the transportation corridor between Big Cottonwood canyon and Park City. It is not clear that existing public watershed land would be impacted and potentially lost forever if such a corridor were built. The blueprint should include a path to charge for private transportation in the Cottonwood canyons. With this option in place, public transportation becomes a means to limit vehicular impact on the canyons.	Herriman	04/30/2015
	I think all you are doing is destroying the Pristine mountains that the Utah born locals Like myself grew up in and love.For Commercial profit and hiding it behind a veil of environmental issues to do it. If this organization had any desire to preserve the wasatch mountains It would limit development in these places that people should only be invited to visit. Not stay There is nothing here preserving Utah's public interest all of these proposals only serve the interest of Utah politicians that are bowing down to slip up some of Colorado/California investor profits via taxes this is why the federal government wants to take it from you.I am not much for federal government meddling in state affairs. But I think in Utahs case big brothers/uncle Sam is right. This seems like a lot of very greedy people that can not see the forest through the trees and they see the dollar signs through those trees and are willing to tear them down to get a better view of those dollars. Asking for public input as though it matters we see the development of parking lots and such that will just coincidentally and conveniently lie in with your mass transit routes (train) that has not been approved yet.	Herriman	02/10/2015
	I think the plans need to recognize that the canyons are used in three distinct ways: 1--Summer. Fewer visitors doing many different things. Parking lots are often full. People are going to many various locations. Traffic is not a major problem (now) but access points are generally insufficient. Note full lots at most hiking trails, notably those in the Albion Basin. 2--Winter, typical day. Current transportation and access seems to be working well. 3--Winter, holiday and weekend. This is the current problem. Too much traffic and environmental impact. However, this really is only a few days a year. Also, the plans do not consider the need for additional restrooms. In the summer, there are very few restroom facilities (none at Brighton resort). This is ironic since dogs are not allowed in the canyon. However, human waste is certainly being left throughout the area, especially in the summer.	Herriman, UT	03/11/2015
	I have lived all of my life in Cottonwood Heights and Little Cottonwood Canyon. Specifically I lived in Little Cottonwood Canyon in Wasatch Resort for 17 years. In my opinion the goals of preserving the recreation experience, watershed, and unique beauty are not being met by your proposed actions with light rail transit up Little Cottonwood Canyon and connecting to Park City. It appears that you say that you are looking out for the environment, but actually 95% of the system groups were those who would benefit economically from this new transit line. This proposed action will only detract from the experience in these canyons. There are already a lot of people who visit these canyons. The mountain accords proposal will just bring more people and congestion. You won't be able to enjoy the peace of nature anymore. Rather it will be a place of constant movement and noise. There will be no tranquility left. It appears that those who stand to benefit the most are the ski resorts and other groups that are economically invested as well. This is truly not about air quality or preserving the wilderness. In fact it is the exact opposite. It looks more like a parasitic relationship where one benefits and the other one is harmed. How can blasting through the mountain be beneficial for our watershed and the wildlife? It appears that the Wasatch Front will stand to lose a very valuable and irreplaceable resource just so that a few economic groups can benefit. This is not the right thing to do. I am a skier who enjoys the ski resorts in Little Cottonwood Canyon, but I do not believe that this proposal is the answer to traffic concerns. The only thing it will accomplish if it makes certain groups more money at the expense of our canyons. Please consider my comments when making these decisions. My grandfather fought for the environment and the water in Little Cottonwood creek when I was a child. My mother has also worked with the Forest Service and fought to preserve the water in Little Cottonwood Creek. A study was done by Brigham Young University's Biology Department which linked the de-watering of the creek to certain environmental changes in the mouth of the canyon. My point is that certain consequences can't be mitigated away no matter how much you try to rationalize them. I feel it is in my opinion a biased proposal because of so many conflicts of interest. It really makes me feel depressed that my children will not be able to enjoy the same Wasatch front that I grew up in. Instead of being a place of refuge and peace from city life, it will be just a continuation of it just a little higher up. Please look into other alternatives that do not have such an environmentally devastating impact. For example what about a shuttle service up the canyon like they have in Muir woods CA and in Zion National Park.	Highland	03/06/2015
	I like the idea of buying up private land for to protect and increased environmental protection for other lands. I am strongly against selling off parts of the LLC to be privately owned. I don't like the proposal for a train and tunnel in little cottonwood canyon and an aerial connection between big cottonwood canyon. there should not be any new lifts, trams, or gondolas allowed in LLC and BCC, or anywhere on public land along the wasatch. Trams, lifts and gondolas, and high rise condos all pollute the landscape and take away from the experience of being outdoors. Guardsman's pass already connect BCC to park city, why not just pave the dirt sections and plow it in the winter and only allow busses to connect people along guardsman's pass?A train is just flat out excessive and would be way to disruptive to the mountain environment. I think a better idea would be to have something similar to what they do at Zions national park, where you park and take the bus to where you want to go and no cars are allowed. You could have a big parking garage where the current park and ride is at the base of BCC and have busses that go up both canyons all day and restrict all cars, or add a significant fee to drive a car up like \$30 or something.	Highland	04/16/2015
	please not add. Train and All lifts to our mountains.....	Highland	04/16/2015
	The fastest growing area along the Wasatch Front is Utah County, and this is where a third of the Wasatch Front lives today. I would like to see more options for getting to the ski areas from Utah County. For instance, a single ski lift and parking lot near Tibble Fork Reservoir in American Fork Canyon to Mineral Basin/Snowbird may alleviate drive traffic up to LCC/BCC/PC by a third.	Highland	03/12/2015
	Very against trading current public lands for private lands.	Highland utah	02/07/2015
	Alleviating traffic congestion and parking problems - Install gondolas and large parking lots at the mouths of Big and Little CC's, similar to Canyons Resort and Breckenridge. Vibrant Economy - Launch a marketing campaign to convince the world that Utah is not as stodgy and restrictive as many think. Utah resorts have neglected season after season many things that Colorado has done right. Excellent guest services, ample parking, a live and let live culture, business partnerships that help offset the cost of travel (Frontier Airlines), competitors, low season pass prices, the list goes on. The Mountain Accord is a ruse to build and sell million dollar cold beds. Give this up, and start attracting more visitors through the things mentioned above, and not attracting a few "one percenters".	Holladay	03/11/2015
	Be careful not to destroy the resource you are trying to protect. I am opposed to aerial links between the resorts. If tunnel links are to be built, let them become the primary access to the Cottonwood Canyon resorts via high-capacity rail to Park City via Parley's Canyon. Yes, that would be greater distance to Snowbird or Solitude, but it could be quick (and certainly more than competitive with Colorado resort access), and it would prevent aesthetic destruction of the Cottonwood Canyons by adding more rail/bus/bike lanes, etc. Please make sure that hikers will still have easy access to the many trailheads in the Cottonwood Canyons. The ski resorts are not the only destinations. I like the Millcreek model of charging for access.	Holladay	04/24/2015
	Because of the current transportation bottlenecks, I would suppose that a limited number of people recreate in the mountains. If transportation was eased-how would the increased user traffic look? I'm not sure that the increase in users has been considered- both from an environmental standpoint-both wilderness use as well as private ski area use.	Holladay	02/04/2015
	Building a rail line up Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons with supporting shops and lodging will significantly increase the number of people in the canyons, especially those who would not otherwise make an effort to enjoy our mountains absent the new conveniences. While an increase in the number of people in our canyons is sure to increase the monetary economies surrounding those canyon rail stops, the environment and recreation will suffer drastically. A rail line in the canyon means that one cannot ride a bicycle in the canyon. A rail line will also increase canyon congestion rather than decrease it because mountain enthusiasts often carry supplies and equipment in their cars that are needed at the trailhead. Casual mountain visitors are unlikely to have mountain stewardship in mind when visiting and will increase the amount of garbage and erosion in the canyon and vastly increase non-monetary economic costs with regard to energy and valuable natural resources.	Holladay	04/30/2015
	Dog owners in Salt Lake City currently have very limited options for exercising with their dogs in the mountains. Presently, the only areas south of I-80 in Salt Lake County are the front range areas and Millcreek Canyon. It's too hot to hike with dogs much of the year on the western front of the mountains. Closing Millcreek Canyon to private vehicles will make A LOT of people very unhappy because these people now exercise themselves and their pets there. Go up to Dog Lake any summer evening and see how many people are there solely because their dogs are allowed. No shuttle system is going to allow dogs. If anything, more areas should be opened to dogs as the culture changes to more responsible ownership -- no chasing wildlife, picking up poop.	Holladay	02/06/2015
	Get going ASAP, especially with the transportation systems we're gridlocked now enough as it is with the "red snake" in LCC. Build that rail! Thanks	Holladay	02/04/2015
	I appreciate the way you are getting so many agencies involved, as well as the citizens of the community. I'm glad to see that this isn't a plan that only reflects the desires of one group - the environmentalists, for example. It seems to me you are asking all the right questions and taking into account the economic interests, the transportation needs, the desire for wholesome recreation, as well as protection of the environment. Thank you for your efforts. One concern I have is regarding the interests of private parties. It appears that the lands targeted to go from private to public are owned by ski resorts who are willing to make the exchange for better access to their remaining property. That's great. If additional land is needed, please be very careful with land owned by private citizens. I am a strong believer in the rights of land owners and would be disappointed to hear of any hostile take-over of privately held land. Please try to ensure that all concerned parties are willing participants. Thank you again for your efforts!	Holladay	04/30/2015
	I like that there is thought being taken to solving the problems. However, because so much of the Blueprint includes next steps as "evaluation", I think it's difficult to comment on what direction is the correct direction at this point. I would love to see what the "evaluations" yield. I don't like the idea of connecting BCC to LCC to PC off the bat, as proposed here. But I do like the idea of disincentives for cars in the canyons, paying for parking in the canyons, and increased options for better, more reliable, more efficient public transportation in the canyons. These are the things that I think everyone can take immediate action on with a positive impact to pollution and congestion. And, it'll make the user experience in the canyons more enjoyable (less car noise, less pollution, less fear of being hit while running, riding, etc. less parking congestion, fewer wrecks). The reason I'm not excited about the connection between LCC/BCC/PC is the general impact of creating additional roadways, which would seem counter-intuitive to the overall goal of preserving the recreation experience.	Holladay	04/29/2015
	I think the economic goals of the plan are not in keeping with the environmental goals of the plan and of many citizens who do NOT want the natural areas corrupted with economic developments.	Holladay	02/20/2015
	I think the major goal should be to connect Park City with a train system. No one wants to take rapid bus transit. The most enjoyable way to get up the canyon is on a train. Think of how Switzerland does this. Kimball Junction is the area where most tourism occurs and should have better access. Mountain Deli is also an area of interest. Eventually the train could connect through the mountains to the Big/Little canyon resorts. Let's keep people moving through the downtown Salt Lake area and up to the canyons. not have them take off from Sandy. There are fewer tourists or locals that head up the canyon from there. All the convention people and air passengers would love a way to visit Park City on a train from downtown. Have you considered new technology like "Air-Tube" that will be available soon. That would be a high tech draw and possible better cost alternative?	Holladay	02/04/2015
	It is difficult to know the economic and environmental sustainability of the proposed plan as speculation/projection is a major variable.	Holladay	04/16/2015
	It seems you are looking to make money for yourselves.	Holladay	04/04/2015
	It's unbelievable to think you would consider making any kind of tunnel system, how is that being a steward of these mountains.	Holladay	03/15/2015
	Linking Park City with the Wasatch mountains is ridiculous and would devalue the Wasatch ski experience. Transit issues in the cottonwoods is fair to address but please don't make Millcreek Canyon have a shuttle. Protection of the backcountry is key.	Holladay	04/28/2015

	<p>My first comment would be that the whole Blueprint seems to lead back in some way to "we need a train up the canyon" and is entirely too transportation focused. While the transportation issues are certainly huge, I am concerned that "every trail of bread crumbs" leads to there. Yes, big Federal money comes with transportation solutions but I was hoping this effort would be much more than that. While it does address other things, the over-arching transportation issues seem to overshadow those recommendations. For the sake of full disclosure, I was a member of the environment system group representing my then employer, Salt Lake County (no longer my employer). I was involved in the Mountain Accord from the start and previously-named iterations - the Wasatch-Summit Project and in many of the studies leading up to this current effort such as the Mountain Transportation Study. As a Planner for Salt Lake County, I also dealt extensively with the ski resorts from early 2007 until late 2014 and was working on new general plans for the Wasatch Mountains of unincorporated Salt Lake County and revisions to the FCOZ Ordinance when I left my position in November 2014 for another opportunity. Let's just say that I have considerably more background on this project than your average interested party having been an intimate part of the process on many levels. I think the process was very well-intentioned and that it represents a comprehensive approach to dealing with development issues in the Wasatch Mountains that is truly needed and long overdue. It is not an easy area to deal with politically by any means given the overlapping jurisdictional interests and sometimes conflicting regulations and goals. The balance is certainly difficult to achieve to keep the area from being "Loved to Death" - both an accurate term and the title of an article I published in the October/November 2012 issue of the Western Planner Journal that laid out a good overview of the diverse range of issues and logistical issues in the Wasatch Mountains. That article received many kudos from many of those involved in the Mountain Accord. My largest concern that I will express as a private citizen (but former insider) is related to the tenor of some of the meetings and how any negative comments or concerns expressed by those of us on the various committees were handled. Specifically, it often seemed like there was an end goal in mind for an outcome at many meetings and that any comments that deviated from that end goal were ignored or quashed. There appeared to be little appetite for dissent and those expressing any dissent were ignored and felt left out in future debates. I am saying that for myself, but other professional colleagues that served on the various committees also expressed similar concerns although they may be limited as to what they can say as they still represent interests on those groups. My point in all this is to simply express that I was somewhat disappointed that despite all the talk about this being a "fair and open process", the reality appeared to be quite different at times. While I completely support the idea of a comprehensive process, I think the way many things were handled in the process thus far left me (and others) with a bad taste as to how honest this process really was and feeling that it was quite contrived at times with a pre-determined conclusion in mind from the start. For the reasons I've expressed in these comments, I initially wasn't going to submit any comments as I felt they would be ignored and not well received or taken seriously. As a professional land use and environmental planner that loves the Wasatch Mtns and has a personal stake in this - I ski and I like the clean water those canyons provide (and the beer made from those waters) I decided to put those concerns aside and comment anyhow as this is simply too important to ignore. I'm not trying to be cynical, but I do want to express that I remain skeptical as to the ultimate motives and end goals given my experience in the process. I certainly would be willing to discuss these concerns in more depth, even with my skepticism remaining because I do think this is far too important effort and issue to ignore. Please accept my comments in the spirit they are intended which is to help in this process. As I said, if you care to follow-up with me, I am certainly willing and those involved know how to get a hold of me. Thank you.</p>	Holladay	05/01/2015
	<p>Properly defined business and use cases would help to better articulate stances and alternative scenarios. At this point, the items presented are still too high-level and require significant supporting data before I can personally stand behind any solution. In other words, supporting high-level due diligence is missing from this initial proposal.</p>	Holladay	05/01/2015
	<p>putting in a ski lift type system from the parley's canyon side of the area through guardsman pass over to the cottonwoods would ruin this area and there is no need for this.</p>	Holladay	02/27/2015
	<p>Regardless of anything proposed, I think in the end, at least for what I'm concerned, I would cut as least as possible into nature. Anything that is proposed to restore, reforest and for the environment I agree with. We don't want to pollute our gorgeous mountain with a tourist overload and as for the Canyons/Vail \$50M project, I LOVE wintersports but am concerned that all these updates are going to raise season passes up. If we could keep season passes for locals at least under the \$600 range, as they are being sold now, I'm ok with any changes. I think quantity of people buying season passes with make up for the price difference. If the \$50M is pocket change to Vail, fine, go ahead but if our local skiers end up paying for it, keep things as they are. I know my comment is tailored towards the ski resort only but bottom line, we do care what we end up having to pay for it.</p>	Holladay	02/10/2015
	<p>Some kind of alternative to tunnels through mountains must be found, this is an extreme disruption to the natural landscape that defines the Wasatch, which is why I responded as "poorly" to the question of responsible stewardship. I'm skeptical that the transportation options are environmentally-sustainable as well, but I'm not an engineer, and I simply don't know if the transportation options meet that criteria</p>	Holladay	04/14/2015
	<p>Thank you for considering transportation options that will actually work in the long run, like rail. The traffic will continue to get worse without this alternative. Also, with two disabled children, I ask that you remember that the beautiful backcountry is for everyone, not just those who want to be alone in the outdoors.</p>	Holladay	03/12/2015
	<p>The "blueprint" proposal had thousands of hours of work put into the system group meetings and sub meetings over the summer, yet, unfortunately their work is less apparent than the Exec board who were less engaged which resulted in a plan that represented their impressions/interests rather than what was determined by the System Groups. In its current form, I cannot support the "blueprint". But the Mountain accord ideals and the timing give me and many others hope that a more equitable balance can be achieved to accommodate many constituents'/stakeholders' desires, IF there is willingness to concede on some of their desires.</p>	Holladay	03/14/2015
	<p>The Blueprint is generally very good, but it appears to give too great a consideration to the economic needs and not enough consideration of the environmental impacts. For alternatives to the Cottonwood Canyons are presented as though they are roughly equal in their cost, impact and effectiveness, without any attempt to address the economic and environmental pros and cons of each proposal. The Blueprint also appears to assume that we need to create a transit system that competes with and co-exists with private vehicles. The likely consequence of that assumption would be the construction of either a widened transportation corridor up Little Cottonwood Canyon, or the construction of a parallel transit corridor, either of which would have huge environmental impacts on the Canyon and the water, not to mention astronomical costs. There appears to be little consideration of using the existing roadway for a Zions Park type shuttle, that could be operated on the existing road, along with limited vehicle use, with little cost or adverse environmental impact. (I suppose this concept might be included within alternative D, but there is almost no discussion of that possibility, or the pros and cons of doing so). Also, the blueprint is very difficult to understand and to navigate. I have spent a lot of time trying to open and read through the various links, but there is no explanation or index to explain how one link or link relates to the others. The information ought to be organized into a single master index with various subparts (and connected links), because the structure of the current information is very confusing.</p>	Holladay	05/01/2015
	<p>The concept of putting a train up Little Cottonwood Canyon to solve the sometimes chronic car traffic issues should be considered separately from the concept of connecting Alta with Park City through a tunnel. The underground tunnel solution tying the three communities of Alta and Brighton to Park City must also be considered independently of the hill-climbing cog railway proposal. Transit solutions that do not require a central railway yard in Salt Lake Valley could function independently as a closed loop system, wholly underground, with daily maintenance performed at a service facility that is part of the terminus. The underground environment in a tunnel is at constant temperature, protected from the weather. This is nothing like outdoor highways and rail lines. A cog-rail train pulling a string of cars adequate for canyon travel is costly over-engineering in a tunnel. Furthermore, it can't provide prompt travel on demand that a queue of, say, driverless, programmed shuttles based on technological advances which might become reality within the next decade. An electric shuttle car system on a closed-loop track would be economically practical in a tunnel. Transportation choices must not be limited to legacy transportation hardware manufactured for other legacy projects.</p>	Holladay	02/24/2015
	<p>The idea of building transportation tunnels through the mountains is Not in the best interest of wild land conservation, water shed protection nor does it enhance the quality of the outdoor experience. Grizzly gulch, The Emma ridge line to Mt. Superior should be designated wilderness! White pine and Cardiff fork designated as notational forest. I am completely and utterly opposed to ski area expansion (increasing the ski area foot print) enough is enough!!! With the exception of Snowbirds expansion / acquisition of the Mary Ellen gulch parcel, expansion in this area would have far less impact on back country users, water shed etc. than other parcels on the table. The peripheral boundaries of the ski areas are already encroaching on the dispersed recreational opportunities throughout the Wasatch. In addition the cottonwood canyons should remain "dead end canyons" to connect the canyons in anyway would dramatically reduce the quality of the outdoor/mountain experience and the individuality character and charm that is now present. Lets not turn the beautiful Wasatch into a paved Outdoorsy land, keep the mountains a wild and wonderful place for generations to come and enjoy and not "sell out" in the name of progress!</p>	Holladay	03/11/2015
	<p>The idea of combining the canyons to the Wasatch back is an absolute railroad job by those who stand to gain a profit the most. It disregards the locals who love the land and wish to keep it separated and secluded. The mountain accord disguises their true intent by throwing environmental nonsense (insignificant mumbo jumbo) right upfront, while backdropping the real impactful issues. Who said "less is more"? There is much truth to this.</p>	Holladay	02/17/2015
	<p>The open space that would be preserved generally seems to be land that could not be developed anyway (i.e. the side of Superior or land locked parcels). The Accord overlooks the potential for improved recreational access in the lower sections of the canyons and from the valley/Shoreline. From a cost effectiveness perspective, this seems like the most logical way to improve recreational opportunities and reduce summer traffic in the canyons.</p>	Holladay	02/12/2015
	<p>The priority must be sustainable natural resources for the future.</p>	Holladay	02/12/2015
	<p>The underground tunnel between Park City and Alta should be Priority One in the plan with Bus Rapid Transit solutions for the canyon passengers for the immediate future. The skiers are in Park City where the hotel and restaurant development is appropriate. If it only takes twenty minutes to travel the eight miles underground from Park City to Alta on a speed light rail train in any weather, you could eat dinner on Main Street and sleep slope-side that night at Snowbird. What a great marketing tool for Utah skiing, and for our wildflower hikes and train rides in the summer. Barely 5% of Utah residents ski. Fewer are going to ride a slow cog railway once an hour when they can drive in half that time. Let's spend the Billion dollars where it counts and make a ski resort link to rival Grunewald, Switzerland.</p>	Holladay	02/10/2015
	<p>There's an assumption built into the working documents that the ski resorts are going to be scaled up. But at this point it's pretty clear that climate change is happening "now". In Utah (as in California) there are going to be diminished snowpacks, and also droughts (which will prevent making up for less snow with artificial snow). So there's going to be "much less" skiing, and it's reasonably likely that soon enough there won't be "any" skiing. We can be pretty sure the resort operators understand this. Their graceful exit is real estate development - selling upscale houses at the ridge of the Wasatch. That requires infrastructure development, in the first place transportation. So we should understand the agenda to be the urbanization of the upper Wasatch, over the next twenty or so years. So the question is whether that's a good idea. For the resort stakeholders, yes; for everyone else, pretty clearly no.</p>	Holladay	04/15/2015
	<p>This proposal seems very biased and not universal. The Forest Service motto is "Land of many uses." Yet, I see no access for motorcycles. I'm an avid hiker/biker/fisher and motorcycle rider. It's disheartening to see no options for motorcycle trails!</p>	Holladay	02/11/2015
	<p>Why do we have to have "excavation" as one of the GOALS?? Really it's a GOAL of Mountain Accord to DIG UP THE CANYON??? Who added that GOAL?? NO CONNECT TO PARK CITY IS NEEDED. a connection to Park City is just another way for the wealthy to make MORE money, at taxpayer's expense.</p>	Holladay	03/26/2015
	<p>Deer Valley currently limits the number of skiers on any given day to prevent overcrowding. A much better Accord would be to define the current limits of the Cottonwood Canyons and approach future growth thru limitation of entry. During high visitation seasons mandatory use of buses or car pooling would be required. Visitation thru Mountain Accords blueprint would bring uncontrolled increases in population in the canyons degrading any and all quality of wilderness or recreational use.</p>	Holladay, UT	03/13/2015
	<p>Connecting the canyons (Wasatch Front to Wasatch Back, and Big to Little Cottonwood) is not responsible stewardship of natural resources. These connections are not necessary economically and have a big impact on the Wasatch Mountains - they essentially establish a new "road" through areas that are now "roadless." The blueprint should include alternatives without such connections.</p>	Holladay, Utah	03/03/2015
	<p>Bad idea Environmental destruction</p>	Houston	05/01/2015
	<p>I would like to see Express Buses for Canyons only from the TRAX station lots. Charge to drive up the canyon in a private vehicle. Our Canyons are over used as is. As a skier that lived a mile from Big Cottonwood Cyn for 36 years I saw how the dynamics changed for the skiers that lived in Utah. What I saw from all the charts and figures was money money money. Salt Lake &amp; surrounding counties seem to be doing better than the rest of the Country. We don't need companies and individuals that only want to make money coming here. How did any of that rambling explain how they were not going to hurt our watershed? How does light rail going up the mountain make a difference when there are avalanches. A train could not travel if there was a chance of being buried by snow. This is one big snow job. Please do not ruin the Canyons I love and grew up with.</p>	Ivins, UT	03/13/2015
	<p>Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of the various transportation options, particularly with respect to the inversion that is so important to health in the basin. For instance, which option would be best, when considering diesel bus from SLC to Park City, natural gas or biodiesel bus on the same route, or electric rail and aerial tram through or over the mountain? Spelling this out and quantifying its estimated impact on air quality (as measured by number of days above federal limits?) would be useful and powerful.</p>	Kamas	03/04/2015
	<p>Transit system should not try to connect Park City with Alta/Brighton. A fully functional multi-lane transit corridor exists in Parley's Canyon. Satellite parking and transit should be enabled in both the Wasatch front and back. The blue print should favor the environmental and watershed issues over economic issues. The US already has mega resorts (Vail, Park City/Canyons) that cannot be traversed in a single day. Connection of the resorts is of limited value. Rail up Little &amp; Big Cottonwood Canyons with covered track in avalanche prone areas could be a great solution to current traffic issues.</p>	Kamas, Utah	04/27/2015

	Some of the questions that are not answered by the Mountain Accord in regards to transportation and the proposed rail system, is how do people get on it? Where will people park? If it is not a good alternative, people simply will not use it. They are going to have to park somewhere and the current park and ride locations are not large enough to accommodate much more than they already do. I would like to see more buses before rails. Express buses that would leave even from 1-15 to the canyons with minimal stops (Perhaps on weekends and holidays – the highest user days of the resorts). I also think a tunnel is a bad idea—those cars would have to park somewhere and there already isn't enough, especially on weekends and holidays. I'd like to see more thought given to cheaper mass transit options that would not require parking, like buses. Buses have the added benefit of not increasing the size of the roads, whereas a rail system certain would. Also, ski resorts are a great resource to Utah's economy, but I am not in favor of additional expansion. Resort skiing is a cost-prohibitive sport for many and I don't want to see even more of our public lands used as exclusive country clubs. Currently Snowbird, Alta, and Solitude do not allow uphill travel access of any kind during the season. I would be in favor of Snowbird having additional parking, but perhaps increased number of buses and express buses can alleviate the need for additional parking and base facilities. Snowbird, Alta, Brighton and Solitude already have the best hills for skiing in the Wasatch, giving them more would be the detriment of current and future residents who wish to enjoy and explore mountains unfettered with lifts, access roads for the lifts, ski resort bathrooms, etc. Consideration should be given to the fastest growing segment of ski/snowboard users, and that is backcountry users. The Central Wasatch is a small area and giving increased terrain to resorts would squeeze out even more human powered users who already don't have access to the national forest that is within the boundaries of the 4 ski resorts.	Kaysville	04/29/2015
	It would be better if rail was up Parley's Canyon as well as Big and Little Cottonwood. If they all link together that is great, if not, that is okay as well.	Keams	04/30/2015
	If the purpose of the mountain accord is in fact to preserve the water, animals and wilderness then the proposed blueprint is in my opinion totally flawed in the direction of development, increased tourism, and selling out those things that can't be bought with money.	Kihei Hawaii	02/12/2015
	I am very concerned with the potential negative economic impacts on Summit County and Park City, by enabling tourists to connect only to the ski resorts and not add to the bed base / restaurant tax, as these guests can just ski and then return to SLC for their other expenditures. I love the improved transit options, and just hope this has been taken into consideration. Possibly remove the connection from Cottonwood to Park City, and enhance I-80 only.	Kimball Junction	04/29/2015
	It is a Pork Barrel proposal by land developers to connect to better snow for a short and unreliable season and traffic that is only a problem on certain holidays and powder snow days. It is a waste of taxpayer money, a threat to National Forest lands and to the water supply for Salt Lake City. The biggest solution problem is Salt Lake City burning coal for power. The Auto traffic in the Cottonwood Canyon is not a major cause of pollution. You can see this from the mountain!	Kingsville	04/15/2015
	Prioritize the focus of the blueprint to be that of responsible stewardship of natural resources. While I understand the desire to expand upon existing infrastructure to make outdoor experiences more convenient to those who wish to easily access all that is great about the wasatch front, the central focus still needs to be maintaining the reason that people visit, the natural environment. There are many cases in southern Utah's national parks where access has been made easier to guests and locals who wish to enjoy quality recreational experiences and the exact opposite has happened. Increased visitation leads to increases in pressures on the same natural resources that need to be protected.	Lahaina, HI	03/16/2015
	In the past I was ambivalent about the Wasatch front/back connection plan. However, clearly growth of the area is inevitable and this plan gets in front of that development in a way that will allow it to be more efficiently achieved and better controllable. Congratulations to those folks who put this plan and presentation together, and thank you.	Las Vegas	04/30/2015
	Utah's landscape is very beautiful and diverse, I believe we should preserve as much of it as possible while yet allowing us to enjoy it. Many parks are having to go to public transportation systems to accommodate the sheer number of people trying to access them; it is only reasonable that public transportation will become necessary next to such a large urban center to allow access to our public lands without destroying them to allow for parking. Even if you build more parking, there will never be enough. Thanks so much for doing this.	Layton	03/02/2015
	Difficult to comment due to the lack of specifics; general goals are good	Layton	05/01/2015
	I am opposed to new roads. In fact, vehicular traffic should be further restricted. This area needs to be preserved and vehicles removed from it. If one of the existing roads is converted to rail only transit this will be an improvement. Cars can be eliminated thereby allowing increase numbers of people and goods to be moved through the area. I think it is great that people who want to put forth the effort to access the backcountry via foot and ski, but providing roads (non-rail) allows people access with no effort or consideration. Eliminate one of the vehicle roads and convert it to rail only. A rail only tunnel through the mountain would also be a low impact option between resorts. An aerial tram would be too high of an impact to be acceptable.	Layton	02/06/2015
	It looks to me like the proposal is mimicking what is already happening now. I didn't see anything that stood out as "new" or "improving" minus the interconnect thing...which is not a solution for "ALL PARTIES INVOLVED!" That thing is just a way for ski resorts to get business. The trails will be destroyed by construction, the views will be taken away by individualism, and nature will leave to find other places to live. Nowhere did I see the Division of Natural Resources playing a role! Plus...if I can't take my dog hiking in the Cottonwoods, then why should there be a massive ski lift thingy all over the mountains? Doesn't make sense!	Layton	02/07/2015
	Light rail is a failure. No rail in our canyons, ever!	Layton	04/12/2015
	Rock climbing (all forms) has been vastly overlooked. And what about exploratory hiking? An imposed fee system is alarming, particularly since mass transit stops in LCC have been completely overlooked in lieu of stops only at ski resorts.	Layton, UT	03/30/2015
	The process must be shown to the public. The "Blueprint" is not a blueprint but a biased "vision" of a few. It seems to assume the interconnect (which is opposed by the people of Utah) as an underlying assumption for mountain growth. The "Blueprint" does not show how private ski area expansion is related to public investment in transportation. The relationship to proposed land protection to Forest Service approvals for vague ski area expansion plans is not explained, nor is public opinion's role in this undefined process defined.	Lebanon, N.H.	03/07/2015
	This is remarkable! It looks like a win for all stakeholders.	Lehi	02/04/2015
	I would like to weigh in. I think the overall blueprint is good, and brings up issues that need discussion and resolution. I am concerned about too much commercialization, and economic development. I am more for conservation and preservation of wilderness and backcountry. I would be more for restricting access to the mountains, than for improving transportation to limit the impact of more people. I would prefer improved biking lanes, and hiking access, but limit personal vehicle encroachment. I would be more willing to pay money to limit economic development, than improve my ski advantages by economic development that encroaches on our wilderness.	Lehi Utah	04/17/2015
	Feedback more on your survey: It is hard to answer these questions the way they are worded. I am hesitant to mark that a proposed Blueprint achieves an objective "very well" when I have serious concerns about those objectives. A better way to ask might be "How well does the proposal serve the needs of Utah's in the area of (transportation). These have been broken out for transportation below but not other areas. In summary one question asks both do I approve of the objectives and do we achieve those objectives, the answers to those might be very different.	London	02/04/2015
	The traffic between the Cottonwood canyons and Park City is problematic. I recently spent an inordinate amount of time in a van crawling up route 210 to visit Alta and snowbird. While I did NOT support ski-link I feel Mountain accord should take into consideration the 'One Wasatch' plan. The Wasatch Backcountry alliance seems more about keeping private land for their own personal use rather than sensible development for all; residents and visitors.	Litchfield, Ct	03/04/2015
	NO LANES NO TRAINS UP LITTLE COTTONWOOD CANYON.	Logan	03/02/2015
	Please do not sacrifice any more public land for private enterprises. Keep the backcountry that is close to SLC open and free. There are plenty of resorts or terrain that can be further developed within resort boundaries.	Logan Utah	04/30/2015
	Well the purpose of Mountain Accord is to support the fat cat ski resort owners and the members of the legislature who stand to gain personally from big changes so I guess you are rocking it. However, as far as preserving the canyons for the general public's recreation and the future generations Mountain Accord could not be worse. No trains and no extra lanes up Little Cottonwood Canyon. The canyon cannot sustain it environmentally, and you are taking a precious gem and turning it into nothing more than a transportation corridor.	Logan Utah	03/10/2015
	Although short term infrastructure upgrades will cause significant disruption to watersheds, wildlife, and commuter traffic the long term benefits will outweigh these short term negatives. As a 30+ native people in this state are opposed to change, no plan will make everybody happy. Listen to your conscious not your wallet, decide with you heart not political affiliation. I have traveled the world and being from Utah has been an advantage. No matter where I go I run into others who have been to Utah and return yearly to experience the solitude of the Wasatch Mountains. Over the years I have watched non managed "progress" take away from my wilderness experience to the point I left the Wasatch front and moved to Cache Valley. According to the Lung Association SLC has the 7 worst air in the nation, Logan #8. These particulates are contaminating our watersheds. Healthy balanced ecosystems are critical when managing excessive pollution sources. All life forms of Utah have the right to clean water, clean air, and a quiet place to experience nature. This comes before political agenda, profits, and personal gain. Make the right decision. Cooperate extensively, compromise, and manage the resource with the future in mind. If you are not up to this task then pass the torch to someone who is.	Logan, Utah	04/30/2015
	Having skied Alta for over 25 years, I am very interested in this process. I like the idea of a rail system connecting SLC, the Cottonwoods, and Park City. If I had a way to get to Park City without driving, I would make a point to go there at least once/twice while on ski trips. At the very least, avalanche flowovers on UT 210 are certainly needed. Even with the veoman's job UDOT does keeping the road open.	Marietta, GA	03/23/2015
	I feel that the Transit alternatives proposed that destroy the endtop of canyon environment in Little Cottonwood Canyon is raping the legacy and current environment of that part of the Wasatch range. I'm saddened that you are even considering ruining such a special environment that attracts and provides both man and nature a unique and irreplaceable escape from other regions.	Menlo Park, CA and St. Paul, MN	02/11/2015
	everything is okay except for the train up little cottonwood. It would wipe out the trail that many folks use along little cottonwood.	Midvale	02/05/2015
	Grizzly Gulch should not be 'under consideration' and needs to be left alone for all the recreation users (backcountry skiers, etc). Utah has some of the best backcountry terrain in the world and above anything else it should be preserved. Although there are many parts of the blueprint that are good (about 75% is pretty good); I feel MORE importance should be placed in environmental and recreation proposals first, then transportation second, and lastly should be economic. I feel this way because Utah has many smart citizens, we can collectively come up with great ways to fuel our economy. But the little remaining lands in the Wasatch should be preserved because if we gamble and it's gone, it's gone forever. Better to be conservative on the conservation side because the 'costs of error' are not near as severe than if we put more importance on economic at the cost of the environment and remaining wild lands left. Please PRESERVE the Wasatch, it's all our home.	Midvale	02/15/2015
	I am NOT a fan of this. Keep it how it is. No one needs access to all these resorts in a day. Keep the Wasatch wild. We have a great balance between tourism, resprtd and most importantly backcountry. You take this away and you are jeopardizing too much of our backcountry. I know someone on here is working hard to strike a balance but as an outdoor recreation professional who sees the need for both tourism and backcountry this is too much. Do NOT expand these lifts and resorts. People come for world class backcountry outdoors here in UT and you will be taking away more than is necessary.	Midvale	02/28/2015
	I am sick of reading how this will increase tourism and bring in more \$\$ when the idea is to deal with the existing situation.	Midvale Ut	04/09/2015
	I favor the mountain light rail connections over an aerial tram, but I have serious concerns about the impact from construction of something like that.	Midvale, UT	04/30/2015
	WHY IS THE BOOMING HEBER VALLEY BEING IGNORED IN THIS PLAN? THAT IS POOR, POOR FUTURE PLANNING FOR LOCALS. Very few people can afford to live in Park City (the average price of a small home in Old Town is now \$1.5 Million) anymore and the plan is ignoring the locals and worker bees, most of whom live in or are rapidly moving to the Heber Valley. Let's do a plan that takes locals into consideration first and tourists second. I'd like to see better transit options between the Valley and Park City.	Midway & Park City, UT	02/24/2015
	Creating transportation and recreation corridors with less maintenance required because I dont see the funding available to maintain a structure. As it is the pedestrian bridge across parleys and the surrounding trails see little to no maintenance and have become unsafe in places and full of graffiti. We need something we can keep maintain not just something that is good for a year.	millcreek	02/05/2015
	I am curious to see how the entire east bench, from Parley's Canyon to BCC and LCC will be incorporated into the transit system. Millcreek as a whole has seen bus lines get eliminated, yet there is the overarching need for better transit systems and reduction of vehicular traffic. I am wholesale in support of buses up BCC and LCC IF: the buses come regularly and on a schedule and IF getting to the buses is not a hassle. IN addition to the above, I am in support of carpooling up BCC and LCC: if a vehicle can pick up a full carload (4 or more people) they should be able to drive up the canyons. When you have whole families with little children, they will be less likely to switch to a bus. Also, the bus situation is not 'visitor' friendly. If an entire car-load of out-of-town-guests comes up a canyon, then they should be permitted to drive. If UPD Canyon Patrol would actually PATROL the canyon entrances, then this could be achieved.	Millcreek	04/10/2015

<p>I believe a tunnel from Park City to Either Alta or Brighton is a huge mistake. If real, demonstrated, consistent annual vehicle transportation needs from the Wasatch Back to the Wasatch Front merit a permanent connection, then spend the necessary money to upgrade the Guardsman Pass Road to an all year, all weather road, similar to Highway 12 between Grover and Boulder Utah, traversing the east flank of Boulder Mtn. in Wayne and Garfield Counties. Within the Cottonwood Canyons, Hybrid (natural gas - electric/battery) Bus Rapid transit should be investigated and promoted rather than a heavy/light rail system which would be greatly more impactful in a negative sense to the Canyon environment. With regard to a lift served ski interconnect system linking Park City and the Cottonwoods, I believe that to be an unnecessary and large chunk of infrastructure being pushed solely as a marketing benefit for the ski industry. I'm 65 years old, a 40 year resort and back country skier as well as a hiker of the Central Wasatch. I (downhill) ski Snowbird and Alta regularly and tour the backcountry a bit still, so I'm no opponent of the ski resorts. BUT, the interconnect concept is nothing more than a marketing gimmick to bring more ski tourists to Utah. No real serious skier from around here will elect to spend half his/her day riding lifts between the resorts when he/she could be on the snow making turns in the powder through the trees instead. Skiers want to be on the snow, not standing in lines preparing to ride in multiple stage lifts to get from resort to resort. Moreover, the lift cuts through the trees, the tram towers, cables, high speed quad towers and the required powering infrastructure would irreparably harm the scenic beauty and pristine serenity of the backcountry they would necessarily have to cross through, over, and above, forever negatively impacting those who would enter that same backcountry terrain to find peace and quiet. I believe the resorts should be allowed reasonable downhill ski expansion within their footprints similar to what Snowbird has done with Mineral Basin and Alta has done and wants to do in the Point Supreme area, all the while keeping Mt Superior, White Pine, Red Pine, and Maybird in their natural states. The mechanized lift connection from Summit County to the Cottonwood Canyons is unnecessary and unwise, and should not be pursued. With regard to Millcreek Canyon, the present toll system is doing some real good, and if vehicle pressure in that drainage increases, and the Canyon environment is threatened, or becomes degraded, then hybrid bus rapid transit ought to and should be pursued there as well.</p>	<p>Millcreek</p>	<p>05/01/2015</p>
<p>I generally agree with the proposed Blueprint, with some specific exceptions and additional recommendations. I do not believe that rail transportation is appropriate for Little Cottonwood Canyon. Expanded bus service, whether via conventional bus or dedicated BRT lanes, could provide better access at significantly less cost and much lower environmental impact. Bus transit can provide much more flexibility, both in terms of quantity of service at peak times and ability to stop at multiple destinations. I am in favor of the proposed land exchange to provide additional protections to popular areas, but I believe that the exchange should be accompanied with restrictions on the amount of development in the ski area bases. I do not oppose the expansion of the Brighton ski area footprint into Hidden Canyon to include additional skiing acreage, but I am opposed to any building within the expanded area except lifts to transport skiers back to the existing resort footprints. I am unsure of the proposal to expand Solitude within Silver Fork, because it is difficult to determine from the Blueprint exactly where the proposed expansion is, and whether or not it would include additional lifts. I would oppose any expansion in the main Silver Fork drainage, as that is a very popular area for backcountry skiing and snowshoeing in winter and hiking in summer. I feel that it is critical to provide convenient access to backcountry gateways (major and minor trailheads as well as infrequently used dispersed access points) to continue to provide diverse recreation opportunities. I support the proposed development of additional trail systems, especially the interconnections between canyons.</p>	<p>Millcreek</p>	<p>04/26/2015</p>
<p>I support the effort to reduce car traffic in the Cottonwood canyons, but the solution should be better and more affordable than using one's own car. It has to be affordable, fast and convenient to overcome our dependence on cars. If you can do that, it has a chance.</p>	<p>Millcreek</p>	<p>02/24/2015</p>
<p>The proposal seems to favor development in the central Wasatch despite issues of climate change (less snow pack) and highly inflated expectations of resort skiers. There should be more consideration given to wilderness preservation and conservation. There should be less focus on resort interests to expand, with my opinion favoring maintaining current boundaries.</p>	<p>Millcreek</p>	<p>02/05/2015</p>
<p>I agree with the need to reduce traffic up Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons but feel the additional of light rail, tunnels, trams is counterproductive to maintaining landscape. As was done in Zions and other places with large amounts of traffic and easier solution is to limit the number of cars and increase bus transport. It would great if we could expand our trail system in the Wasatch Front but if that is linked to connecting Big Cottonwood, Little Cottonwood, and Park City the cost is too high. I am supportive a alternative to buses on the major established corridors like Foothill and I-80 but think cost advantages of Light Rail versus buses should be taken into account.</p>	<p>Millcreek Township</p>	<p>05/01/2015</p>
<p>Most of the proposed solutions are excellent. However, an aerial transit system is incompatible with environmental protection. It will inevitably create pressure for commercial development along the route. Please eliminate all consideration of an aerial transit system between the Cottonwood Canyons and Park City.</p>	<p>Millcreek Township</p>	<p>05/01/2015</p>
<p>Thanks to all for putting this together. I live near Millcreek Canyon and use it several times a week for trail running. I just noticed this morning (3-9-15) that 18 plus acres are up for sale on the north side not too far from the canyon entrance. There is no development there now and it is very steep to build on. I think it would be a blight on the beauty of this canyon to have development within it. We already live with some cabin stock up it's corridor now. How can this property be zoned out of developments reach and the owner compensated for its purchase?</p>	<p>Millcreek Township</p>	<p>04/09/2015</p>
<p>While I appreciate the efforts of all involved and input from the public, I have several concerns which I will touch upon in the comments below. So, thank you! These questions are v. subjective. What do my answers mean? It's not even clear what Mountain Accord goals are because they tend to be contradictory between the different systems. The transportation studies quoted aren't clear either. For example, how can you predict increase cars in the canyon in the winter when parking is limited? Are thousands of cars going up the canyon in a snow storm so they can turn around and return? The economic benefits are not determined. The language used in the process is unintelligible to most of us. What does this "mountain accord speak" mean? I thought a blueprint gives fairly precise directions on how to do something. This "blueprint" varies from page to page as to what the primary mission is. Ordering of important goals changes so that I am never quite clear as to what the primary goals are. Yes, it is stated at the top of each system, but these systems are sometimes incongruous. I expect more and find the data presented to be of poor quality. It would appear that traffic and people in the CC is declining. And if there is a trend upward, who is fueling this? Ski resort marketing to the rich? The opening of high density parking for Snowbird along t 210 that I have never seen before until the last year and in particular this year? It seems that the current goal is to favor what resorts want to satisfy their bottom line and how the state perceives to market the central Wasatch. Alps, really?? It ain't British Columbia either. I've skied both. It's not even the Dolomites. What the Central Wasatch is? Land for development purposes. The new "multi-use" for those who can afford it. See Vail's just released report on increased revenues due to high rollers and their business model of the Epic Pass.</p>	<p>Millcreek township</p>	<p>04/30/2015</p>
<p>A train / mountain rail system in LCC seems like it would be very difficult to do. It would also require numerous snow sheds, etc. to be able to operate in any conditions. It also seems like it would be very difficult to do without a lot of wildlife habitat damage and environmental disruption. It might make more sense to route rail to Park City then tunnel to LCC? I do believe that a mass transit system is needed for both LCC and BCC. The least invasive might well be a tram/gondola up the canyons, but NOT over the ridgelines! or electric trolley buses running in their own lanes.</p>	<p>Millcreek, UT</p>	<p>04/30/2015</p>
<p>Among the proposed next steps, "Evaluate the designation/protection options" for USFS land seems premature and federal designations/formal proposals might potentially lead to restricted options as Mountain Accord proceeds. Better to delay this evaluation for a later phase.</p>	<p>Millcreek, UT</p>	<p>03/14/2015</p>
<p>Do not disrupt the natural systems anymore than what we have already done to Wasatch front. These proposals are short sighted and really do nothing but promote economic gain. The excessive materials needed and additional pollution is uncalled for. If you want to protect the wasatch front than protect it. Don't use some crazy economic scheme to push a false agenda of envirental protection on the wasatch front and surrounding canyons. The proposal will disrupt pristine wildlife and habitat and will create excessive strain on the ecosystem. We already have enough man made items in the Wasatch please don't allow any more.</p>	<p>Millcreek, Ut</p>	<p>05/02/2015</p>
<p>Some interesting ideas - some of which (tunnels) seem a bit pie-in-the-sky as far as funding goes. But a good way to look at the bigger picture. Scary to think of the Wasatch Back as urbanized as the front.</p>	<p>Millcreek, UT</p>	<p>02/11/2015</p>
<p>This is another attempt to develop the Brighton area. The water shares are all allocated. The road is at capacity. A link line is out of the question due to the sensitive nature of the canyon. The ski area is at capacity during ski season. Why would we want an area like Vail Colorado? They have basterdized that area and ruined it. I am a land owner in Brighton and as you can tell I think the idea is stupid. We want to keep the canyon and Brighton just as it is, get r??</p>	<p>Murray</p>	<p>03/16/2015</p>
<p>1. In looking at these documents, I see politics at its worst; general statements with NO actual metrics and NO concern for ACTUAL environment, only PEOPLE not LANDS or WILDLIFE. You don't even bother LISTING WILDLIFE in ANY OF THE DOCUMENTS. 2. I don't see ONE actual measurement here. We badly need to measure the actual environmental consequences of the WILDLIFE so we KNOW what is there now and can PLAN to PROTECT it as we Develop and Use the area. 3. By 2040, there will BE NO WILDLIFE except garbage-eaters left in our near mountains; is that the goal, delay until the arguments are moot? 4. FIRST should be ACTUAL RESIDENTS of the area, the ECOLOGICAL CYCLES that are there depend on them, not us. We will end up with concrete and dirt otherwise.</p>	<p>Murray</p>	<p>04/25/2015</p>
<p>Enough. Enough of carving up the last remnants of these irreplaceable mountains. Enough of these short sighted greedy little people starting with contemptible governor herbert &amp; ted wison stealing the legacy we should be leaving our kids. Isn't the disgustingly overdeveloped base area of Solitude or the revolting hyper greed development all over the Park City side enough of a warning? Hyper trans-nationalist realtors keep lying. God help us now that Vail Corp is here. Hopefully the water board people have the balls to stand up to these soul dead rapacious bastards. Spare us the rationalizations, we've heard it all before. won't bother trying to shame these little leeches- it can't be done. This is our land, not yours. Keep out and stay out.</p>	<p>murray</p>	<p>04/30/2015</p>
<p>I am completely against rail or aerial transportation from park city to BCW or LCW. Completely against any form of tunneling. While increasing tourism dollars to Park City and increase access to PC residents, the plan will absolutely decrease the quality or recreational experience for salt lake valley residents. I</p>	<p>murray</p>	<p>05/02/2015</p>
<p>I am concerned about the impact trains would have on the canyons. To provide sufficient space for roadbeds for both a highway and trains would require a good deal of land and could destroy much of the scenic nature of the canyons and streams. The impact the freeway has had on Parley's Canyon is an example of how a canyon's nature can be dramatically changed.</p>	<p>Murray</p>	<p>03/16/2015</p>
<p>I applaud the purpose of Mountain Accord to preserve the legacy of the central Wasatch through responsible stewardship of the natural resources, quality recreation experiences and a modern, environmentally-sustainable transportation system. If these three are properly addressed, a vibrant economy will certainly be the end result as the outdoor recreation experts would attest. As other locations and cultures have learned, we must protect the very exceptional beauty and experience of the Wasatch as this unspoiled scenery and unurbanized experience is what visitors seek. To do otherwise would ruin the very un-replaceable places so important to our connection with and stewardship of this planet.</p>	<p>Murray</p>	<p>05/02/2015</p>
<p>I do not feel that building a tram to connect the Cottonwood Canyons to Park City is a good idea. I think that we need to protect our backcountry. I DO like the idea of building a train up the canyons, but I understand that it does not meet all of the transportation requirements that have been set. The bus systems seem like a great idea. I would like if the bus ran year round (even if it was only on odd or even days, or even once a week in the spring/summer/fall)</p>	<p>Murray</p>	<p>04/05/2015</p>
<p>I don't believe current residents should suffer for the impact of tourism. If we increase recreation fees, we should increase it to out-of-state visitors, not current residents. Fees are pretty high as it is, for current residents, in my opinion. A suggestion might be to tax on some of this tourism revenue and apply such money to deal with environmental impacts. Whatever you decide to do, please do - protect our watershed - protect the beauty of the Wasatch - limit development in areas that should remain natural. Thank you! Paul Melgar</p>	<p>Murray</p>	<p>04/20/2015</p>
<p>I don't want a train or light rail going up the canyon. A train would ruin the canyon, and make it so the canyon is inaccessible. you would have to put the train on either side of the canyon and that would make that side of the canyon closed off. because it wouldn't be unsafe to get across the tracks. People use both sides of the canyon. Please don't put a train or light rail up the canyon. Shuffles would be fine.</p>	<p>Murray</p>	<p>03/17/2015</p>
<p>I had a question in looking at the maps with current wilderness, lands for possible extended environmental protection, and the possible new travel routes and transportation hubs. Many of these new routes and transportation venues were located in the "land for possible extended environmental protection." so how would the state be able to keep these lands protected- if they were to develop them into roads or railways for transportation? and would there be any kind of rule or limit to transportation upgrades in these areas? meaning= would there be a "stopping point" or would it be fair game to keep developing and extending either road or rail? I am worried, understanding the upcoming needs for additional transportation to accommodate tourists and/or residents in these areas, that any kind of development will have both a short term and then long term effect on the environment. is there any kind of checks and balances in these sorts of developments? how much is too much? and what will happen not only to the watershed but to the mountains in general after this kind of development? while I know we are also hoping to try an dboost Utah's tourism revenue- if we aren't careful, we could over develop and over work the mountains and then not have any part of this beautiful landscape for not only tourists, but ourselves and our children.</p>	<p>Murray</p>	<p>02/09/2015</p>
<p>I've read a few items on this website and I like what I see. Some of the wording of the proposals are hard to know if they are for or against the way I view things. My wife and I are outdoor enthusiasts. We hike, fly paragliders, ski, windsurf, to mention a few. It's always a concern to me to see conflicts between the use of our natural resources and protections or restrictions. Both are important and both seemed to get misused. I saw the words a Perfect World in here somewhere. We live in a beautiful place but it's far from perfect or even fair. Hopefully this organizations and ones like it can help it become more so. I read the email you sent and agree with it. Access to land is essential to the beautiful sport of paragliding. We have virtually zero impact on the land and it beautiful to watch and do. We only hike a small portion of the trails because we hike with our dog most of the time. Good luck in your efforts. I'm supportive of efforts to balance land use and access. Thanks</p>	<p>Murray</p>	<p>03/12/2015</p>
<p>I don't like base expansion or increased visitation at the expense of the environment. The #1 priority has to be protecting the watershed. Expanding base operations to draw in more visitors is strictly about making more money. This is not a capitalism issue this is an environmental necessity. I do much prefer buses than a train or a tunnel. Again strictly trying to protect the watershed.</p>	<p>Murray</p>	<p>02/09/2015</p>
<p>No lanes and no trains in Little Cottonwood Canyon. I can't believe you would even think about tearing up the beautiful temple quarry trail that goes through some beautiful places. Leave the canyon alone. If it's not broke, don't fix it. We don't want ALL those people at once in such a beautiful place. Serenity is why people use the canyons. Keeping a single lane is fine. It just makes people slow down and enjoy the scenery.</p>	<p>Murray</p>	<p>04/21/2015</p>

	I want backcountry preserved, no linked ski areas and no tunnels. Better bus service sounds good. I want to be able to find solitude and untouched nature in the canyons. This is already being compromised by the sheer number of people in the canyons. I am for preservation, preservation, preservation of flora and fauna in the canyons.	Murray	03/05/2015
	Please include bicycles as an important part of the plan. They will play a huge part for all four parts of the Mountain Accord. Economy, Recreation, Transportation and Environment	Murray, UT	05/01/2015
	The Blueprint seems to favor the interests of the ski resorts in the Cottonwoods, possibly at the expense of summer users, backcountry skiers and watershed interests. The Blueprint assumes a growth in the number of resort skiers, but I am not convinced this will happen. Backcountry skier numbers, I believe, will continue to increase.	Murray, UT	04/30/2015
	I have major concerns about connecting Park City to the Cottonwood Canyons in any way shape or form.	Murray, Utah	05/01/2015
	Maximum conservation. Why destroy a gem. We'd never get it back.	Murray, Utah	04/28/2015
	The ski industry will do anything to gain new terrain, pure and simple. The ski resorts in the upper cottonwoods - ALREADY operating on mainly public land - are in a land grab in the hope they can grow skier days and revenues. The upper cottonwoods is a unique environment. Once a lift is put in, it will never go away. How can increasing the Utah tax base by \$18m or whatever the cost of the transportation options are help anyone but the resorts. If you want a vibrant economy, spend it on teachers, or tax incentives for out of state businesses to relocate to Utah. I agree the accord is an attempt to reconcile parties with different objectives and it possibly does that. However, sometimes one has to put ones foot down to save the environment.	New York	03/03/2015
	I am curious about the future of hunting in the area, a traditional activity.	Newark, CA	04/30/2015
	Grizzly gulch needs to be set aside as wilderness no chair lifts. The trail from alta to grizzly gulch sometimes has 100 people in line waiting to get up it. If a chair goes in grizzly the backcountry between brighton and solitude the backcountry there is ruined	North Salt lake	04/29/2015
	The blueprint leaves out a trail up Parley's Canyon. This idea has been discussed and even planned at various degrees and for various sections of the canyon, i.e. west mouth to Mountain Dell or Mountain Dell to Parleys Summit. There is too much speculation as to how trails projects may be funded. Too often trails have to battle for funding and are often afterthoughts instead of priorities. The concept of a "Wasatch Trail Loop" should be considered when planning for improving and connecting the "regional Trails Network." How is that network defined?	North Salt Lake	04/30/2015
	My family appreciates the work that has been done on this Mountain Accord proposal.	North Salt Lake, Utah	04/29/2015
	What is the blue print for transportation? It is up in the air. Nobody wants to make a commitment. No one appears to want to make a sacrifice. The one thing is we don't need chairlift strung across the canyons, and we need to stop cars with a transit system which runs every 15 minutes ALL day not morning and afternoon. Transit systems work they run constantly regardless of the cost. It is for the public, and we have to pay the cost. No one wants to feel any pain, and do not want to be inconvenienced. We need the federal government to step in and take control since the Utah Legislature will vote to destroy the area if they can get a deal for their cronies.	Oakley	04/07/2015
	As a former resident of Holladay I grew up in the Cottonwood and Millcreek canyons. I believe it is of primary importance to our way of life to preserve the pristine natural beauty we have. I want my children to have the opportunity to ski Alta powder without the urban sprawl that blights so much of our west coast neighbors. I wish you would include the Pineview/Snowbasin area in your study as we are experiencing too much building in our area. A vibrant economy is important but at what cost. Expanding the Mountain Accord to include more of the Wasatch would be fantastic.	Ogden	04/26/2015
	It's pretty confusing for a lay person who doesn't have a lot of time to study it. If it proposes a train into canyons and recreation areas, then it's not environmentally sustainable nor responsible stewardship of natural resources. Likewise with tunnels or interconnecting canyons with gondolas. It is unclear at this time if snow and participation in snow related activities will be as large as projected. It is important for changes to benefit all local visitors and not just the small segment of the population that can afford the luxury of ski resorts. The marketing of ski resorts is only concerned with these residents and consumers. The natural environment and ecosystems seems to be the last priority.	Ogden	04/16/2015
	"Light rail transit (LRT) exclusive guideway up Little Cottonwood Canyon to the Park City area, including tunnel connections between Alta, Big Cottonwood Canyon and Park City." The foregoing is an encouraging quote from the study. The most "exclusive guideway" would be a master tunnel with Draper as the portal into the "front" with respective branches to access all ski areas and Park City proper. There is Global precedent for such tunneling. Such precedent has been expressed in its very early conceptualization by Master Geologist Leon Hansen...deceased. There are many of us who believe that a "Super Tunnel" would remediate if not eliminate most environmental concerns and create a cornucopia of economic activity. The father of the Utah Tunnel concept is Leon Hansen. Leon was a Masters degree level geologist who had a lifelong working relationship with the Greater Park City Mining District of Utah. Leon has held senior positions with several large, international, mining enterprises. There exists a repository of proprietary data that confirms the existence of precious metals resources that equal or exceed what have already been recovered from the mining district prior to its closure. Mining was halted decades ago because the metals resources were impacted and impounded by water being that the water in the mines is a resource even more precious than the remaining gold and silver reserves. If the waters are recovered, the metals can also again be recovered. Synopsis: The Utah Tunnel will be a tunnel like many other long, long tunnels...New York-85; Sweden-51; Japan-33; Moscow-25; Madrid-25; Finland-74; LOETSCHBERG-21; Chunnel-31; Utah Tunnel-21 The Utah Tunnel would also be 21 miles long and most like the LOETSCHBERG tunnel. Loetschberg is the longest land tunnel (21Miles) in the world. The Loetschberg tunnel took eight years to build and cost \$3.5 billion. The Loetschberg tunnel transports skiers to Swiss resorts more quickly. The Utah Tunnel would be a multipurpose/multi use resource. It will convey...Water...Strategic minerals...Tourist transit to world class ski and recreational resorts...and other economic benefits to all of the citizens of Utah. The Utah Tunnel...it can be done...during economically difficult times. The famous symbols of recovery in the West during the Depression included: Hoover Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, The San Francisco Bay Bridge and the Golden Gate Bridge. The Utah Tunnel will develop the following resources: Water...Multi-Millions of gallons from aquifers under and around the Uinta and Wasatch mountains recovered. Strategic minerals...\$0.000,000,000 (at thousands of dollars an ounce) of water locked, precious metals (gold, silver etc.) resources freed!!! Travel to ski and recreational areas...rapid, uncongested, and safe transit from the airport and other points to resort areas developed. Hydro and Geothermal power...other economic benefits... The tunnel from Draper to Park City will pass under three of Utah's most famous ski resorts. The plan is to connect those resorts with the tunnel thereby ensuring safe and rapid transportation from the Salt Lake International Airport to the resorts. It is our understanding that there is an existing railroad right of way from Draper to the Airport.	Ogden and Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	By being shot straight to hell; there is no need to make you corporate bastards more money than you already have. It's all about money rather than the preservation of our natural resources...stick a fork in your shit show idea and get the F*** out of UTAH.	orem	02/05/2015
	First, I appreciate that so many groups have come together to work on this, and also appreciate the willingness to compromise. However, I feel that the current plan emphasizes the economy and access over the environment, and that ultimately these decisions would be detrimental. In an attempt to keep my comments brief, I'm opposed, specifically, to the proposed connector tunnel and to the train up Little Cottonwood Canyon. I don't believe either are necessary and will have severe negative impacts to the environment. Why not improve and expand a bus line instead to transport individuals. Once expansions and development happen we can never go back. I urge the members to put more emphasis on maintaining as much of the pristine environment as possible - that is something we've been blessed with and have a stewardship to protect, and is also what brings so many visitors.	Orem	03/15/2015
	The Wasatch Front is becoming more and more enjoyed by locals, and tourists every year, and it seems that every year there are more people out recreating than there was the year before blowing down at all. But I do believe that the Mountain Accord blueprint is a start in preserving the mountains that we love. I am an avid archery hunter, and these mountains are very important to me and many other outdoorsmen who frequent these mountains. We need to keep these mountains the way they are, and prevent them from becoming just another tourist spot for wealthy people from around the world to come to just to ski, shop, and party. I support the proposed blueprint because it is better than the alternative.	Orem	03/04/2015
	Protect Grizzly Gulch it is a classic backcountry hiking and skiing area for true locals. Do NOT create a transit from Park City to Brighton and Alta. That's too much damage to wilderness, not fair to wild life, not fair to SLC locals. Keep Park City tourists and user wealthy residents IN Park City. A majority of locals already cannot afford to ski in the Cottonwoods. Encouraging elites Park City to come to LCC and BCC more often will encourage these already awesome enough resorts to ramp up their luxury services and costs.	Orem Ut	04/23/2015
	No extra bus lanes or trains up LCC. Provide more parking so we can take a bus. Provide incentives to ride the bus or ride share by charging a toll or parking fee for vehicles with fewer than 3 occupants. Don't spend so much money to support only one segment of the economy, especially a segment that pays so little to its employees.	Orlando	04/30/2015
	The proposed mass transit train system is a great long term solution however, the best near term solution is staring us in the face. With only four additional chairlifts we can link up the One Wasatch and turn this into a phenomenal world-class ski area with minimal environmental impact. This could be done right away and the greater community would benefit. If you look to the Canyon Six Resort as adding the 8 lifts South of Tombstone. Were we to permit misguided naysayers not allow this to go in we would still have a Wolf Mountain / Park west. Now with just 4 additional chairs we can make the dream of the vast and silent majority a wonderful reality. Please link up the ski resorts for a true one of a kind world class ski center in Utah's Wasatch.	Park City	04/06/2015
	I attended the meeting at Park City High School. I believe the majority of those who attended were concerned primarily about the transportation initiatives, and specifically, the tunnel. I am personally opposed to the tunnel for both economic and environmental reasons. I am opposed to spending funds to "study" the tunnel as I see this as an alternative that will be "dead on arrival" in Park City. I would like to see a light rail/integrated public transportation solution that better connects Park City with the Salt Lake Airport, Wasatch Front ski resorts, and the valley. More visitors would use public transit if there was a quick and reliable mode of transportation to/from the airport.	Park City	04/28/2015
	a major lynchpin is localized affordable housing, which seems to be the toughest to legislate and implement. without it, the other components are "arranging deck chairs on the Titanic". to move forward, the blueprint implementation needs real teeth and incentives that will mean something significant to the powers-that-be, not just "encouragement". if major employers in Summit County (ie Vail ..) would commit to affordable LOCAL seasonal housing (dorm-like), then employment needs could be satisfied with minimal increased traffic (thereby environmental) congestion. has there been a weighted analysis (maybe I missed it?) of the subgroup populations that will grow, who is doing the lion's share of traveling, the times of year that have the biggest impact (ie 50,000 people for 5-10 days at Sundance vs. 4 months of Salt Lake residents coming up the canyons either daily for work or weekly for recreation, etc.) my "gut feeling" is that it's commuters during the winter, so the localized housing needs should be prioritized. in all of this, how much input and support is coming from legislators? does the state government support this 2040 effort? if so, can they be induced to help move this effort forward?	Park City	02/24/2015
	a tunnel between park city and big cottonwood is long overdue.	park city	03/16/2015
	All of the transportation alternatives that connect the Cottonwood Canyons to Park City are HORRIBLE and will ruin Park City.	Park City	02/08/2015
	As a member of the Park City community for over 40 years I have watched the good and bad of growth. I am diametrically opposed to any connection between either Big or Little Cottonwood Canyons and Park City or the Wasatch Back. A transportation system that runs concurrent with existing I-80 to Kimball Junction is a possibly acceptable option, but only if it does not enter Park City limits. There is absolutely no economic incentive for Park City and the Wasatch Back to provide recreational amenities for the Salt Lake valley. We don't need the traffic, impact and social costs while the valley enjoys the benefit. Indeed Greater Park City is already over planned for development. Mountain Accord is a project designed to enhance the economic viability of greater Salt Lake City and environs by destroying the mountain environment it claims to protect.	Park City	04/28/2015
	As ex-Mayor Dana Williams said, "you've drunk the Kool Aid." Your plan is appalling. It caters only to the ski industry and economic interests. It does not consider the devastating impacts to the environment in general and to wildlife in particular. Drilling tunnels is an insane idea. Your plan does absolutely nothing in regard to the major issue, which is traffic congestion in Parleys Canyon and into Park City. Shame on you for pushing this plan!	Park City	04/30/2015
	As we recall, the Mountain Accord was born because of the controversy regarding Skink. Opponents stated that 13 lift towers and a gondola would hurt the environment. And now...A TRAIN?! While I can support a train, I do not see how pumping millions of people year-round into the Wasatch is more environmentally friendly than just connecting the existing ski areas by lift and letting people use their skins for transportation. A multi-billion dollar train seems like overkill.	Park City	02/24/2015
	Believe the "OneWasatch" proposal was the best for the purposes of "recreation". Connecting the Park City mountains with Big Cottonwood and Little Cottonwood canyons would be the best thing for the Utah economy....a singularly differentiated ski experience. Highly recommend using chairlifts, aerial trams, gondolas for the connections	Park City	04/30/2015
	Billion dollar tunnels or train systems are not environmentally compatible. The best thing about the plan is the trail network.	park city	03/27/2015
	Cordery It is a very poor choice to drill large tunnels inside of mountains. That displaces everything that we have come to Utah for. It would drastically change the landscape if you were to drill tunnels through the mountains. Just think about all of the people who will be here when we are gone. It is not fair to put anyone through this disaster of a plan!	Park City	02/23/2015
	Delete all connections between cottonwood canyons and park city. Specifically, delete trains and tunnels from the plan. Enhance bus connections between slc airport and park city.	Park city	04/30/2015
	Detail on the electrical re generation qualities of a rail transit system.	Park City	02/28/2015
	do a light rail line from SLC to Park City on to Heber on to Provo, running both directions this will help move employees to PC from Heber then rely on local buss systems to move away from light rail stations	Park City	02/05/2015
	Eliminate the transportation element as long as you continue to pursue trains up the Cottonwood Canyons. Zion National Park has proven buses work. Eliminate cars completely and no trains that cost too much and have too much of a negative impact. If you're serious about wanting to preserve and protect the Wasatch Mountains then do just that.	PARK CITY	02/25/2015

	Gillwald obviously funding for all this will play a role. transit connections to and from the cottonwood canyons to park city are important along with increasing resort base amenities in case one gets stuck at solitude with no real way to get back to park city.	Park City	02/06/2015
	How many more people do we really want to "attract" and why? I know that the resort industrial complex wants more more more - but to truly give visitors a unique and positive experience there is a tipping point. It's getting so crowded in Park City - we may be victims of our own success. Of course the climate changes that we will (and already are) experiencing may just make a lot of these plans seem ridiculous - even with the best snowmaking equipment - if the temperatures are too warm we will not have consistent snow throughout a ski season. I have friends from Chicago who typically come four times per year that just cancelled their spring break trip here. For a while you may be able to attract new people with outreach marketing - but if the snow isn't great and if too crowded to get into a restaurant then they won't return.	Park City	03/12/2015
	I agree with preserving watersheds, open space, and water resources as well as doubling the federal land and wilderness area. Adding a transit system with tunnels will not do this. It will be extremely disruptive to the environment, wildlife, etc. I believe this is driven by money and will benefit those that can develop and increase personal revenue. Who will fund this? Why should our government pay billions when this is mainly for personal gain. I think a well planned out enhanced bus system with disincentives to drivers would be the solution. I also think it is very interesting how this came to pass since Vail has invaded Park City and the wealth that came along with them is most definitely behind this!	Park City	04/27/2015
	I agree with the comment from the October 29, 2014 meeting, "Concern about transporting too many people into the Cottonwood Canyons; noted that the canyons were eliminated as Olympic Venues in 2002 because it was felt that 25,000+ visitors were too large to handle and also a public safety concern." In addition, I live in Park City in the winter, but am a season pass holder at Alta. I don't ski in Park City and haven't skied there in five years. I fear that the connection will change the culture and the recreational experience and lifestyle in the Cottonwood Canyons. Let's not strive to be Colorado; what we have works. I'm for saving the environment and keeping the Wasatch beautiful, however, will this be accomplished?	Park City	04/29/2015
	I am against the proposed tunnel from Sandy to PCMR. It is extremely expensive and will bring only day skiers up (larger crowds here in our community) with little contribution to our economy or community. How does the proposed improve Park City? Seems to me that it will make us another suburb of Salt Lake and that is not why we moved here. Also, seems to me that the options which will be implemented will be buses as the cost for light rail is too expensive for our state (I will never get the funding) I would prefer to see improvement on I80 and in transportation options from kimball to park city improved vs. a tunnel through cottonwood canyon.	Park City	02/23/2015
	I am concerned about the "why?" of the Mountain Accord movement. Nobody on the Wasatch Back cares about going to Sandy on a regular basis so I see no benefit and only IMPACTS to the citizens of the Wasatch Back. I am also concerned about the environmental consequences of building such an endeavor. The construction requires a large footprint that could be very destructive to the environment and wildlife. I don't see the need and feel like this would be better served with light rail along the existing highways. Economically, this all makes no sense to me and I never seeing this being monetized.	Park City	04/30/2015
	I am concerned that these plans are for the financial benefit of the few at the expense of the many and of the future.	Park City	04/26/2015
	I am not really in favor of putting in tunnels from the Cottonwood Canyons to the Wasatch Back. Our mountains are already riddled with old mining shafts etc. With I-80 being the main artery from the Wasatch Front to Park City, we will need in the future a more efficient bus system. Perhaps at some point in the future, cars may not be allowed in central business districts without paying a surcharge such as they do in London or Stockholm. Also feel that there needs to be a better system from Park City to Heber City and Kamias.	Park City	04/30/2015
	I applaud addressing transportation problems with environmentally friendly mass transit options. I do not support the building of tunnels or over the snow connections that potentially adversely impact the watershed and environment, fauna, flora and access and quality of life. At the very least a full EIS should be done before proceeding with any of these alternatives. I am a skier, but I do not support turning the Wasatch Front and Back into a giant amusement park for the ski industry. There are many non skiing recreational users and nearby residents who want their quality of life preserved. More development is not necessarily good.	Park City	04/30/2015
	I appreciate the hard work that people put into this, but this to me is mostly about economic growth and the economic considerations outweighs the other areas that this proposal is intended to support. I believe small projects that enhance key bottlenecks should be considered and not a holistic mega-plan. Decisions are being made now with 2015 technologies being considered. In 30-40 years we will have completely new tech that will give us other options. BUT pursuing these plans now will restrict the best plan possible for the Wasatch, that can only happen when we understand what the new technologies in the coming decades will deliver. Once we mess with it, we will never get it back to the way it was... please don't. Thank you.	Park City	03/27/2015
	I believe after viewing the webpage this is a wonderful attempt to preserve the Wasatch back. I am opposed to anything that would endanger my ability to ski, mountain bike or dirt back in the Wasatch. I believe alternative transportation options allowing transportation from Park City to Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons makes sense.	Park City	03/06/2015
	I believe this whole process is a marketing gimmick for private landowners and businesses. It would better meet the purpose of MA if it focused more on protecting the environment and water shed. I would like to see more benefit for Park City residents rather than Salt Lake. I do not believe more and more unchecked growth is desired by the people who live here, only the ones who will directly profit. The whole Wasatch back is an incredibly diverse, unique and beautiful area. It will be ruined by more and more growth. We do not need any more marketing.	Park City	05/02/2015
	I believe we are at a tipping point on the Wasatch front and back. This may be the last chance to preserve the unique environment and community instead of destroying the carrying capacity of this place. I believe more extreme measures for conservation and disincentives for automobile use and sprawl development should be utilized. Economic growth can continue to prosper through these efforts. Lets try something different - let's think of future generation not immediate profit for the development community. Make this accord have teeth. I also believe that a train back up Parley's canyon is the answer, environmental and economically. Blasting a tunnel makes no sense at this point.	PARK CITY	04/30/2015
	I believe you are too concerned about bringing in more people and how to make their vacations better and not enough on how to make the home owners and residents of our community have a sustainable future in a community we have invested in. Where will the water come from to support the vacationers? Don't they vacation here now because of how it looks and feels. If we turn Park City area into Salt Lake City who will want to come? If we build business parks that will house high end jobs then the residents won't have to depend on tourism to sustain. Lets work on making our community sustainable with less emphasis on tourism. There's too much at stake here. Water, Air, trails...quality of life, we bought this...we deserve to keep it. There's more to us than a destination resort. We are a community. We won't become a ghost town if we don't spend money on getting tourist around easier. We use what we have. Buses on an HOV lane works. UBER type transportation to bus stations and back to the city. I picture each community having an electric small bus that is on call and transports people to and from their house to the city bus) The HOA of Jeremy Ranch pays for their drivers, Pinbrook for theirs, etc. The city doesn't need to pay for this but collaboration will make it work and will be part of the future plans of each community.	park city	04/30/2015
	I cannot answer the questions since I believe that the Blueprint uses words and phrases which are open to interpretation relative to a person's point of view. This makes the process political, encourages extreme positions and provides cover for any decision. Who decides what is sustainable? What is responsible stewardship? What is quality recreation? Who's vibrant economy? Economically sustainable transportation system? How about affordable? This blueprint is trying to address too many issues at once.	Park City	04/29/2015
	I can't imagine what need you are meeting by building a train and tunnel system through the Cottonwoods and over to Park City. The expense and environmental impact will be incredible. If you want to make it easy to get from SLC to Park City, do it up the I-80 corridor, not through our gorgeous mountains. This feels like something that Sandy requested to be able to provide quick access to all the mountains.	Park City	02/07/2015
	I do not want any tunnels or roads connecting Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons to the Park City area over Gardsman Pass. What I would like to see are very big multi level parking garages (free) at the bases of all the Canyons (Little, Big and Parley's) and people being REQUIRED to park there and then be bussed (free) up to the resorts. Only those owning residences being allowed to drive a vehicle up to their residence. Anyone renting or staying at hotels or condos would be required to park at the lots at the base and they would be taken up from airports or the parking garages at the bottom of the canyons by vans. There would be no personal vehicles driving on the canyons except for owners. All workers would have to use the parking garages	Park City	05/01/2015
	I feel the Blueprint is a sell out for those of us that really want to protect the Wasatch. A sell out for us and a BIG win for business expansion and development.	Park City	02/05/2015
	I feel this is a very well thought out plan that addresses all aspects of proper stewardship.	Park City	02/04/2015
	I grew up at the base of Little Cottonwood Canyon and I now live in Park City, Utah. The Wasatch Mountains are dear to me. The Mountain Accord doesn't improve upon any aspect that is being proposed. The project is driven with financial benefit and is manipulating a transport system resolve as a decoy. I want to deliver a speech such as Chief Seattle. In essence, there is nothing sustainable or preserving or vibrant about scarring beautiful mountains and connecting that which isn't connected. Only problems will come of such human destruction. Are we thinking generations ahead? No. What is sacred anymore? 'Give the people convenience' is not sustainable. This whole idea needs to get flipped on it's head. The Wasatch mountains and its ski resorts are attractive as little niches that can be discovered by tourists and locals alike.	Park City	03/17/2015
	I left the sections on environmental stewardship as an unknown because I do question the environmental impact of building a tunnel, vs developing a bus only infrastructure over the Guardsman's Pass, thereby decreasing resources needed to develop a tunnel. While I personally would prefer to have a train and tram system throughout Utah, I understand that from a political perspective, the state might not be ready for that. For that reason, I would like to see further proposals for buses, simply because I think they would be easier to digest from a cost and impact solution, while perhaps not as much of a vast improvement. My vision is to develop a gated bus route over Guardsman's. The pick up/drop off point in Park City would be in town and there would be no stop at the top of Deer Valley, ensuring that riders did not leave their cars at the top, causing increased traffic on Marsac. As it is now, Guardsman could be gated, only accessible by buses and residents who own land.	Park City	04/30/2015
	I prefer more emphasis on restricting development	Park City	02/05/2015
	I really hope that you ignore the government of Park City and continue with the idea of connecting the cottonwoods to Park City. We desperately need a transit system in Park City and access to the cottonwoods without using the Parley's 500 would be so much safer, environmentally sound and economical. I think the government of Park City is run by the Large resorts in town who want Park City to be a destination resort. They come to Vail or Deer Valley and they go NOWHERE else. Easy access to Snowbird is not in their business model. It seems that a tunnel would be very expensive to create; however, I would imagine it is better for the wildlife corridors and the scenery. I would like to know more about your research on the tunnel. Why did you come to that possibility. I would like to know more so I can spread the word. I think it would be ridiculous to do buses they are part of the traffic and can be unreliable when there is an accident. The transit system has to be better than travelling by car or it will not be used. We need a train system that is efficient. One selling point would be that for the cottonwoods, you can always get up there as it is easy to create snow bridges etc so the train can run regardless of avalanche danger. I also think that you need to propose NO TRAFFIC in the cottonwoods. Then give people an efficient and easy alternative. Thanks for doing this	Park City	03/14/2015
	I strongly support both the Mountain Accord and the One Wasatch proposals. I am a visiting professor of marketing and I've taught ski resort management (formerly at the University of Utah and currently in Europe). Our ski resorts are in such close proximity to each other it seems natural to link them and create an even better European resorts experience. The marketing, economic, and ski and tourism experience benefits will be incredible!	Park City	04/29/2015
	I think that we need to focus on preserving as much of our open space and surrounding lands as possible. We live in a desert and droughts are starting to be more common every year. I think transportation is a big concern as well as the over development of the wasatch front and back. I believe that connecting the cottonwood canyons and Park City is not an option, each canyon and Park City offers its own unique experience and putting Ariel trams and tunnels to connect these places would take away from the special experience of each place. I think it is also fair to think of our next generations our children and their children. I personally want them to be able to recreate in these mountains the way they are now. A lot of people go out there to escape the over crowded resorts and to appreciate the natural wild setting that is in our back yards. These mountains are our future without them we lose everything and we should make our decisions on what's best for them and not a select few that will profit from connections and expansions. Bus rapid transit and some light rails sound like great options for transportations, tolls for day use in the cottonwood canyons could be effective for traffic issues, renovation projects and land preservation for the future.	Park city	02/06/2015
	I think the focus has to be on transportation options that are affordable and efficient. I don't like any of the bus options. Buses move at the same pace as a car, are less comfortable and the overall travel time is a lot longer. The only type of mass transit that should be considered and invested in are trains. While more expensive initially, they are more efficient to run, have high reliability and can be designed so that they get you there quicker than in a car. Take it from a guy who commuted into NYC for 23 years by train. The train up Rt 80 through Kimball Junction to Park City makes sense. Not so sure about the one through the Cottonwoods. Don't waste time and money on buses except more frequent service up the Cottonwoods.	Park City	02/19/2015
	I think trains or monorail on existing interstates combined with large capacity aerial trams with dedicated parking structures/zones areas would enhance transportation argument and lessen impact of connections. You have to maintain the resort destinations or you'll lose the battle with the municipalities and the residents. Sense of place has to be maintained and enhanced without compromise.	Park City	05/02/2015
	I would love to be able to start skiing in Park City and at the end of the day go to say gold miners daughter and get a pizza and then be able to catch a train back to park city THAT WOULD BE AWESOME.	PARK CITY	03/02/2015
	I'm 100% in favor of the One Wasatch concept, connecting the major mountain resorts with chairlifts, gondolas, and (or) trams. Improved bus service would be positive, but I'm not sure about the cost effectiveness of expanded light rail or train service. I'm 100% opposed to blasting tunnels through the Wasatch mountain range to create new roadways.	Park City	03/11/2015
	I'm concerned that the Brighton Estates area is not on the map. With a pending water system, 100s of lots, and other pre-existing proposals by Park City Mines and Deer Valley it seems that this area is being overlooked. This could quickly become a highly dense area including houses, cars, and a resort. Did I miss this being addressed if so please show me what I missed?	Park City	02/04/2015

	I'm not sure that building a tunnel or a tram into Park City is sustainable or necessary. Let's leave that whole area as it is...not sure people want to travel into the backside of PC from Solitude/Brighton	Park City	04/16/2015
	I'm really happy this process is taking place, but I have to say that I am very unimpressed with the transit plan as laid out. Why on earth would light rail from the airport, up cottonwood canyons and into Park City be on this map when bus service from the airport to 80 is the only option? I am a very politically active resident in Park City and I'm going to tell you right now, that is just not going to work. While the residents of Park City are mixed on the idea of light rail, many favor it up 80 and around the highway areas, but not in town. We certainly don't want to be the last stop on a train that comes from other ski resorts but doesn't address our own from the 80 corridor. I would like to see a train that runs in a C starting at Kimball Junction ending in the cottonwood canyons with the airport in the middle, running in both directions. I have no issues with the cottonwood PC connection, I just think it should be made over the snow (gondolas etc).	Park City	02/08/2015
	In a nutshell, my feeling is that the "One Wasatch" ski resort interconnect project is woefully missing from that plan. It is, in fact, "the elephant in the room" in the way it was left out not to offend a highly vocal minority. As a matter of fact, "One Wasatch" embodies the four pillars of the Mountain Accord plan: Environment, recreation, transportation and economy. Further, interconnect resorts have been tested in the Alps for more than 40 years to the satisfaction of its visitors, its local population and its environment. Finally, it stands as a free test that would work with each one of the categories considered. Environment: Many people staying in Park City ski Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons everyday. The availability of a ski connection would render these car trip unnecessary and would also allow folks living the Valley to ride the UTA transit system to any Cottonwood Canyon resort and get to Park City without using their car. Most importantly though, skiers (alpine, touring) have very little or no impact on the pristine mountain environment. Contrast this to, say snowmobile traffic, for example... Recreation: The interconnect would add exponentially of the experience that both locals and visitors receive when they ski our seven resorts without having to rely on vehicular transportation. The best things in life are experiences and opening up a small part of our Wasatch Mountain to winter recreation would expose more people in a full and dramatic manner to the beauty of our mountain environment; it would also elicit even more love and respect from everyone towards our magnificent nature. Transportation: As said on the "Environment" section, vehicular traffic and need for extra parking could actually diminish with a working ski interconnect. With it, a very compelling argument could be made to visitors for not renting a car. The net result would be enhanced traffic everywhere. Economy: A ski interconnect would bring more destination visitors to Utah during the mid-week period, maximizing the resorts capacity and providing an insurance that in spite of a receding snow cover, tourism business would continue to be good for Utah, making it a unique place in North America for its multi-resort experience.	Park City	03/22/2015
	In addition to my earlier comments, would like to add the following: 1) User Fees are a must. I have seen how much Millcreek Canyon improved once the user fee system was initiated a couple of decades ago. Absolutely should expand this where and when possible. Please consider an annual pass like the National Parks annual pass to avoid having to have passes for each individual canyon. \$100 is a good starting point for an annual pass and \$10 or so for day passes. 2) Park City to Brighton tunnel options are really clever but are they realistic? Would fully support this for the reasons mentioned but given the track record of Park City developers (now Vail) the tunnel option seems like a stalking horse for their preferred option of aerial which is beyond worthless. It won't carry the load, allow people to move the equipment, they need, will destroy the very landscape we are trying to save. Please bring back the Guardsman Pass expansion option. The Swiss and Austrians would laugh if they saw how easy it would be to make Guardsman Pass an all season road. It is basically almost half done thanks to the ugly construction in upper Park City. Just finish the road and leave the rest of Big Cottonwood Canyon alone. 3) Where can I sign up to help donate towards public land acquisition fund? Putting as much of the Central Wasatch into public hands is the best protection.	Park City	03/28/2015
	In my opinion the proposed rail system is a great mid / long term idea. If one has been to Japan there is already in existence an excellent model in place "Shinkansen (Bullet train) from Tokyo to Guala Yuzza ski resort. This model could be used from SLC to all of the existing resorts. The beauty of the Japanese model is that you exit the train, buy your ticket (rent skis) and are zipped to the slopes on a Gondola. I also believe that we need to connect the existing ski resorts prior to 2040 by a system of gondolas and chairs. The environmental impact of a train system will be much greater than a few well placed gondolas.	Park City	02/25/2015
	Increased public transportation options are good. However, I'm unsure if this would tackle the effect of traffic. Most people will still use their cars when possible.	Park City	02/05/2015
	It is still too vague for me, with too many questions. I understand that this is step one, and that it is a massive task.	Park City	05/01/2015
	It looks like the players proposing this plan are more interested in money projects. I don't like the tunnel idea at all. That part makes the entire accord look like the ski areas are pushing for more access for skiers. Transportation is another big money project for bonuses for UTA, envision Utah has a better comment survey participation method. If this method for comment is the only way to influence the accord, the accord group is going to push this program right through. The future for skiing is not certain due to climate change. I would much rather have a toll booth at the entrance to the canyons. Bussing for non permitted travel up the canyon. Keep the canyons difficult to ruin. Protect our water. Don't start big projects that cost me money to make our state Disneyland. If traffic is terrible people will plan ahead to get a permit. Allow travel up Albion basin by a permit. Some people just drive around up the canyons, we can stop that with a fee. No need to expand the resorts, or buy up property. This program, the mountain accord needs better communication. It's very difficult to understand the goals of the group other than greed, and inside deals. I'm not sure if there are other goals than money, am I wrong?	Park City	05/01/2015
	It meets the purpose well with exception of: - Casual use of the word "wilderness"; the 1968 Wilderness Act is outdated and cannot be updated in the current congress (touching it would gut it). Bicycles or mechanized devices cannot be ridden in Wilderness. So I think casual use of the word Wilderness is a mistake. You are already aware of this as I've gathered.	Park City	02/25/2015
	It seems a rail system over Guardsman Pass versus tunnels would be the most inexpensive and environmentally sound way to connect Big Cottonwood Canyon and Summit and Wasatch County.	Park City	05/01/2015
	It seems like the blueprint has hit the recreation hubs well and all trans up Parleys Canyon. Swapping land with the ski areas to build out at their bases is a good plan. Any kind of transit connection up a canyon other than Parleys is asking for it, thought. Build it and the people will come. I see enhancing trans (buses only with adequate service) up B & L Cottonwood canyons with one of them as Bus Only. Parleys needs buses or light rail with service every 10-15 minute. Huge Park & Rides at the base in SLC and also in PC at the soon to be Transit Center. But PC tourists should not need a car to come here at all because bus service should be top notch. No trains or road enhancement over Guardsmen. Too risky with disruption of what's IN those rocks and also watershed.	Park City	05/01/2015
	It seems that unlike a number of my PC neighbors I am in favor of the light rail system connecting the Wasatch Back and Front. The idea of taking guests (tourists) from the airport to the resorts by rail eliminating cars and traffic is wonderful. Until such a system is developed I believe more "Park & Ride" lots should be established outside of PC to encourage more use of the current bus system in the hope of eliminating traffic and congestion. Keep up the effort and I hope the local governments (PC & Summit Co.) don't give up on this promising effort! Eric	Park City	03/16/2015
	It's imperative that we use tunnels for transportation. It's more money upfront but with out scaring of the mountains and safer than snowy roads. Driving from Alta to Park City is ridiculous with the current system.	Park City	03/06/2015
	Keep individual canyons separate	Park City	04/30/2015
	More discussion about electric cars/vans, solar-powered charging stations, carbon offset fees for inefficient modes of travel. Make sustainable transportation sheik--buses should be decked out so people WANT to ride them. Tourists are coming to ski--they'll take whatever modes of transportation we provide as long as they are comfortable and timely.	Park City	04/30/2015
	Mountain accord needs to address first benefits for The Wasatch front. Pollution is the major threat for all of us who live here. The 6 big polluters give us 50% of our pollution and only 8-9000 jobs. The minor amount of environmental impact caused by developing an improved transportation system, roads, and expanded terrain for the recreational industry is minuscule compared to the real polluters in UT. The recreational industry probably provides considerably more jobs and is the future of UT. Developing year around recreation and the subsequent business will provide far more jobs and local benefit that the existing old industries. In order to do that a mass transit plan is essential to provide efficient access. Guardsman's pass needs to be open year to both vehicle and light rail. Both resort traffic and commuter traffic need to be considered. There need to stops at the resorts and population centers. Commuter use will decrease the per passenger costs. Midway needs to be incorporated and the resorts need to have a single pass for UT residents that make skiing/biking etc affordable. Trails/ski runs and lifts should go from Midway, Park City, the Canyon resorts and Sandy. Tolls for non resident vehicles should be charged and subsidies for rail should be given to encourage use of mass transportation but not exclude UT residents. Electric vehicles need to be encouraged in the canyons and salt lake. Park City's traffic is a mess. A Mass transit loop route up Big Cottonwood over Guardsman's and down I 80 is essential. Mountain access should be available from housing in Midway, Sandy and Salt lake not just Park City. The plan needs to include all of the Wasatch and not just protect Park City's housing base. This is essential for the economy of the whole Wasatch. The plan needs to work for visitors and be affordable for locals who will pay the taxes to make it happen. The environmental issue is real and the solution is simple, make the big polluters clean up their discharges or move on. Develop the recreational industry that is sustainable and will create more and better jobs. Develop a mass transit system that serves everyone and does not close out the locals.	Park City	03/28/2015
	need alignment with OneWasatch and per such would like to see more transit by ski lifts (chairs, gondolas, funiculars, etc.) and less pavement/cars -- more recreation not more recreational vehicles	Park City	04/09/2015
	Need more land protected on the Southeast--why is there the big area missing? Running busses through areas that now are just dirt roads or trails would result in huge degradation of the natural areas. Need better protection!	Park City	03/10/2015
	No tunnel to Park City	Park City	03/13/2015
	Not allowing any transportation over the the Wasatch Crest between resorts.	Park City	05/01/2015
	Overall the document still reads too much like a General Plan without much detail to really comment on. Transportation and Environment groups have done their jobs but the Recreation and Economic groups are lacking in detail.	Park City	02/09/2015
	Please amend the wording of Consensus decision to require that governmental members such as Summit County or Park City may reject a portion of the Mountain Accord agreement; and Mountain Accord will honor that rejection.	Park City	04/30/2015
	Please maximize the designation of federal lands as WILDERNESS.	Park City	05/01/2015
	preserving wild / un-mechanized areas in central wasatch for human-powered recreation is my number one goal. these areas are a unique resource because of their proximity to a large population base. environmental quality, wild life habitat, water shed also important. limit any lcc and bcc ski area expansion except in cases where land trades make sense. eliminate heli ski operations by buying out concession. eliminate snow mobiles in lcc and bcc, especially cardiff fork. no need to link park city with lcc/bcc roads or ski areas. 3 park city ski areas will link "organically" with little negative impact on traffic and enviro quality	Park City	03/15/2015
	Put less emphasis on the ski resorts needs and more on the communities. Park City's and Summit Counties transportation problems exist and need to be resolved regardless of the impact from tourism and skiing.	Park City	03/15/2015
	Reducing traffic must be a bigger priority. Light rail has to be part of this. Ever been to ski areas in Switzerland or Austria? Buses won't solve the problem. Rail plus high parking charges are the way to go.	Park City	02/06/2015
	I live in the Pinebrook community of Park City and work in Midvale. I would love to be able to take transit. I do not work regular 9-5 hours, so would need the flexibility of a transit system that would be faster than my SOV and almost as flexible. I would also like to be able to take my dog with me on the transit system. A train system with a stop in Kimball Junction would be attractive to me as a commuter. Even better would be a stop at the Jeremy Ranch/Pinebrook exit.	Park City	04/26/2015
	Seems to be a shift for UTA moving large amounts of people to a small environmentally fragile environment. It will be an enormously costly effort to benefit very few developers and pushed onto the taxpayers. The water issue here never been addressed, we had a moratorium in the 70s and has been pushed under the carpet time and time again. There is something wrong with a process where large amounts of money are required to even have a voice at the table. We have had numerous projects shoved down our throats by the legislature turning PC into a sideshow.	Park City	05/02/2015
	Seems to me that the whole thing hinges on whether a train system into LCC is financially feasible and realistic within a reasonable period of time. I did not see a position being taken on the One Wasatch proposal, which I am strongly against.	Park City	02/18/2015
	I only saw one mention of protecting wild life corridors. Letting other animals live on this Earth is essential to our welfare. This plan looks unfinished because this concern is not addressed as thoroughly as it should be. There is no need for access from Park City to Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. It will create more traffic in a pristine area and goes against the environmental aspect of this blueprint. Maybe an underground train or a gondola, but increasing car traffic is against all of our best interest. I think this project is amazing and I'm so impressed by the forward thinking. That you all for doing such an amazing job and keeping everyone so involved.	Park City	04/30/2015
	So far, I'm disappointed by what Mountain Accord has achieved. It seems like the group has spent a lot of time on just coming up with ideals rather than actual action plans that can achieve results. While good, these ideals seem self evident. It's time to get to work on coming up with actionable goals that achieve a balance of environment, recreation, transit, economy, livability and equality for all parties involved. I know a lot of people are focussing on the train like, so I'll just add my two cents too - don't build a train line from Park City to Sandy. That's just silly. Focus on the infrastructure we have, make it better, make it more efficient, convenient and more sustainable. Also, I really like trails. A lot. I like non-motorized activities the best.	Park City	05/01/2015
	Stewardship for the Wasatch does not include any significant development over and above all the development that has done by ski resorts and private property owners. No new development outside of private property and ski resorts is the ideal that I can agree with and support. A trade for appropriate lands to preserve public property and preserve tracts of the environment is acceptable.	Park City	04/30/2015
	Thank you for the vision to look into the future issues to protect an incredible place that is the foundation for the greater Salt Lake Area. Involving all the different interest groups is key to accomplishing the goals. I would like to see the Heber Valley involved, as you look at the 360 view around the central Wasatch they are a key component and will only increase over time.	Park City	02/25/2015

	The Accord seems to be focused on improving access to the Wasatch. It seems to be that the most preserved areas of the country are very difficult to access. Improving access is only going to encourage faster development and more destruction of our natural resources. I would like to see more protections and limited access built into the Accord.	Park City	04/26/2015
	The biggest proposal that Mr. Accord has come up with is a train, bored through the Wasatch. Is that environmentally friendly? I don't think so! I prefer the concept of One Wasatch, where all of the resorts are connected so we can ski between them.	Park City	04/08/2015
	The blueprint has a lot of information but not a lot of good sustainable solutions.	Park City	04/11/2015
	The blueprint is based entirely on promoting the ski industry, with no effort to address diversifying economies when the ski industry is no longer viable. The transit system does not go far enough to reduce automobile use in the Cottonwood Canyons. UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES SHOULD A TUNNEL BE CONSIDERED BETWEEN THE COTTONWOOD CANYONS AND PARK CITY!	Park City	05/01/2015
	The blueprint is in conflict with the purpose of the Mountain Accord. It will serve to further erode our environment	Park City	04/07/2015
	The blueprint places a lot of emphasis on development over preservation of the environment and natural landscape. We need to focus on keeping our open space open for dispersed recreation, wildlife, and preservation of natural resources.	Park City	05/02/2015
	The blueprint should be looking at the long term—for example, it states that the Big Cottonwood and I-80 road are ok for now, so we need to do nothing other than add buses (that few will use, just like now). But that won't be the case in 25 years, and Mountain Accord should plan for that now. And I suppose we have to compromise with the ski areas to get their land into the public domain, but isn't there already enough development in the Cottonwood Canyons? Wouldn't a better course be to buy the ski area lands and add them to the National Forest? And where is added water going to come from?	Park City	03/16/2015
	The current Blueprint appears to be a menu of potential high level actions associated with 4 distinct, not integrated, focus areas. Its impossible for an informed reader to make specific comments due to high level granularity of the document. However, the magnitude of resources that would be required for some potential actions (e.g., light rail tunnels) conveys the feeling of a plan that is overly weighted toward further development at the cost of a sustainable Wasatch. So at this point in development the Blueprint causes me grave concerns. Further, the process by which inherently competing interests (i.e., development vs environmental sustainment) will be satisfied or appeased is nebulous. Taken together (perceived current weighting toward development and an opaque decision making process) causes me to be very skeptical of the final outcome relative to enhancing environmental sustainability. Further, no legal means of enforcing trade-off deals that could provide future protection for environmental resources have been identified. Leaving the option for walking back on agreements resulting in further loss of protected sensitive environments.	Park City	03/26/2015
	The economic blueprint could do a better job of calling out the need to diversify the economic interests of the Wasatch Front and Back given impending climate changes and the resulting likelihood that the snowfall will be much reduced in the future. It appears that the idealized systems and blueprint framework is grounded in the belief that tourism will continue to be the main driver of the local/state economy.	Park City	03/11/2015
	The Mountain Accord seems to have turned into a way to justify a train for the Wasatch front to access the mountains at a cost that is unaffordable and unsustainable. It does not address the needs of the back of Wasatch community at all! This feels like a bunch of politician/developers getting together and figuring out how to get rich at the taxpayers expense.	Park City	02/08/2015
	The Mountains are already over crowded at many of the ski resorts. There is no information about how crowded the trail systems and ski hill are at this current time and how bad it will be if we can get more people up the mountain. I would also like to see some information on how many people use the public transit system already. There is a free bus system in Park City and I would be interested to know how many people use this system each day. I see people driving to work along side the bus every day.	Park City	02/05/2015
	The proposed approach appears forward thinking, even-handed and realistic about getting in front of and purposefully managing coming growth and pressure on our amazing natural resources.	Park City	02/05/2015
	The proposed train up Little Cottonwood Canyon and the tunnels to connect it to Big Cottonwood and Park City is environmentally unsound and economically unrealistic. The train would be underutilized most of the year. It would place a tremendous burden on taxpayers who would pay for an inflexible transportation system that would at best be serving a relatively small number of people and a few ski resorts. Far more flexible and more economical to beef up the bus system, perhaps making the canyons car-free as in Zion. If the canyon roads remain open, most people will continue to use cars to get to the resorts. The environmental damage to the canyon during the construction of a rail line and tunnels through the mountains would FAR outweigh their value. Don't rip up our mountains!	Park City	02/28/2015
	The proposed transit connection through the Big Cottonwood Canyon is an absolute travesty and is being driven by special interests in the Valley. No one in Park City wants this. It makes no sense and is an outrageous use of taxpayer dollars. Focus on the Parley's connection!!!! THAT makes sense. THAT people will use. The other is a marketing tool for Sandy and Salt Lake County. The general feeling is that this issue was decided long ago and this window dressing of a public process is just that. I do not believe that any consensus was developed.	Park City	02/04/2015
	The purchase of privately held land/easements is laudable. Removing entitlements from sensitive lands will ensure continued preservation and high quality recreation.	Park City	02/17/2015
	The transit system as proposed provides great benefit to the city of Sandy and possibly Draper, the Snowbird and Alta ski areas, and marginally also to the LCC and PC ski areas. This would necessarily be paid for by the city. The LCC train and tunnel offer absolutely no common sense year-round benefit to the cities or citizens. It seems to work only as an effort for the LCC resorts to mitigate their occasional weather-induced access and egress issues (let's all hope heavy and regular snowfall becomes and remains an issue). The city of Sandy wants to be a mountain resort city. Laughable on its face, this idea would be boosted immensely if their hotel base was connected by the glamorous train to the mountains and a tunnel to the PC side is gravy on the deal. Meanwhile, the Accord's predictions show the incredible growth coming on the Wasatch back - yet fails to provide any realistic solution to the transit issues that are happening already. My input: a train, preferably a direct Trax connection with no necessary transfer, that links the Back to Salt Lake City is the vision for the future that is required. If a train connection is desired, the top of the LCC/PC area should come off the PC line. There is a reason that Parley's Canyon has been the connection all these years. It's the only one that makes sense. Please do not let the funding source of this scheme drive the result. It is a chance to do something good.	Park City	04/30/2015
	The transportation system is not well thought out. There is no need to connect all the ski resorts with a train type system or a auto type system. The ski resorts do not need to be connected. Types of skiers are different within the resort system. Skiers on the Cottonwood side and High end resort skiers on the PC side. The Gondola is not a good option because of the skier difference.	Park City	04/30/2015
	The tunneling between Little cottonwood and Park City seems like a good idea when compared to the alternatives. It would be great if only trains and cyclists can use it. Powering the train with green energy would be a great addition as it would have less of an impact on our water supply. If the tunneling goes ahead I would look closely at the necessity of any aerial tram/gondola connecting Park City and Big cottonwood Canyon. I feel this would be very unnecessary and would only encourage development of that beautiful area. The ski interconnect that currently serves as the 'go between' works very well and is always a trip people remember for the rest of their lives.	Park City	02/04/2015
	The weakness of the plan is that it depends on extensive financial support. A backup plan is needed. For example, opening Guardsman Pass to vehicular travel in the winter will address part of the connection problem to Brighton. But the Guardsman Pass road does not even appear on the map... it should at least be a footnote.	park city	02/04/2015
	The work that the Mountain Accord has undertaken is impressive to date based on what I have read and heard. I agree that there are generally, no bad ideas. However, I personally believe that the Accord is attempting to address too many issues and should consider narrowing its focus. First and foremost in my mind is the fact that Utah does not need another consortium to guarantee economic growth. there are no mid to long term regional indicators on the horizon that even remotely suggest a slow down in the creation of jobs in the technology, services, energy, health care, tourism and even manufacturing sectors. Which leads me to the notion that the Accord should be solving for just two factors that truly threaten the quality of life for most of the citizens. First, the Accord should work to protect the fragile environment of the Central Wasatch so these pristine environments are not engulfed by the inevitable growth that is on our doorstep. As our economic growth increases demand for these prime recreational spaces we need to exercise thoughtful management of these limited spaces as to maintain the quality of life that is Utah. Second, The Accord should be focused on the planning and development of a world-class transportation system that shifts our paradigm from single user vehicles in those areas that need protection the most (the Canyons) while providing long term planning for the Wasatch Back. When you combine local vehicular traffic with thousands of rental car units it is simply an escalating recipe for disaster on many weekends and heavy periods. If we solve for transportation we have a better opportunity to maintain the quality recreational experience residents and visitors desire. The economy is best left to leaders who create competitive, market driven businesses with fair oversight from the state and county governments. Protect the Wasatch and solve our transportation woes. That's the focus to me. Thanks for listening.	Park City	04/27/2015
	There is so much to read on the Mountain Accord site that we went to the Park City meeting to get some clarification. But, the consistent theme there was that there are so many unknowns that your panel could not adequately give answers at this point. The Blueprint could contain more concrete proposals, and the cost of those. Perhaps going forward the Blueprint could include "Education", so the public can be aware of the impacts of unfettered growth, water use, and boundless consumption. I think it is important to acknowledge that without adequate snow pack (after this winter, we may need to plan for that) our watershed will suffer, as will any economic growth or expanded recreation.	Park City	03/17/2015
	These questions are tailored to serve your own purposes and not necessarily give you the feedback that you need to hear. IMO, I would say that there are better ways to address transportation issues, etc. with less impact to the environment than what you've proposed. The Accord, in what you've presented, is misleading on many levels. The proposal puts humans (economy, recreation, etc.) first and foremost. I can't support that.	Park City	03/17/2015
	This is a clear push by the city of Sandy and Wasatch Front legislators to increase tourism at the expense of our canyons and the environment.	Park City	03/15/2015
	This is awful, billions is a lot of money to spend to urbanize what is left of Summit County	Park City	04/30/2015
	This plan doesn't address the problem of getting thousands of people from the condo to the restaurants at 6 pm nor from the ski hill to the condo at 4 pm. The easiest thing, to plan for, is how to move bodies from the airport to the destination, a 4th grader can see the answers... what will happen when 10's of thousands are zipped into the resorts with a sea of taxis in gridlock? maybe this has been included in this overview and it has escaped me... maybe not... My idea would be to work out the hard issues of ski hill to restaurant FIRST! that's where the rubber meets the road... The airport to resort sections will fall in place as we see how the demand loads work out, going into the future. The bottle necks are here now, we don't need to pile more bodies into the existing bottle necks. Work on the hard decisions, then your plans A, B, C, D will be easy choices... I doubt those who were in Park City this Christmas will be back next year... did I miss the high level comprehensive set of actions?	Park City	02/24/2015
	Though we were told all along that this explorative and planning process was not about a train, I believe we were misled. If this wasn't the case, then someone needs to answer why over the snow connection now appears to be off the table. This is a patently dishonest political play by the leaders of the Accord to get what they want (train). If not, then put the over the snow connections back on the table as a viable option and let the people decide. Or stated another way, imagine if the Accord folks just unilaterally took the train concept off of the table altogether the way they have over the snow. Do you think the communities would be upset? If so, who would be upset? This is a decision that must be made via the public process, not unilateral political decision making. I ask how the Accord even has the authority to do this? Do you have the same authority to take other transportation options off the table unilaterally? Again, who's decision was it to eliminate over the snow? This is a serious question that must be answered.	Park City	03/11/2015
	Transit solutions to the Wasatch back should focus on routes up Parley's Canyon or possibly over Guardsman Pass because they could be utilized by visiting tourists and locals alike. Creating a tunnel from the Cottonwood Canyons to the Wasatch Back is wasteful and only supports tourists.	Park City	04/04/2015
	Tunnels are an expensive and stupid solution. Whose pockets are being lined by that boondoggle?? I expect Utah to make better financial decisions. The combination of rail and/or bus and a high speed ski lift system would be a better and much more efficient solution. It would significantly reduce the numbers of vehicles on the roads thus reducing traffic and pollution from vehicles.	Park City	05/01/2015
	Unsure how any of this benefits Summit County. There are 6-7 major ski and recreational resorts, several of these are in very close proximity and quite easy to access. How connecting these additional areas will improve the environment or economics of this area relative to the enormous expenses which will be incurred, is a mystery.	Park City	03/16/2015
	We do NOT need a tunnel connecting Park City with the Wasatch front ski resorts. We DO, however, need a viable light rail system connecting Park City with Kimball Junction and then continuing down to SLC and the rail system there. We DO need the light rails system to operate to the airport on Sundays to be useful to tourists and local travelers in SLC and Park City. A light rail system up the Cottonwood Canyons, connecting to the I80 transit system, would be helpful to tourism and the environment. A tunnel is a waste of taxpayer money, and will not improve the quality of life for Utah residents or tourists.	Park City	04/22/2015
	We look forward to seeing the ski resorts joined together to create the largest ski resort in the world. We are confident that the various bodies and authorities will do this in a way that preserves the beautiful Wasatch mountains for future generations.	Park City	02/04/2015
	We should coordinate these efforts with the One Utah/Ski Link proposals. It is critical that we link the resorts: 1) they back up to one another already; 2) the positive economic impact will be enormous ( we will have a 'European Ski Experience' of 20,000 skiable acres); and 3) linked ski areas will mitigate transportation costs and impacts on the environment. Lavnee and the Board are doing a great job managing this process!	Park City	02/25/2015
	We should focus on outcomes that are economically feasible and have a chance in the next 20 plus years of being completed. The train tunnel concept makes very little sense. While it is most important to protect water shed everywhere, more should be done in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. What about addressing the septic systems in the canyons and the effect on water quality. Certainly putting ski lifts to connect the ski areas will have less impact on water quality than the current septic situation. Also, the meeting in Park City was poorly run and could have been handled in a much more professional manner.	Park City	04/30/2015

	What exactly does "increased environmental protection" look like on an enforcement level? Anytime you build a road or chairlift/other ski transportation, you are not only cutting through habitat and wildlife corridors, but you also open up hundreds of acres that will be more susceptible to human traffic, litter, noise disturbance and the possibility of future development. I have a hard time believing that bringing hundreds of thousands more people into the heart of the Central Wasatch will actually translate into a healthier ecosystem and good land stewardship, even if the effort is there from a small group of people. I also don't think ski resorts like Deer Valley, Park City and Canyons are lessons of environmental responsibility, even though they'd claim differently. The consumerism and water use alone should be a red flag. Turning the whole central Wasatch into a mega-resort and economic hub (more than it already is) simply cannot be considered environmentally sustainable. What does "vibrant economy" mean? It sounds nice. Don't we already have a booming economy? Why can't we focus on making the "resort experience" more intimate, more defined by individual character, rather than lumping them all together into the Walmart of ski resorts. It feels like we are just accepting the "bigger is better" mantra without considering the fact that many people go to a resort like Solitude, just for that: solitude.	Park City	04/30/2015
	While I support some of the transit opportunities servicing Park City, I object to a plan that combines the Wasatch front ski resorts and the Park City ski resorts. I feel that Park City maintains its character by being physically separated from the Wasatch Front.	Park City	03/12/2015
	Why doesn't this Mtn Accord include the back side of the Wasatch Mtns through Soldier Hollow recreation area? There is skiing, tubing, golfing and biking, including mountain biking and road biking? There are national competitions held in this area, including Nordic Combined skiing (winter) and Tour of Utah biking (summer). Additionally the plan shows NONE of the areas for nordic skiing, such as Mountain Dell, Park City including RoundValley area, Olympic Park area (near Kimball Junction) and Soldier Hollow. If the plan is going to show alpine ski areas, mountain biking trails, and hiking trails where are the defined nordic ski trail areas? They require access and parking and get more crowded each year. And the safety and access improvements to these venues? Perhaps a better definition of "Central Wasatch"? Seems to include only the middle mountain area, yet the report includes SLC area and Quinn's Jct area. Midway/Heber are experiencing high growth. Wouldn't now be the time to include these areas in the recreation/economic/transportation Wasatch Mtn Accord? Many supporters are listed on the front page - where is the TUNA (The Utah Nordic Alliance) decal? Has anyone contacted them? Additional land purchase for preservation is great idea.	Park City	04/29/2015
	Would like the Blueprint to address the locations of the entrance to the Park City area exactly. Where would the transportation enter from over the mountains in Park City? I am speaking of the exact street location. No where does it specifically state this. This will impact the people living around this location drastically and I notice this issue is being conveniently ignored. Please respond on the blueprint where this location is to be and what kind of transportation. Thank you.	Park City	03/26/2015
	Wright Mountain Accord Comments (Glenn Wright, Park City Resident) The Recreation and Environment pieces of this project are well done and mostly of concern to Salt Lake County. The Transportation element is more controversial. My comments are based on the document called Mountain Accord Transportation Corridor Purposes and Alternatives 2/3/2015. I favor a combination of alternatives B, C and D. -BRT or bus up both Cottonwood Canyons, with other traffic restricted to commercial vehicles and residents only. -Aerial connection from Park City to Brighton. -Express Bus from SLC airport connecting to a BRT line from Kimball Junction to the resorts and Quinns Junction. -Aerial Connection - similar to the Peak to Peak Gondola at Whistler ( <a href="http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peak_2_Peak_Gondola">http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peak_2_Peak_Gondola</a> ). The Aerial connection to replace the Town Lift and start on the west side of the ski bridge, with stops near the uphill terminus of the Crescent Lift, or perhaps to a point near Scott's Bowl or Puke Hill, terminating at Brighton base area. This lift is about twice as long as the Peak to Peak gondola at Whistler which cost \$51M CDN. I suggest that it be built in a public/private partnership between the resorts and the UTA or UDOT, to be operated by the ski areas during the ski season and by resort personal, but paid for by the public partner during non-resort operational hours and days. Express Bus - This service must be easy for the visitor to use and include a system to seamlessly deliver luggage to the final destination (perhaps in different vehicles) as well as merging into a robust BRT spine on SR 224. The Chamber of Commerce and travel agents should be promoting mass transit before the visitor arrives and attempt to intercept visitors before they hit the rental car counters	Park City	03/08/2015
	You cannot reconcile a 'vibrant economy' with 'responsible stewardship of the environment' when tunneling through the mountains and building rail systems is on the table.	Park City	04/26/2015
	A new high traffic corridor between Little Cottonwood and Park City would greatly increase urban sprawl instead of relieving the traffic congestion we face. It seems that the underlying and unspoken purpose of adding the train and southern entrance to Park City would be to increase development. At some point, we need to determine how much is enough and learn how to give a more quality product rather than just opening the area up to more and more. Adding the new development corridors would take away from the character of what has made the Wasatch Front an idyllic place to live, work, and play, and turn us into an LA of the Mountains.	Park City	05/01/2015
	The information in the Accord is not specific enough to answer any of the questions truthfully. Maybe I need to read the whole thing again but I doubt it will get much clearer. My question is, "when is enough, enough?" How many more biker, skier, hiker, tourist etc. do we need to provide transportation for? At some point it will become self regulating like Yogi Berra once said about a local diner, "No one goes there any more, it is too crowded." I think everyone needs to take a deep breath and slow down a little. Who is pushing this whole thing? Look at the small amount of input time was given to Park City compared to that of the Wasatch Front. The impact on Park City will be huge where Sandy will hardly know or care what happens in the mountains above them. Please slow down and really think this thing through, there won't be any do overs. Randy Spagnolelli RandySpag@gmail.com	Park City	02/25/2015
	Tunnel idea is very interesting if it could re-utilize some of the existing mines in Park City and the Cottonwood canyons. Would be reasonable grades (rather than up and down) and avoid the snow removal issue. Would like to see this idea developed. Aerial gondolas make no sense. Footprint of giant towers across the wilderness area. Will get minimal use nine months of the year and even in high season will not likely be economic. Just look at how much Snowbird had to build to try to economically justify the giant gondola it built 40 years ago in the failed attempt to get the Olympics. Not to mention destroying the mountain top on which the gondola was built. Can always tell with Snowbird is when hiking the Wasatch peaks now. Widening and plowing Guardsman Pass as an all-season road is not the greatest thing but may be cheaper than the tunnels and would not damage the wilderness area like aerial gondolas that will be economic/environmental failure. Could add bike/ski lanes/trails on the side of the road. Switzerland and Austria have a number of interesting engineering solutions for these high elevation roads. Would be interested in learning more about how the Brighton/Trail will be protected now that Deer Valley owns Solitude. One of my favorite hiking areas that I do not want to see end up like Empire Pass/Montage with development throughout the open space.	Park City	02/24/2015
	The saying "If we build it, we 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 touring the expansion of PCM with Canyons as it is being touted as the largest ski resort in US...they will come !!! 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 & SR 248 into Park City as being the most nonobtrusive option and if there is adequate parking for people coming up I-80 I believe it would be receptive. Adding BRT Bus rapid transit vs bus 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/liven int" 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. Also, I do agree with all of the current proposals for the Transportation options to be DROPPED...none are acceptable.	Park City UT 84098	03/11/2015
	don't spend billions of dollars building roads and trains into our mountains and mountain towns!!! you will only make the mountains more crowded and developed then they already are!!! it would ruin the character of park city.	Park City Utah	03/16/2015
	1.Create invest/disincentives to reduce the use of private cars to move skiers, other recreational traffic, and resort employees between Kimball Junction, Quinn Jct, lodging facilities, and residences, and the ski resorts. 2.Improve and expand the free bus transportation from residential areas (including Heber valley, SLC valley, etc.) for employees of the resorts and of the general hospitality infrastructure to the various work places. 3.Separate as much as possible the ski resorts/visitor traffic in the Wasatch back from the daily routine traffic of residents, with the goal to improve everybody's experience.	Park City, UT	04/08/2015
	As a Park City resident, I won't support an over the mountain rail system to Park City from the Cottonwoods and Sandy. An over the mountain to Park City tram, or train seems like it'll be both extremely expensive to build/maintain, and very slow. Increased bus service and park-and-rides for the Cottonwoods seems more achievable and useful than a light rail.	Park City, UT	03/16/2015
	Full Disclosure, I work in the Real Estate industry, specifically in the finance world. So I benefit from this type of growth. That said, this growth is the evolution/death of the Wasatch Front as we know it. It is the path of enabling more and more to use the area. It is hard to argue that we should prevent people from using the area however there is no argument that this type of growth is motivated by a profiteer at some level enriching the very few yet affecting the many. Again, I work in this industry and understand the process of land acquisition to final end user consumer taking title downstream. I am against it as I am here in Park City because of the small town feel/ quality life for my children vs the Rat Race of the valley and other metro areas. Bringing the Rat Race to Park City is something I will fight as long as I am here. There is a place for this type of ambition and it is not in my backyard.	Park City, UT	02/24/2015
	I am highly opposed to the plan for a tunnel into Park City. It would do harm to the character of our town. It would only add to the congestion here. It would help developers, hotels and restaurants in the valley but not those in Park City. Inaction the proposed cost is out of control! I am also opposed to your bringing a train into Park City.	Park City, UT	04/30/2015
	I feel that a tunnel from Little Cottonwood Canyon to Park City is a terrible idea. It is environmentally unsound due to the damage done by tunneling through pristine areas. It creates far too much traffic coming into Park City on steep windy roads. It will only increase Park City's traffic problems. If it is desired to connect the different areas, the solution proposed by One Wasatch is a more sound idea. It would only require 2 more aerial lifts in addition to the new one being built between Canyons and Park City. That way skiers could ski all the areas in one day IF desired. It would not increase automobile traffic. Mass transit options between the Salt Lake Valley and Park City are a much better idea using the I-80 corridor.	PARK CITY, UT	04/26/2015
	I have spent considerable time underground in the Park City Ontario Mine. The cost of building tunnels and then maintaining them is unrealistic. The proposed connections do not solve any transportation problems but only move traffic from one congested narrow canyon to another.	Park City, UT	04/30/2015
	There should be no road or tunnel connections from Cottonwood Canyons to Park City.	Park City, UT	04/30/2015
	The blue print is poor because it costs too much.	Park City, Utah	05/02/2015
	The phrasing here incorrectly assumes the responder agrees with the real (ie. economic) purpose of the Mountain Accord. Please respond and honestly explain how more access to the Park City area from the Salt Lake Valley protects and improves the natural beauty and recreational experience for people(residents and visitors) on the Park City side. You are tripling access options from an area populated by millions to an area populated by a few thousand. The protection that you claim to be promoting should be limiting access from the Wasatch Front to the Wasatch Back. The Wasatch Back will have enough stress from the growing population on the Wasatch Back. Congestion in the Millcreek and the Cottonwood canyons is only a problem for Park City residents when you physically connect them. A more accurate title for your plan would be "One Salt Lake Valley". This plan should be limited to improving conditions on the Wasatch Front.	Park City, Utah	02/11/2015
	need more information regarding the details /specifics of the Blueprint. Understand that it is still early and the ideals set out are very good but the how-will-you-get-there nuts and bolts is not conveyed. Maybe it is still early and details are being worked out, but there is a lot of this is great we should do this, but the path forward is not clear (maybe it is still being worked out)	Philadelphia	02/06/2015
	No trains, lanes ping up little cottonwood canyon. Preserve nature. There is already a riad to access the canyon. Nothing more is needed or necessary.	Piano tx	03/05/2015
	I think connecting resorts between SLC & Park City is a very cool idea, but may be somewhat impractical. You start out in one resort in one canyon, and you end up in another in another canyon and city, without your car, or questionable transpo on the other side. Too many unknowns- people won't take the risk. It's cool, but unless resorts respect other resorts tags, I'm not interested in paying alot of extra \$ to visit a resort for 1 run, and scramble back to fetch my car. If it's a clean transfer, it would be alot better. But the issue of transpo on the other side is a bit dicey. I would be scared I'd get stuck on the other side. If I were a visitor, I think I'd just pick another day and ski that resort. Although, it sure does seem enticing. Not sure if I would use it at all if these issues weren't addressed. Seems like any common-sense tourist would have the same fears.	Pleasant Grove	05/01/2015

	By not putting highway/road connections through the mountains, which will only increase traffic, pollution, and eventual degradation of natural resources.	Provo	04/15/2015
	The nature will be disrupted with all these modifications mentioned in the blue print. These mountains are appreciated and make Utah residents proud of living here. Their pristine beauty should be kept untouched by man's development that only seeks financial gain with no consideration of other life like the impact on the wildlife or natural ecosystem in that area.	Provo	03/15/2015
	When it says transit does it mean bus or rail?	provo	02/06/2015
	Canyon resources should be extended for more than just commercial ski industry. The proposal to construct rail access seems difficult to justify for any other interests. Future plans need to address more than commercial exploitation. I see the Mineral Basin "cleanup" as a good example. It was "cleaned up" primarily to provide support for extending Snowbird resort, and excluding all others. This violates the Forest Service "multi-use" mission, among others. I favor developing a balanced comprehensive plan for the future, but I don't have much confidence that this is it.	Provo, UT	02/09/2015
	Seems like the ski areas are having their way with this process. They are probably the only interest group who would benefit from increased infrastructure, especially transit. They've somehow convinced everyone that this is necessary for economic growth, when it really hurts our backcountry experience and therefore our reputation as a great "mountain city."	Provo, UT	02/06/2015
	Why try to squeeze more people into the Cottonwood Canyons? All for more money for the corporations. Leave them alone! Do not sell out! Develop in Parley! Stay out of the Cottonwoods! Any more development will have the die hard skier's and rider's leaving, and spending their money in Montana and other less developed Rocky Mountain states! I'm sure this is an agenda, and the powers that be are trying there best. Leave the Cottonwoods's alone!	quincy	04/30/2015
	good luck buddy!	rancho santa margarita	04/30/2015
	I don't believe Mountain accord has in mind the best most majestic future for the wasatch. I would like to see the least possible impact on the beauty and naturalness of the mountains. We can't continue to trade all of our great natural resources that all of those places and our state is great for in exchange for dollar signs. Your ruining natural beauty, wildlife habitat, and further incorporating what should be left an untouched peace of gold. We don't need trains or expansion of ski resorts. I would be more open to the trains if vehicle travel was no longer permitted up the canyons. Don't ruin wildlife habitat or corridors, or put in danger Utahs thriving hunting and fishing community that provides billions to the economy by trading these places to forever be lost because of irreversible economic growth. Destroying our natural resources isn't moving in the right direction.	Richfield	03/10/2015
	There should be greater protection on our natural resources and there is no need for a train system up the canyons. Shuttle bus would be an effective way that would not damage or marginalize the scenery, water, or wildlife habitat. We need to keep the Wasatch a beautiful and natural place, rather than develop and ruin it forever. The more protection from development the better for all of us.	Richfield	04/08/2015
	I don't like this idea at all. I will take away from the natural beauty of the area. One reason I love SLC is the solitude of the mountains. This proposal will end that. This plan only benefits someone's greed.	Riverton	03/14/2015
	This is a good plan, long overdue and needs to be done.	Riverton	04/30/2015
	The Blueprint stated that the federal lands would be doubled to help preservation. Does the land really have to fall into federal hands to be preserved? Could the state preserve these lands just as well? I understand that the Wasatch is top priority not only for the extent of the natural resources but also for the watershed. However, I would love to see the Mountain Accord extend to the Oquirrh mountains also. It would be wonderful if we could preserve Rose and Butterfield Canyons, the Herriman Hills, and space for the Bonneville Shoreline Trail before the west side Canyons also get "loved to death." Also, many developers are eyeing the lands on the mountains of the west side of Salt Lake Valley, behind the backs of the people looking to the east.	Rose Canyon	02/05/2015
	A tunnel from the Cottonwood Canyons to Park City would RUIN the Cottonwood Canyons. We would see an influx of people who would otherwise be recreating in Park City. The only way that a tunnel would be feasible environmentally is if cars were banned from the canyons completely. There should be improved bus service from PC to SLC if those residents want to recreate in the Cottonwoods. UTAs needs to be improved to allow better access from PC and the Salt Lake Valley as well. A 2 hr commute time from the Salt Lake Valley is unacceptable if we are truly concerned about cars in the canyon. Ski areas should not be allowed to expand any further. They are already huge polluters of our watershed. Snowcats burn hundreds of gallons of diesel fuel per night in our watershed and along with snowmobiles, leak motor oil and petro chemicals into our watershed, as well as disrupting nocturnal wildlife.	Salt Lake	05/01/2015
	As far as providing "quality recreational activities" it addresses how to better get people to areas such as the ski resorts or park city, but does not speak much to how or what is going to be improved on the "trail networks". I am an avid biker. Both Road and mountain bike. I don't see much in these plans as far as details about improving bike lanes and if transportation up the canyons is getting an upgrade, then so should the bike lanes and shoulders up the canyons for road bikers! On the mountain bike side I feel like Salt Lake (more the avenues/shoreline area) badly needs a similar trail system that has been created in the Draper-Corner Canyon area. Some uphill and downhill specific trails. But if something similar could be set up in Parleys, or Millicreek or the Cottonwoods, that would be great too! I would love to see a trail system come from Parleys summit down to Lamb's canyon. It would seem to have a similar feel as what has been created on Jackson Pass, WY. Just a few thoughts, and if someone has direction on where I can get more information, or get involved in trail system discussions I would love it. Thanks, Tyler 801-209-7116	Salt Lake	05/01/2015
	As the goal of the Accord is to "preserve the central Wasatch" and to mitigate the effects of future growth, the current blueprint falls desperately short in its efforts to protect this precious resource. If the goal is to strike a balance between preservation, public usage, and economic benefits, that balance was attained at least two or three ski resorts ago. Any model that attempts to accommodate increased usage expansion of developed areas through trail building, expansion of infrastructure, or increased tourism is counter productive to the goal of protection, and in conflict with the concept of conservation. The Wasatch range is a treasure that needs to be protected for future generations, not exploited for short sighted economic gain or recreational convenience.	Salt Lake	04/30/2015
	Drop any ideas of hugely expensive mountain railways and fully interconnected mountain areas. Include, and does seem to be there, creative shuttle and bus ideas and ideas for programs to promote such use and make it easier. I find much of the blueprint and accord laudable - save the environment, clean air/water, great recreation. The specifics are much harder to interpret (and foresee) the pros and cons, but some are concerning (Below)	Salt Lake	04/19/2015
	Hi, I am most concerned about the environment. I want to see an Environmental Impact Study by an independent entity that will not benefit from any economic development under the jurisdiction of NEPA before I am convinced that what you propose will actually protect and preserve our "unique" mountains. I am concerned about the impact to our watershed, flora, fauna, and quality outdoor experience. Train - against. Tunnel - against. Land swap so resorts can increase density in bottom of canyon - for Grizzly Gulch - keep as backcountry skiing access. Snowbird in Utah County - fine - this way they can make more money, right? Protect White Pine and Days Fork - awesome. Expand and maintain trail systems - good use of public money that benefits "the people of Utah and tourists" Guardsman Way - protect from further development. More parking lots - avoid if possible	Salt Lake	04/15/2015
	I am a backcountry skier, hiker, fisherman and general muscle-powered user of the Wasatch. I encourage all planning that comes from this process, with particular attention to the following issues- 1) Water quality preservation is of utmost importance. 2) Transportation by car should be limited, bus service improved, LCC particularly should be examined for possible shutting, train service, or similar alternatives. 3) No tunnels through the mountains, no gondola, ski lift or mechanized transport should be considered. 4) No further ski resort expansion should be allowed, particularly in Grizzly Gulch, Flagstaff, White Pine, American Fork side of the divide. 5) Overall enviro concerns must take precedence over developers' and resorts' needs.	Salt Lake	04/17/2015
	I am like a lot of people who live in Utah for the recreational opportunities. Any resort expansion invades heavily used backcountry space. The resorts are not hurting. Look at the money they are currently willing to throw around in lawsuits and acquisitions. They don't need an interconnect and more lifts, with a few exceptions, removes an irreplaceable resource. Interconnect has been a dream for the ski companies for ever. NO! If Park City and Deer Valley want to drop their ropes I say go for it. Sol-Bright and the lift between Alta and Snowbirds Mineral Basin are fine. Hardly anyone uses them. New lifts or gondolas going over ridge lines to connect the canyons is a terrible idea. HATE HATE HATE this idea in any form. OneWasatch, Ski Link, Interconnect or whatever you want to call it, it's a terrible idea.	Salt Lake	04/30/2015
	I do not believe that the transportation systems proposed (tunnel) can be accomplished by meeting the environmental preservation/conservation goals of the accord.	Salt Lake	03/25/2015
	I think you are being deceptive on the website. Under "key proposals" or "actions" you don't come out and say you're proposing to put 2 tunnels through the mountains PLUS an aerial tram! Viewers might miss that like I did the first time through. How on earth do tunnels protect the environment. This is ridiculous. And to propose an aerial tram over that gorgeous ancient aspen forest across from solitude. I am very upset about this!! You should require multiple occupancy cars and put in some kind of bus like what they did at Zions. Please do not trash the mountains with tunnels!	Salt Lake	04/15/2015
	In my review of the Mountain Accord, I feel the purpose of protection of our natural resources is undermined by creating easier access. Though I support less cars and more transit, I feel increase bike access should be assessed as well. More people accessing the mountains is great but I fear a loss of the wild nature of many Wasatch areas as well as increased litter and waste that comes with the addition of people to previously less access areas.	Salt Lake	05/01/2015
	In order meet environmentally sustainable goals that protect the environment, there should not be any cross mountain transportation plans that will newly disturb the Wasatch Mountains.	Salt Lake	05/01/2015
	Is there a need to consider capacity - capacity of cars in the parking lot, bikers/hikers on trails, etc.? What will limit human use and what are the implications on wildlife of those differing levels? I recall a study done at Delicate Arch that essentially determined how many people could have a quality experience. They were able to identify a carrying-capacity if you will. When visitors exceeded that number, the experience began to decline. Is there an equivalent to be considered with the Mountain Accord?	Salt Lake	04/30/2015
	More development between the Ski areas only damages more of the ecosystem in the high mountains. It might be good economically-but we have already impacted our shrinking wild areas-those are the priority.	Salt Lake	03/22/2015
	Must preserve all existing hiking and biking trails.	Salt Lake	04/26/2015
	Restrict traffic, halt all development expansion, including ski areas, no tunnels.	Salt Lake	02/11/2015
	There is no need for increased connectivity or increased transportation, beyond the needs of the special interests who stand to profit.	Salt Lake	04/05/2015
	very broad brush at this point makes it difficult to come to any conclusions or judgments about how effective the accord might be. Details are needed OR parameters set to create minimum standards	Salt Lake	04/30/2015
	Was hoping this might be something another than about development and building a train. Transportation should of been about efficient affordable year round options for all. The mountains should be star of the show not "a train like Zermatt". The world does not need a direct connection between State St in Sandy and Park City.	Salt Lake	05/01/2015
	I do not want any ski resort connections with Cottonwood Canyons/Park City built. I do not want ski resort expansion. (I am a skier) I do not want to open more land up for commercial development in the canyons. With Global Warming we will have more years ahead with less snow, perhaps drastically altering our ski industry. Do not build massive condos, trams, etc, which are based on our past records of snow fall. I DO want a non polluting (ideally) way of mass transit up and down canyons to provide for hikers and other recreation. Solar battery powered or something - get Tesla to build it! I want the watershed protected, hiking trails improved, x-country ski trails built, but generally leave things alone and preserve what we have now for further generations. Thank you	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	no extra lanes and no trains up Little Cottonwood Canyon.	Salt lake city	03/10/2015
	Only transportation options that improve the following aspects of the Central Wasatch environment over the current state of affairs should be considered: 1) watershed quality, 2) environment for native flora and fauna, and 3) quietude. Access to trails for human-powered exploration should not take a back seat to transportation to large resorts. The emphasis should be on getting people to their destination and back to their point of origin. Any design that facilitates single vehicle traffic through one canyon into another such as connections between the Cottonwood canyons and either Park City or the Heber valley will greatly increase traffic density with a concomitant increase in noise and air pollution. Just because areas above 7,000 ft generally have better air quality than the valleys is no reason to pollute the mountain environment until it does become a problem. In other words, DO NOT recapitulate the mistakes of urban development where wells of through-roads permeate the land in the interests of housing and financial development. And then, any transportation plan should have majority public support followed by an Environmental Impact Study under the NEPA process.	Salt Lake City	04/27/2015
	The Accord places economic growth above preservation. I have heard the Ski Utah rep promote connecting the canyons as a unique "marketing" benefit - not as a move with inherent good for our community. I also object to placing a train in Little Cottonwood. The expense is not justifiable and the need to control traffic could be met by limiting parking (by cost and spaces) and implementing a van system like the one used in Zion National Park. Please, please reconsider the existing proposal. It requires enormous public spending while benefitting very few citizens and compromises the wilderness quality of our beautiful canyons. Kate Lambert	Salt Lake City	03/09/2015

	I do like the new trails and designated protected areas, but I am not sure what it means to have "increased environmental protection". I think I speak for a lot of people when I say, we thought a rail system into the canyons meant closing the roads to most, if not all car traffic (big and little cottonwood canyons). Also, connecting the rail system between the canyons only adds to the degradation of the tri-canyons and ruins the experience for those people trying to get away from cars, trains, ski resorts, helicopters, etc. I am sure the ski resorts are very happy with what you are proposing. This proposal is very slanted toward economic interests and overall I am very disappointed with what is in the proposal. I really thought this was going to be a process to save the canyons. One good note, I consider myself to be someone that is willing to compromise to get to a mutual agreement, but there have already been so many compromises in the Wasatch for business it would have been nice to see a proposal that really wanted to save the Wasatch from more development. I have lived here all my life and watched the Wasatch get loved to death, this proposal, if implemented, is the end of what used to be a unique and special place.	Salt Lake City	03/04/2015
	The Mountain Accord purpose, as I understand it, is looking towards the future of our mountains, the increasing people using the areas and the traffic involved, the impact on the land, water and air. It seems to me the "proposed blueprint" ideas are thoughtful, but seem to fall short of actual trends of the current users of the Wasatch Mountains. The water data presented is old. Our water shed areas increasing limits places individuals can go with their animals. The UTA continues to raise prices, take routes away, what makes the Mountain Accord think the public will use transportation infrastructure that may be difficult to use. The canyons lack adequate current parking and many trails are in disrepair which can be a factor in environmental erosion. I agree the future of our beloved mountains and all their great resources should have a plan, I just don't feel the general public's interest is being considered. It feels to me that the Ski industry and their moneys are driving this blueprint.	Salt Lake City	03/11/2015
	The scenarios stated don't do enough to protect the wasatch and it's resources. Preservation is more important than economic stimulus. Connecting the resorts together isn't a good idea for anyone except the ski resorts and their interests. Find a way to get less cars on existing roads -don't make new ones!	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	* I think light rail is ridiculous, in terms of cost and purpose. In nearly every place and study, systems like Bus Rapid Transit are a WAY better use of public dollars. * I oppose any growth or development or expansion of existing ski resorts. Development should be pushed in our urban valleys, not our canyons. * The words in the blueprint all sound good, but I fear many of the words are just a cover for more houses. Bigger houses. More malls. More shopping. More condos. * I'd like more camping, more hiking, more buses, more safe roads for cycling.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	1. Please consider a walking/biking path along the road in Upper Mill Creek. 2. Air Quality along the Wasatch Front impacts the economy, our health and our recreation. How does the Mountain Accord proposal address this?	Salt Lake City	02/25/2015
	1. Unfortunately to see the Aerial Solution for both canyons but specifically LCC off the table. Having used high-speed gondolas in Switzerland I believe it preserves the scenic and natural resources and it is such a great traveler experience. The trail down could serve as an alternate way to get down the new, wide canyon trail on mountain bikes or walking. Leaving the road for road-bikes. I could see traffic allowed before 7am, after 7pm, or destination traffic with permits. 2. Great to extend the trails as proposed, but there is still much more to do with existing trails that are lacking basic maintenance. 3. I could get behind a one-wasatch idea if it meant just the connector lifts, and if hell skiing would then be forbidden in the Wasatch as well as snowmobiles in guardian pass and other areas where they regularly poach. 4. The sad thing is that our snowpack will continue to diminish and the resorts are going to need all the water they can get their hands on for snowmaking. We think running free buses up the canyons will do the trick, and on paper it might sound good, but experience in other cities shows people just don't like to get out of their car for the bus part if they don't have to. Zermatt has this figured out decades ago, Avoriaz too. Kick the cars out and watch the value of the experience, as well as property skyrocket. People get used to it super fast. Zermatt allows electric cars only, the downtown area is a walk only zone and businesses are doing better then ever before. By the way, good luck, you guys are brave trying to tackle this. Thanks for the opportunity to chime in :)	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	A few comments: 1. A shuttle system is a GREAT idea! Right now the canyon is at capacity (car capacity). If more users are going to use it, a shuttle is necessary. I do feel that the speed limit should be reduced, and there needs to be limitations on how wide the road becomes. As I own property in the Firs development in Millcreek, this is important to me. 2. The only way rail makes sense in the Cottonwoods is if driving private cars is limited to land owners in the canyon or there is a hefty \$5 fee (ala Millcreek). 3. The land swaps seem fair to me, but there needs to be zoning restrictions so that a Brighton Hotel (for instance) cannot be 20 floors tall. This way we retain as much of the traditional character of the place as we can. But I do feel that if Grizzly Gulch isn't part of the agreement, then there should be no land swaps at all. 4. I very much oppose any type of transportation linking the ski resorts that would put any kind of tram/ski towers over the ridges between big and little cottonwood canyon. The only place it makes sense to link the canyons is brighton/PC through hidden canyon. UNLESS we are talking about tunnels. 5. I think it important to establish legitimate trailheads for some tenuous situations, such as Heughs canyon, for instance. 6. Mountain Accord should seriously look at stopping motorized access in Mineral Fork. There is motorized access for almost the entire northern and southern Wasatch. While the number of hikers increases, the amount of land set aside for hiking is not getting any bigger. Mineral Fork seems like the best place to do that. 7. Make sure the new parking lot at Wasatch Mountain State Park is not so close to the cabins up there. Cabin owners don't want it, and recreationists also don't want to see cabins there either. There are alternative locations for that (abnormally large) parking lot further down-canyon that make more sense.	Salt lake City	04/30/2015
	A rail system tearing through Little Cottonwood Canyon will destroy the environment, cost far too much money, and cater to the wealthy. It will be a blight on the exquisite landscape year round simply to solve a problem that exists during a short period of the ski season. I realize most of the big stakeholders have huge profits to be made, but I still fail to see the point of ruining two gorgeous canyons in order to access Park City, when I-80 provides easy transportation. Why carve up our mountains in order to serve high-end tourists and locals? Canyons are for more than skiing, and since many in our valley cannot even afford to ski, Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons should remain as pristine as possible for those who seek the simpler pleasures of nature.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	A train tunnel up/under LCC/BCC would seem to create a lot of opportunity; no worry about weather; tunnel access to all areas; alternate/safe exit route in case of road accidents; water/tailings clean up; no surface impacts or property loss; mass transit. That is how they do it in Europe. Don't be so constrained, this is a vision.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	About transportation: It is unnecessary to provide a transportation link between the Cottonwood Canyons and Park City. The need is for a viable mass transit system that serves access to the Cottonwood Canyons from the Salt Lake Valley. Please do not build tunnels thru the mountain. Instead, we need restricted car traffic and a vibrant/frequent bus transportation system such as has been implemented in some of National Parks (e.g., Zion). About Development: Please do not expand the base facilities at the Cottonwood Canyon resorts. The goal should be to keep the development simple, with basic services and lodging. The magic of the Cottonwoods is that they are not overly developed like Park City, Jackson, Lake Tahoe, Colorado, etc.	Salt Lake City	02/09/2015
	Accolades that such a variety of interests have come together at the table.	salt lake city	04/26/2015
	Address the proposals that would link all ski resorts. You may not support it, so counter it. If you do support it, address it. And if you don't have a stance, you can't ignore the proposal!	salt lake city	04/29/2015
	After reviewing the Blueprint of the Mountain Accord, I truly believe it's VITAL to make wilderness/environmental protection the priority. We are at a point in human history where we are starting to see the environmental stewardship above all economic, recreation, industrial, etc. purposes. I know it may seem irrational and extreme now, but if Mountain Accord sets environmental protection as #1 on their "To Do" List, their project could potentially become a role model for other projects like these around the country. Mountain Accord has the unique opportunity to combine transportation, recreation, environment, etc. by working with specialists from ALL these areas, rather than polarizing the groups. Groupthink is the ONLY way we will come to a resolution to this problem, but I truly believe that environmental awareness should ALWAYS be in the back of our minds, no matter what. I urge you to prioritize wilderness protection.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	An environmentally-sustainable transit system would involve mass construction in, and around, all of the canyons. Such large scale construction would have an impact on the natural environment and would certainly have an impact on our fragile watershed. The 'blueprint' must realize that the environment comes before economic and recreational expansion. If our mountain environment is compromised for our selfish want to expand, and industrialize, then surely it will fall and we will be left with a deteriorated shell of our glorious mountains. It is imperative we take care of our mountain environments in a world affected by climate change; especially in our dry, hot climate.	salt lake city	04/05/2015
	An Unpardonable Sin The quality and quantity of the snow, steep beautiful terrain, and easy access make the skiing/gliding experience in the Wasatch Mountains (backcountry and resort) world class. This is a special place. But the quality of the skiing experience in the central Wasatch is in jeopardy. I see the proposals for expansion by the resorts and Ski Utah's "One Wasatch" simply as marketing tools to attract more tourists to our world-class resorts. As a native Utahn, Snowbird season pass holder, and frequent backcountry skier, I don't believe these proposals for expansion are in our community's best interest. The Alta and Snowbird ski resorts cannot accommodate more skiers/snowboarders without further compromising the already crowded skiing experience that exists there. Who wants to stand in longer and longer lines while waiting to ride the greatest snow on earth? Not only are the lines insufferably long, with larger and larger crowds the snow gets "skied out" faster and faster. Is this the kind of experience Ski Utah and the ski resorts want for their customers? At the same time, the backcountry cannot afford to be annexed any more by the resorts without compromising the riding experience there. The ski industry in Utah has an insatiable appetite for expansion and development at the expense of the environment and wilderness experience. Both the resorts and the backcountry/wilderness can co-exist harmoniously but it's time for permanent hard lines to be drawn. Tunnels and aerial trans connecting the Cottonwood Canyons and Park City would desecrate what little is left of a wilderness/backcountry experience that exists in the glorious but fragile central Wasatch range. Why connect the resorts? If I want to ski at Alta, I go to Alta. If I want to ski at Deer Valley, I go to Deer Valley. The concept of an interconnect is just a sightseeing gimmick for tourists. No local would dream of wasting quality ski time riding lifts between resorts. Don't ruin what makes this place special and unique just for more money. It's true, transportation challenges in BCC and LCC do need to be addressed. More efficient mass transit makes sense, but let's not reinvent the wheel with complicated expensive projects that permanently deface and deform more of this glorious little mountain range in which we are so fortunate to live.	Salt Lake City	04/16/2015
	Any additional access to little cottonwood with damage the canyon. Remove the road and switch to rail only access.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Any major construction project in our/my National Forest I am definitely opposed to. The impact will be irreversible...Period. We have made it thus far with the way it is...Its about money. Real Estate. Etc. There is NO NEED FOR THIS So called Transit system with a ulterior motive. I AM HUGELY OPPOSED TO ANY KIND OF PROJECT IN THE SERENE MOUNTAINS THAT SURROUND US. I can't speak for others, but I would think the majority of REAL born and newly born Utahns with a love of the Mountains would oppose any such project. Dont try and create son e kind of illusion on the public that there is some economical need...It will do more harm than good...PERIOD.	Salt Lake City	02/04/2015
	Any mention or illustration of transportation "connections" from LCC and BCC through to Park City negate the stated purpose of balancing stewardship of natural resources and quality recreational experiences and show that the personal economic vibrancy of some of the Mountain Accord participants is clearly getting more attention.	Salt Lake City	04/08/2015
	As a fairly new resident of Salt Lake City and Utah, I would like to see as much wilderness preserved as possible. I am happy I moved here before developers and the ultra rich have gotten their hands on every piece of the Wasatch. I fear one day you won't be able to enjoy the serenity and peace which the mountains provide because there will be endless chair lifts and gondolas and rich people's second homes scattered throughout our wonderful mountain range. I understand this is a "give and take" process but I hope you place members on your board who realize once the mountains are developed, it's lost forever (or at least for a lifetime).	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	As a long-time user of the Wasatch backcountry (all seasons -40 yrs) I am concerned with two items in particular. The first is the transportation issue. We sorely need some kind of public transit that works for all and reduces, if not completely does away with, private automobiles in the canyons. I approve of the "whistle-stop" idea so that there are many places that hikes/climbs/ski tours can start and end conveniently. And as a backcountry skier for 40 years, I have seen many areas that used to be backcountry gobbled up by the ski areas. Honeycomb Fork at Solitude, Clayton Peak and Snake Creek Pass at Brighton and Pt. Supreme/Katherine's Pass at Alta. Heaven forbid Snowbird ever getting into White Pine Canyon. With climate change, more backcountry has been ruined by less snow at low and mid elevations, while at the same time, the number of backcountry enthusiasts has greatly increased. I would hate to lose any more area. I don't at all understand the need to be able to go from Park City to Brighton and Alta, but would prefer tunnels to ski lifts. I assume that there are old mining tunnels that could partially be used to develop this system. And one more thought...if the state of Utah were to take over our public lands, how would this affect the Mountain Accord blueprint?	Salt Lake City	03/05/2015
	As a person who is primarily interested in human powered recreation (ski, climb, bike), I see more of an appeasement of my group rather than a wholehearted attempt to develop and grow the infrastructure for making the wasatch and SLC a leader in urban areas embracing human powered recreation. This is a huge opportunity to be a true pioneer and we'll likely blow it by chasing the money.	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015
	As an avid Wasatch user, more economic development within the Wasatch seems like a direct threat to the preserving the pristine natural experience. This is mainly directed at the ski industry which is looking to expand. Secondly, a tunnel connecting Little Cottonwood Canyon to Big Cottonwood Canyon is a monstrosity.	Salt Lake City	03/11/2015
	As an environmental engineering researcher, I highly approve of any sustainable infrastructural changes. I attended a seminar on the proposed Blueprint at the University of Utah on March 9th and was interested to hear all points of the proposal. I agreed for the need and the plan of Mountain Accord, but I did not approve of the connection between Park City and Little Cottonwood. It is a well known fact that the resorts of Big and Little Cottonwood need more roads connecting a direct connection between Park City and the Cottonwoods would cause much more congestion at the Cottonwood resorts which would make additional issues - right now the driving distance between PC and the Cottonwoods is preventing huge crowds at these resorts. Establishing a connection between PC and the Cottonwoods would hurt business at Park City Resorts, guaranteed.	Salt Lake City	03/10/2015
	As for recreation vs. environmental protection - I support stronger protection but would want to make sure that existing and potentially new trails in current non-wilderness areas will be open to bicycles.	Salt Lake City	04/22/2015
	Assigning at least order of magnitude costs to different alternatives. Benefits are outlined in detail but are impossible to assess absent any indications of costs.	Salt Lake City	04/08/2015



	I am absolutely opposed to construction of tunnels, rail lines, and ski lifts in the Central Wasatch.	Salt Lake City	02/12/2015
	I am all for improved express bus transit. The tunnels are a silly idea to be-it's rather redundant and overdeveloping to add both a light rail and tunnels. Let's proliferate what we already have going for us (public transit) via bus/shuttle and allow a bounty of people to become intimate with the canyons with driving out of mind! People don't benefit from fleeing from one canyon's end to another through the mountain, they benefit from time to be where they are. Canyons end only to allow a soft return to the valley, and the thrill of making it up and down another. In consideration of "Proposed Cottonwood Canyons Scenario for Public Consideration", I see that in exchange for more protected lands, ski resorts want additional water for snowmaking. No. We need water in the table to hydrate the growing population through the fall. Normally we could rely on melting snow as nature's water meter, allowing us to have water throughout the year. But with less snow melting sooner, people need to meter the water. Snow making does not create The Greatest Snow On Earth, it is a climate change catalyst. Keep in mind that Park City's #1 source of CO2 emissions comes from energy needed to make and cover the mountain side with snow.	Salt Lake City	02/23/2015
	I am extremely opposed to running mass transit directly through the summer recreation areas of Little Cottonwood Canyon. I understand that the recreation and economic focus for this project have been wholly centered around the ski industry; however, the plan neglects the recreation for the other 3 seasons. You will be cutting through vital climbing/bouldering and hiking areas in order to shuttle people up to the ski resorts, which attract far fewer people during the 'off season'. In addition, the environmental impacts of disturbing the land, watershed and creeks running through these areas is a poor compromise. While I'm not happy about the proposed changes, I do understand the need to reduce congestion, provide more environmentally-friendly modes of transport and reduce the amount of land in these wilderness areas used for parking. Perhaps a better alternative would be to widen the road slightly and run the rail up the center of the road that is already in place. I appreciate you taking into consideration the opinions of the local community.	Salt Lake City	02/11/2015
	I am generally in favor of the approach being taken to develop the Mountain Accord but believe protecting the environment for water, wildlife, and low impact recreation should be the highest priority. In general, the emphasis on discouraging automobile traffic and encouraging public transit is favorable, but I think the proposals in Little Cottonwood Canyon would have negative environmental impacts. Instead, I think utilizing the existing road, and adding avalanche protection if necessary for the use of public transit like buses would be better, and include means to discourage automobile traffic such as a toll booth and paying for parking permits in the canyons.	Salt Lake City	04/27/2015
	I am hesitant about blasting through the pristine Wasatch wilderness to create transit tunnels and destroying wildlife habitat to build aerial lifts as means of transport from Little Cottonwood Canyon to Park City and other areas. That is where the Mountain Accord goes away from keeping the transportation system completely "environmentally sustainable". Sure, less cars means less pollution and traffic...but trains, buses, and lifts would increase canyon usage which in turn might have a negative impact on the environment. Blasting open the back end up the canyons would take away the charm, solitude, and uniqueness of the Wasatch. Not all tourism needs to be streamlined and efficient. The best adventures are often rugged and full of little mishaps here and there. I hope that the Mountain Accord Blueprint is able to preserve this incredible aspect of the Wasatch Mountains.	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
	I am HIGHLY opposed to an light rail, aerial transit, or tunnels to connect the canyons and/or Park city. These would be quite destructive to maintaining the quality of the canyons. A BRT would be acceptable to me, but none of the other options.	Salt Lake City	02/04/2015
	I am impressed with and excited by the thoughtfulness and comprehensiveness of the Blueprint. Thank you so much for the hard work that has gone into this project!	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I am in favor of a light rail system going directly to the ski resorts. There should not be any stops around popular hiking trails. You claim that this blueprint encompasses the environment, recreation, transportation and the economy. As far as I can tell there would only be economical benefits if tunnels were to be created in our mountains. There is absolutely no reason that a person should find it necessary to visit multiple resorts in a single day. That's pompous behavior.	Salt Lake City	02/04/2015
	I am in favor of the ski link and feel to be competitive with the rest of the world, more emphasis should be placed on its development.	Salt Lake City	02/04/2015
	I am in support of the Mountain Accord. The plan is the right and responsible course of action for preserving the qualities, which make Utah a great place to live and visit. Change and population growth are inevitable in our amazing state. The future perseverance of our resources and quality of life depend on our ability to take an active role in developing the Wasatch Front's infrastructure, transportation and recreational use sustainably. Have you ever been to Corner Canyon to bike on a Saturday morning or tried to ski the first powder day of the season? If you have answered yes to these questions, you must understand. If not, you should come explore the wonders the Wasatch offers to anyone wishing to explore it's bounty. Inaction is not an option and will only lead to the degradation and misuse of Utah's incredible Wasatch Front.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I am like a lot of people who left Utah for advanced education and came back for the recreational opportunities. Lots of people in my profession make more money than I do because they chose not to return. The loss of money is more than compensated when I make dawn patrol laps before work, 7/10 times those laps are done in Grizzly Gulch. I am never the only one in the parking lot. Any resort expansion invades heavily used backcountry space. And if you think the backcountry is limited to a few weeds trying parking at Mill D or Spruces or Bear Trap or White Pine or Grizzly Gulch after 9 am on any Saturday once the snow flies. Weiridos, I'll grant you but there are lots of them. I've been backcountry skiing since the early 90's and have watched the explosion. There is no place like the Central Wasatch in the world. Montana, Wyoming and Idaho have more wilderness but lack the public access. The resorts are not hurting. Look at the money they are currently willing to throw around in lawsuits and acquisitions. They don't need an interconnect and more lifts, with a few exceptions, removes an irreplaceable resource. I will add that in looking at prices to take my family of 6 skiing I'm thinking of buying everyone an avalanche beacon. I would support land swaps with resorts in order to permanently protect places like Grizzly Gulch which is the last easily human powered accessible north facing area above 9000 feet left in the Central Wasatch. If Alta wants to expand there, let them give up public Forest Service land on which they currently operate. How about Albion Basin? I would support a lift expansion in Honeycomb Canyon for Solitude providing it does not actually extend the range that inbound skiers are able to go. No opening up Silver Fork to Solitude skiers. In other words the lift will not begin lower than the Honeycomb Return lift thus effectively opening up the East Bowl of Silver Fork and west side of lower Silver Fork to side country access. Look at where the avalanche deaths are increasing and you'll see it's mostly coming from people leaving resorts and getting in trouble.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	I am opposed to any expansion of the ski resorts and opposed to any connection between LCC, BCC, and PC, including tunnels and ski lifts. I'm opposed to a train. First traffic solutions should be parking pricing structure at the resorts.	Salt lake city	05/01/2015
	I am opposed to the proposed transfers of forest service land to private ownership. At least some of the areas are the only public parking areas that allow public access to forest service land. If these are turned over to private ownership they will eventually be used for development and what parking remains will likely be limited to guests at the resorts or become expensive parking, as is occurring in Park City now that Vail has taken over the ski area. I am also very concerned about the impact on Salt Lake's water supply. Water used for snow making comes back to us as run off in the summer. Water used to support development becomes sewage. Given the current drought and the likelihood of climate change from global warming I don't think we can afford any additional development in Big Cottonwood Canyon or Little Cottonwood Canyon.	Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
	I am strongly opposed to resort interconnect over the back of the Wasatch via lift connection. The interconnect will create a major detriment to both backcountry skiing, hiking, and bike trail system, our watershed, environment, and user experience. The Mountain Bike community rides all Spring, Summer and Fall and are a major source of tourism and revenue for all our communities on the Wasatch. To encroach upon pristine wilderness in the form of land development for more hotel/restaurants/condo space and resort to resort lifts for the profit of Vail/Epic Resort Corporation is unacceptable. I encourage a bus/shuttle/campool rider incentive in the form of earning \$ towards the next year's season pass for each bus ride or campool taken, and Resort discounts would also be helpful. A strong disincentive to single car ridership up all canyon roads in the form of a toll of \$2 per single rider car. As for the small trav/train link up the canyons? I am undecided. Finally, a large transit/train up I-80 and perhaps a link eventually for I-70 is already WAY overdue! It should already be through the planning and funding stages by now. Thanks for listening, Amy	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	I applaud the efforts to permanently set aside and protect additional land in the Wasatch from development. Protection of Mt. Superior and the White pine drainage are especially important. Although no additional development in the canyons would be ideal, I understand its necessity. The proposal for a tunnel system to preserve mountain side and ridge line lands seems like an acceptable compromise. I hope the specific of these new transportation corridors will focus on keeping these modalities as non-intrusive as possible. I hope biking lanes are being considered in these proposals. Also the efforts to dissuade private vehicles from driving in the canyons (e.g. fees, tolls, parking limitations) are important. For the rail and other public transportation systems, it will be important to have stops along the way up and down the canyons, and not solely at the resorts. This will allow other users of the canyons, not solely resort patrons, to take advantage of new transportation systems. Keeping these systems affordable to the riders is important as well.	Salt Lake City	02/12/2015
	I appreciate the emphasis on preserving the legacy of this special place as much as possible. I feel like too much emphasis and leeway is being given to the ski resorts. The transportation options seem quite intensive and may have a significant impact on the canyons.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I believe a train system only serves the ski industry and not the other users of the canyon. More natural gas buses with several stops along the way would make much more sense. It would also allow for climbing areas to not be destroyed, along with forest and animal life.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	I believe if we transport the number of folks into those canyons that will be possible with the present proposed transit options the canyons will be ruined. The numbers are unsustainable for a wilderness experience in those canyons. We have to limit numbers. That should not be economically driven. If economics in and of itself is what we want then I think initially it would work but Salt Lake is loved because of its exquisite wilderness proximity. They don't have a Salt Lake or a New York outside of the Tetons, or the Grand Canyon. We have an important resource that needs to be protected. Transporting folks into it just because we can and to benefit economics is not a responsible stewardship.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	I believe more emphasis should be put on maintaining natural resources, environmental quality and recreation and less on a "vibrant economy." I see no reason other than "development" and pleasing developers for linking LC and BC resorts with PC resorts. It's been shown that this is all marketing hype generated by Ski Utah which will not increase skier visits, will not be utilized by skiers and only opens the door for more development and secondary homes which will be occupied 2 weeks out of the year. I'd rather see the land remain undeveloped and enjoyed by all rather than developed and set aside for the few.	Salt Lake City	04/14/2015
	I believe that linking the canyons through tunnels won't improve traffic situation or skiing experience. Air pollution is not being considered effectively in any of plans so far. Skiers would have to pay a highly increased prices for combined tickets, yet won't be able to enjoy all the terrain that these areas offer. It's better to ski at one area at a time. Snowboarders will be pushing for Alta to allow snowboarding and yet, Alta Ski Area is one of ONLY three "skiers only" resorts in the country and skiers want to keep it that way.	Salt Lake City	02/06/2015
	I believe that the quality of the Wasatch mountains is enhanced by less development than more. I am not in favor of the ski resorts (Alta, Snowbird, Brighton, and Solitude) expanding any further. The land around these resorts is essential to our water and the wildlife. There is no need to have a "ski connect". This includes the gondola between Park City and The Canyons. Just because they are owned by the same company does not mean that they have to be connected. I ski in the winter and hike and trail run in the summer and the beauty of our canyons, so close to a large city is unparalleled. That is what visitors exclaim over. Not how we can further develop but how great to have what we have so accessible. I believe that Save Our Canyons is on the right track although I do not agree with letting Snowbird expand to the south. And shouldn't there be some kind of moratorium on placing buildings on ridgelines? When one looks out across the mountains, seeing a boxy, building on top, does not keep with keeping the view pristine. The convention center on Hidden Peak should have been located elsewhere.	Salt Lake City	04/08/2015
	I believe that we could all benefit from better transit within the mountains and to them, however I think that linking park city to either of the cottonwood canyons is a mistake. I don't think this would be environmentally informed and it would be non reversible.	Salt Lake City	03/09/2015
	I believe the best thing to do is to create a train system to take people along the EXISTING highways to interconnect all resorts, and otherwise improve the current transit system. We do not need any expansion of the resorts from the way they are. There is no need to connect canyons and ski resorts that are easily accessed by driving an hour to get to the other destination, or hiking for a couple of hours to get there.	Salt Lake City	02/10/2015
	I believe the Mountain Accord's blueprint should lean towards wilderness and preservation more than business and additional infrastructure. Granted, some infrastructure (like efficient transit options) is very necessary, but priority should be given to maintaining open/green space. We need to encourage people to reconnect with the earth and nature, this is not done by turning our wild-spaces into theme parks. Although it might sound selfish, I honestly would like to see less tourism in the Wasatch. The mountains have never needed our human economy to inspire awe, offer a place of refuge, or provide recreation opportunities.	Salt Lake City	03/05/2015
	I believe the rubrics used to assess the goals in the above charter miss important characteristics of our mountain environment. I do NOT believe that access to mountain canyons should alter the natural flow of the mountain environment. If there are rugged cliffs at the end of a canyon, this should not be altered by a tunnel to allow higher use and impact on the canyons. We need to respect the natural boundaries that have been created by the dramatic uplift of the Wasatch Mountains.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I couldn't gather the key ingredients of the blueprint from a quick read. It was all vague, general purpose-style language, much too much information on a map, and lots of stiff language. I read an opinion piece in the SL Tribune today that bemoans the lack of input, so I went to the site. I don't have an hour to commit. I have 10 minutes. Give me a survey that says things like: do you want year-round bus access to Brighton. Itemize the key proposals. I support your mission, would love to help. In the next round, I recommend you do a survey of your survey before you release it. Test out the ease of the questions. Go to Impact Hub or one of the other fresh-idea labs to figure out how to gather input in a social-media age.	Salt Lake City	04/12/2015

	I do not like the idea that we would be able to go from Alta to Brighton and PC in a car through a tunnel. I am concerned that will really get people into the canyons. People who just want to drive through. The costs must be horrendous! I would like to have a tougher approach on the driving ability up and down the canyons. Only car-owners who have cabins should be able to drive up there, the rest should have to use the trail-rail ( I am not a cabin-owner). It is awful to drive up to the ski-resorts to ski. I am certainly glad we are trying to change that. The cars might as well stay in the valley and we go up on a light-rail. Currently it is awful to drive up the canyons in the spring to fall, the drivers are sharing the road with cyclists going up and down, with cars passing cyclists in both directions. I do not see how they can share the road. I am not sure where the Gondolas come in the picture... Another thing, let's remember that this is USA, not Europe, where everyone is used to a transit system (that works), therefore people use them. I do not think people will use a transit system, if a road is available to drive a car, no matter the cost. Possibly if UTA can prove they can compete with cars in speed. I know UTA likes to pat themselves on their shoulders. I think they can do that IF they can prove their system is faster than the cars, so far that has not happened anywhere in this city.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I do support preservation of these lands. I do not feel that building transit would preserve the land. This would be harmful for the wildlife and ecosystems. I also have concerns about how it would affect our water supply. I would support more buses being added on the current roads. I would also support a toll fee to increase use of public transportation.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	I do think that increased public transit in the canyon is a big plus, but I'm concerned that the construction of a train system could be overall detrimental to the area. It could potentially be a net loss in the beauty of the area.	Salt Lake City	03/01/2015
	I don't see how tearing our mountains apart to build a train between PC and LCC and BCC is responsible stewardship of the lands. It seems more like a gimmick than a plan that will cut pollution and keep our wilderness intact. Restricting vehicular traffic up the Cottonwoods to employees only and expanding parking lots at the base as well as running clean energy buses and shuttles up the canyons seems like a far better option and one that will actually keep people off the roads and from lining up and idling for HOURS just to get up the canyon (LCC). If the buses were more convenient and ran in a more timely manner people would utilize them, and they will definitely utilize them if they are required! Let's get serious about actually doing something about the air quality in this area and stop that outrageous line up and down the canyon.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I favor optimizing bus service to all the ski resorts. I am opposed to a light rail system going up Little Cottonwood Canyon and I am strongly opposed to a tunnel system between Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons. I would favor a long gondola up Little Cottonwood Canyon. This would be a terrific tourist experience and would decrease auto traffic in the Canyon. A Gondola might work in Big Cottonwood Canyon also, although I recognize that it would have to be even longer. The easiest way to connect the Park City areas with Big Cottonwood Canyon would be to improve Guardsman Pass and keep it open in the winter.	Salt Lake City	03/11/2015
	I found the survey questions and options and data presented in a confusing manner. My fear is that when we see a blue print in the next phase it will be rigid and fixed without good discussion. The tradeoffs are great, we have no crystal ball, we should go very slowly on development, be careful to preserve the beauty and nature that is so necessary for so many of us who find the mountains part of our religious experience. Protect what we have. Pollution and climate change are already affecting the area, not to mention the overpopulation of the planet.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	I fully disagree on any kind of development or expansion to new areas. People come to Utah because of the snow, if they want more terrain they would go to big sky, Jackson, whistler. A lot of the resorts already look like a six flags park with zip lines, toboggans and what not. Development will not bring more people, national and global population growth will. I truly believe that corporations should capitalize on having pristine lands as their neighbors, not expanding into them and making said lands lose their appeal. The energy and focus should go towards on how to make our environment better for future generations by keeping our lands pristine and unique.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	I fully support efforts to transfer Grizzly Gulch into public ownership in order to eliminate the threat of future development and to secure public access to recreation in the area. In fact, this task should be of very high priority. I would also support appropriate user fees on public lands in the Cottonwood Canyons.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I haven't answered any of the above check-box style questions as I don't believe they can adequately convey the whole of my thoughts. Not that this little box will do complete justice, but at least it can't be misconstrued. I am against any resort expansion, use of taxpayer dollars to fund transportation to the resorts in the Cottonwood canyons or permitting any more lifts to be built on our land. They already have enough of the prime high elevation terrain. If they can't figure out how to make a profit on that, then that is their problem. Their claims to be building a more European ski experience are pure bullshit. The Wasatch is a small percentage of the size of the Alps and they already have enough control of the land up there. If they wanted to create a truly European ski experience, they would tear out 75% of their lifts and make the terrain more of a lift accessed backcountry experience. I put the emphasis on backcountry experience as you would still have to put in quite a bit of effort to reach terrain outside of what the lift affords you. I would prefer that through this process, we further protect the remaining land we have from any more encroachment of the ski resorts.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I honestly do not feel any public land should be sold to Alta until they open up to snowboarding. Snowboarding is not banned by the Forest Service and Alta needs to stop hijacking public land that 40% of the Salt Lake public can not use. I thought the Mountain Accord was about making the mountains a viable place for our community. Alta's policies go against that.	Salt Lake City	02/04/2015
	I just don't understand how you can say you want to protect the environment when you're proposing to destroy it. And I am so sick and tired of hearing the whining about "you have to wait in traffic and then you might have a good day skiing but then you have to wait in traffic again and it just ruins the day". Oh boo hoo. That just tells me where your priorities really are. It's not about the environment. It's not about the economy. It's not about community or about anything you supposedly say you want to protect. It's about the selfish bastards willing to destroy the canyons, to take people's homes and properties and ruin residents lives, to spend billions of tax payer money and for what? So that they don't have their day ruined by having to sit in traffic? I call that bullshit! If you are so bent out of shape about traffic why aren't you taking the public transportation?	Salt Lake City	02/12/2015
	I just spent over an hour writing comments only to not be able to submit them. This, as well as trying to understand this unnecessarily complicated report makes it extremely frustrating. Many folks I have talked with have not given input because of the unwieldy nature of the report. Now I can understand why!	Salt Lake City	02/16/2015
	I like the idea of incorporating public transit and discouraging or restricting use of automobiles to access the canyons and ski resorts, but I don't like the idea of a train going from Little Cottonwood to Big Cottonwood or Park City because of the impacts to the environment and the experience of hiking and, backcountry skiing in the mountains between the resorts. I think we should first try more bus service, add parking lots at the bottom of the canyons and charge for parking in the canyons to encourage use of public transit.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I like the proposal but don't think we need tunnels connecting LCC/BCC/PC. Trams, etc would be a better solution and keep the character of the cottonwood canyons intact. Tunnels would really open up the cottonwoods and create an influx of people and traffic that would negatively affect the feel of those special places.	Salt Lake City	02/09/2015
	I object to building transit systems to the mountain areas. Improving and creating more transit opportunities into these areas, will facilitate their destruction. On the contrary, we need to protect these areas from the masses.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	I oppose the tunnel connection between little cottonwood canyon and Park City, as well as a lift interconnect between the cottonwood canyons and Park City. I also oppose the expansion of both Alta, Snowbird, and Solitude, and as result, would like to see more land protected for both recreational and environmental reasons. As it stands, I feel that the blueprint does more to promote the interests of private groups for economic reasons more than it serves both the public, and more importantly, the environment.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I read the SLCA's response to these questions and I overall feel the same way they do on these issues. I'm am a "dispersed user" in the cottonwoods, so my main concern is to protect and to preserve both back country skiing and climbing. I am very concerned about transportation methods interfering with the world class climbing we have. If we were to move some of this climbing, I honestly would consider leaving Salt Lake City.	Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
	I recognize the necessity of compromise, but this proposal is full of invalid assumptions. Are there any guarantees that OneWasatch or SkiLink proposals will stop if Mountain accord is adopted? Is an increase in trails, transportation, or ski boundaries really an advantage to what the canyons represent to this community? Will increasing skier visits to already vibrant ski areas really be a significant (and necessary) impact to the Utah economy? My guess is the answer to these questions is "no", which is why I cannot support this proposal. I cannot support a mountain rail system primarily designed as a marketing tool for ski resorts. If anything, traffic congestion in the canyons acts as a natural limit to daily visitors in the canyons. How will hiking, biking, picnicking, and camping be controlled during peak summer months if the train allows ever-increasing quantities of visitors to get up the canyon? I am not an expert, but I find it hard to envision a train in the canyon without disrupting view shed, water shed, noise, and wildlife. I can, however, envision a road permanently dedicated to bus-only transportation, not unlike some of the national parks. Much of the private land proposed for a "swap" in this proposal appears to be unsuitable for commercial development already. Else it would probably already be developed. Thus, I see little gained by the "trade" for these private lands. Expanding ski area boundaries into American Fork Canyon while presenting the need for increased transportation are in direct conflict. Ski area expansion, by definition, suggests the quest for more visitors/traffic. Utah ski resorts are already world-renowned. My guess is they are profitable as-is. It is not a "given" that for these legitimate businesses to continue to be successful they must be on an ever-increasing path to expansion. Expansion means more traffic, more congestion, more pollution, more stress on the environment. Those canyons do have a maximum capacity. Stop the quest for expansion and focus on maintaining the existing business. Furthermore, the canyons represent a much greater value to the Salt Lake Valley beyond skier visits. Protecting the watershed at the expense of increased ski resort expansion and greater transportation access for skiers is not worth the compromise.	Salt Lake City	04/13/2015
	I suggest that Little Cottonwood Canyon adopt a different transportation approach under which it would not yet be joined with a route to Big Cottonwood Canyon and Park City. That option could always be added later. In the first phase, I suggest we keep Little Cottonwood Canyon "wild" by limiting the maximum number of cars that may access the canyon each day (year round), increase parking fees, and, if necessary, providing park and ride lots and rapid transit bus service from the base to the top of the canyon. This would open Big Cottonwood Canyon to the full effects of the proposed transportation link (and there is already a summertime road connection to Park City) but would allow Little Cottonwood Canyon to try an alternative approach to the growing population that may limit the number of visitors and provide a unique wilderness experience as compared to the other canyons. If, after a few years, it doesn't work out, a transportation route to Brighton and Park City can always be added. I think the Mountain Accord is headed in the right direction in many ways but the unique and precious beauty of both Little Cottonwood Canyon and Big Cottonwood Canyon are due largely to the fact that they are effectively dead end canyons and skiers, hikers and others cannot access them from another canyon and count on a transit ride back out. If that has to change, let's start with the sacrifice of Big Cottonwood Canyon but hold off on sacrificing Little Cottonwood Canyon until we can see what the results have been and whether the objective have been achieved. Let's keep Little Cottonwood Canyon wild. Thank you.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I support aggressive land preservation and protection. Please preserve land, protect watersheds and water resources. Secure additional protections on federal lands!	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	I survey ski guests each year, 8 years, total of 3,000 surveys a year by our team. 99% say keep the mountains the way they are, as that is why guests come to Utah. Not to buy stock in Vail Resorts, not to believe the cool aid, knee jerk Ski Utah hype. The views, the ease of use. Yes they drive, you WONT get guests out of their comfortable cars til you make the UTA bus as comfortable as their car. Simple solution to change behaviors is ala Mill Creek, charge a fee. These people spend thousands per week, they could care less about a buck or two. Have ya ridden a UTA bus lately? Rude drivers, big gaps in schedules in the Canyons, high pricing, and stupid schedules. Ridership is way down. Its great to see the last gasp of resorts promoting everything EXCEPT going green. Parking lots are not green, roller coasters either. Time's are a changin', costs are way up, snow is way down. No way a foolish train makes sense when 5% of Utah locals ski. Right now you have 12 weeks of drunken Oktoberfest with sheriffs at the Tram top at 3pm to stop the fighting, real nice. With social media now there are thousands of quiet people working in the backwoods, Utah used to be the land of the foolish, no more. The Skyline High event made more Utah's ticketed off and we saw the lobotomy job foisted on the public with zero comment, no input, a bunch of idiotic poster boards. Resorts need to fend for themselves, not get a hand out and act like trains, tunnels are so badly needed. They need vision, not more money. Oh those 3,000 surveys? More resort transportation, better food and half day skiing, not expansion. Markets decide the future and this Accord is a joke that even very young students are totally opposed to...	Salt Lake City	03/26/2015
	I think it's good that people are involved and discussing the protection of the Wasatch mountains especially with the high use and growing population; however, I find that this proposal is driven by some ulterior motives that are not in the best interest of the people. The transportation section, especially, smells of these motives. I cannot see the cost-benefit, let alone the possible, unalterable destruction that could happen if the proposed transportation ideas come to fruition. I will talk more about that below in that specific section.	Salt Lake City	03/06/2015
	I think land preservation needs to be the #1 priority here. Ski resorts are great, but do not need to further expand at all.	Salt Lake City	03/05/2015
	I think Lone Peak Wilderness should expand to White Pine. Twin Peaks Wilderness should expand to Silver Fork. Olympos Wilderness should expand to Alexander Basis. The tops of the Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons should be National Parks - seriously. Snowbird should not be expanding into Mary Ellen Gulch.	Salt Lake City	04/28/2015
	I think resorts need to prosper, but, the traditional backcountry areas needs to be protected along with the experience of serenity the canyons currently provide. Pursue the land swaps before resorts can do any expansion.	Salt Lake City	04/28/2015

	I think shuttle buses up and down all canyons would be fine. Widen and improve the road up big cottonwood through guardsmen pass into park city and heber. I am against building a mountain rail up little cottonwood because it will ruin land already there for both preservation and recreation uses. Tunnels are extremely invasive and would completely disrupt little cottonwood creek as well as beautiful backcountry terrain above Alta and eastward towards heber. The inherent beauty and intense experience of the enjoyment of the wasatch range is keeping it somewhat remote and keeping man made structures out. I am completely against usage fees as well. Keep the wasatch pure and serene. I support environmental studies for water management but shuttle buses are the only transportation I support. People choosing to live in heber and midway should understand the implications of where they live with regards to accessing Salt Lake City. Traffic is only bad on certain occasions and certain times usually during good skiing days and holidays during ski season, maybe Oktoberfest. Summer traffic is usually always manageable and most people probably wouldn't even ride the rail they would prefer vehicles.	Salt lake city	05/02/2015
	I think that relying heavily on private funds flaws this system and would like to see them eliminated/limited/ or made completely transparent. I do value the proposed plans for the Cottonwood canyons and on the shuttle service up Milcreek canyon (I would like plenty of bike access on buses/trains), but I worry what role private funding is having for all of this-especially the Cottonwood/Park City connection. Therefore, I do not want the Cottonwood/Park City connection. I also don't know the difference between a shuttle and a local bus.	Salt Lake City	02/10/2015
	I think the blueprint does not adequately address the threat to existing wilderness areas from population and commercial pressure. I think the rail access to Little Cottonwood Canyon is a good thing, but it should not connect to Brighton and Park City. I think that connecting Alta, Brighton, and Park City will diminish the uniqueness of each.	Salt Lake City	04/27/2015
	I think the Blueprint should put more emphasis on the environmental impacts that could occur from construction of transportation options such as a light rail or an aerial system that would connect ski areas. How much pristine and untouched land would have to be sacrificed for these things to happen?	Salt Lake City	04/15/2015
	I think the concepts of conservation, transportation, recreation, economy, etc. are essentially covered, but much remains to be seen regarding the feasibility of the some of the proposed actions such as rails, tunnels, avalanche sheds, road improvements.	Salt Lake City	03/09/2015
	I think the transit options, like trains and trams, to connect Big & Little Cottonwood Canyons and BCC and Park City cannot be built with negatively impacting the natural ecosystem to a high degree. Use of these trains or trams to connect these canyons will continue to harm the ecosystem over time and diminish any gains in any other parts of the blueprint. Other than these intrusive, unnecessary trains, the plan looks solid.	salt lake city	05/01/2015
	I think this plan allows the ski resorts too many options to expand. I especially don't think Alta should be able to expand into Grizzly Gulch. The ski resorts are big enough. We need to leave some of the Central Wasatch as it is, without lifts running everywhere.	Salt Lake City	03/13/2015
	I think transportation is the biggest issue in our canyons. I like the idea of light rail. I've often thought that reducing car capacity and increasing public transit and at the same time increasing safety for cyclists and hikers is the way to go.	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
	I think you should have a better "options oriented" survey than this subjective well-poor option survey. That is, put out a "final survey" that lists specifics under the four categories for people to select options that they are willing to "pay for". Example: Transportation: vote for the transit options you would like to see in place- no change, improved winter bus Park City and /or Cottonwood Canyons, year round bus, bus with dedicated bus lanes, rail to Alta, rail to Alta w tunnel to Brighton, rail to Alta, Brighton and PC tunnel. That way you can get a feel from "the people" as to which specific options are supported or not. Just a thought... this survey is pretty bland in my view.	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
	I understand that increased development of the central Wasatch range is inevitable, however I believe that a stronger stance towards preservation is much more beneficial to the area, and the public, and an even greater resistance towards development should be shown. To do, the Mountain Accord does seem to be the most responsible plan for our land usage, however I think that a full cessation of development of the upper canyons should be imposed, and we should focus on the methods of transportation, and traffic to the area.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I understand the concepts behind Mountain Accord, and I'm glad that public meetings have been held over it. It's not that much of a hot button issue unless you're in the canyons more that a certain amount every year - or an environmental/recreational professional. Then again, I'm not sure what the public at large really thinks about Mountain Accord. It's sort of just gone on in the darkness - what do other people think (Other countries, who are our highest tourist countries that utilize the Wasatch). I think getting out a LARGE amount of PR would be a better way to meet the purpose of Mountain Accord. That is what is meant by the word "Accord" in this case, correct? So if that's the name, live up to it - do more to get more involved, don't just post random meetings for certain individuals to treasure hunt and find. Don't be afraid of change, and don't be afraid of losing out on your wallet. Mountain Accord, not Mountain of High Ranking Individuals Who Make Decisions in the Dark.	Salt Lake City	03/09/2015
	I vehemently oppose building a road through Grizzly Gulch from Alta to Brighton. It does not reflect responsible "stewardship" of our land and does not protect environmental concerns, rather is driven by economic concerns alone. I also oppose year round access over Guardsman pass from Brighton to Park City. To make the road safe for winter travel would have too heavy of an impact on environment and cost too much in the winter months to maintain. This plan seems to address car access and travel only. Please look at alternate resources: train.	Salt Lake City	02/06/2015
	I was led to believe that this was supposed to be a PROPOSAL, rather than a blueprint. Much of the work that was done is not represented in the "blueprint" and it is clear that executive members of the mountain accord simply made decisions for their own benefit.	Salt Lake City	03/10/2015
	I wish it could be more clear on transportation. Currently the unique feature which has both positive and negative effects are the variety in different parking options in the canyon. In other recreation areas like the mountains surrounding the Tahoe areas, backcountry users have only a few places to park which concentrates users, and limits areas available for hiking/skiing--this is bad. Also, I wish it were more clear on how to solve the urban transportation issues which have a great impact on the canyon transportation problems. The Urban areas need more attention to solve the canyon problems.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	I would like more information on how land reclassification will proceed. As an avid rock climber I appreciate the installation and replacement of fixed anchors which might be prohibited if climbing areas are re-designated as Wilderness.	Salt Lake City	02/12/2015
	I would like more information on how land reclassification will proceed. As an avid rock climber I appreciate the installation and replacement of fixed anchors which might be prohibited if climbing areas are re-designated as Wilderness.	Salt Lake City	02/12/2015
	If Ski Area connectivity happened, where boundaries already met - like Deer Valley -> Park City - then I think the retention of the limited resources is met.	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
	If the ecology is what you want to protect, how about controlling the dogs that are allowed to trash the creek in Millcreek canyon? It feels like this is all designed to protect the bikers and dog walkers.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	If the mountain accord is focused on this "sustainability" mindset it needs to take into account the environmental degradation that is going to occur with mass amounts of people. The idea of "wilderness" conservation is being put by the wayside in order to bring upon economic prosperity. By putting economic prosperity at the forefront it is only going to open a door for a complete elimination of wilderness within the Wasatch.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	If the Mountain Accord truly wanted to stay in line with its goals of "... preserve the legacy of the central Wasatch through responsible stewardship of the natural resources, quality recreation experiences..." it would not entertain the idea of expanding resort boundaries. Preserving the legacy of the Wasatch means no more development, especially unnecessary ski area expansion. The resorts are HUGE and already take up a vast majority of quality, skiable terrain in the central Wasatch especially in low snow years such as this. You could probably argue that bigger resorts mean bigger business, but is that really what we, as locals, want? At what point do we draw the line and ask, are we done developing yet? It's hard enough to go for a long hike, summer or winter, without seeing ski lifts, lodges, and restaurants. Transportation is certainly an issue that needs to be addressed, but MA has yet to release any plans that seem feasible or detailed enough to persuade me.	Salt Lake City	03/30/2015
	If this is in fact a blueprint, which to me invokes an action plan, I have to acknowledge low marks for this plan. I would tend toward labeling this a vision that provides decision makers guidance from which to act on. In general I am adverse to the blueprint referring to "disappearing" qualities, values and resources. It threatens use of disappearing values evokes extinction of these values. Does not a plan or vision carry a premise of identifying existing values, potential mitigations and collaborative wins? The implied threat of disappearing values tells me this action plan is one sided and meant to be exclusionary. Additionally the "protection" of environmental and recreational components is important in preservation for quality and use aspects. That is stated, but am also seeking language that would promote increased access and use. Public land for public use. Do not use Accord as a vehicle to further restrict any use resources and access. Economic development and infrastructure improvements (transportation included) should be encouraged in and surrounding the canyons. A vibrant use and access can still be achieved without calling for exclusion. I ask the Accord to recognize the vision accommodate all concerns and not impart limitations. The proposed economic actions and transportation alternatives are a very acceptable initiation for the Accord. Please be open to further positive expansion of resource preservation and use as well as area access by all. Simply, if area population is expected to double by 2050, then I would expect area policy to support a doubling of infrastructure and access.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	I'm a big proponent of keeping as much land as possible protected and preserved as wild. I was pleased to see the proposed enlargement of the ski areas were not as big as I'd imagined.	Salt Lake City	04/13/2015
	I'm all for the bussing (hopefully as electric or at the very least natural gas driven). However, my biggest concern is the costs of building the transit systems (i.e. rail system and tunnels)-and how they would be paid for. While I think the bussing systems could and should be taken care of with public tax money as well as via patron fares, I need to say the ski resorts themselves should be financially responsible for the rail or tunnel construction (especially the tunnels since they and their patrons are the ones who will benefit most from those tunnels--as in people wanting to "jump" between the resorts). And how much surface disturbance will occur in order to build the rail system up Little Cottonwood Canyon?--No doubt a considerable amount. Additionally, I definitely don't want to see any more "aerial" structures built--especially between resorts--as they always require access roads for construction of the support towers and later their maintenance--thus further diminishing the quality of the backcountry between the resorts--i.e between Alta and Brighton. So at the very least, the bussing system should be implemented long before the rails, and the tunnels ought to be the very last to be constructed.	Salt Lake City	02/15/2015
	I'm neutral about the whole plan. It calls for more development, more people, more ski area takeover of the Wasatch Mountains. I wish the Wilderness boundaries had been drawn properly years ago - I wish there had been more of an effort to buy out public inholdings years ago. Reading the Wasatch Accord plan feels like all of this planning is happening way to late to get an optimal outcome. So what I see in Wasatch Accord is that we who live in Salt Lake City are going to lose some things we have enjoyed and valued -- we'll get more crowded canyons, more development in the backcountry, bigger more expensive ski resorts that will be more unaffordable to families like mine, more threats to water quality. And what are we getting in return? Nothing at all. Frankly, I want the ski industry to give something back, and I don't mean "jobs" or "economic development". The Wasatch Mountains are a huge part of the quality of life in Salt Lake City, and the ski industry continually wants to take just a little bit more of that quality of life away from every single Salt Lake City citizen in order to pursue their own profits. How about instead of gobbling up the backcountry, conning congressmen into selling public lands asking me to pay for their fancy "mountain rail" they offer something back to the community? The blueprint could be better by showing me what the ski industry is actually contributing to this effort instead of merely representing what they are demanding.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	I'm not convinced that anything in the Blueprint is more than a tax payer supported transfer of wealth to the ski resorts ("recreation hubs"), with minor concessions to the environment and recreation. Ultimately, I disagree that recreation, transportation, environment, and economy should all be equally prioritized. The environmental aspects must remain paramount, and in the process they provide for recreation. Transportation and economic growth for those who already have so much wealth are not to be valued at the same level as the environment.	Salt Lake City	04/14/2015
	I'm not sure what the terms really mean (an environmentally sustainable transit system is a great goal, but is that best met with a train or effective bus rapid transit or other? Quality recreational experiences mean very different things for very different user groups, ie, snowmobilers vs. backcountry skiers vs. snowhoers vs. resort skiers). I realize this is an attempt to balance all of those things, but these questions don't allow for that distinction because the terms are far too squishy and vague.	Salt Lake City	02/18/2015
	In a lot of ways, the whole package presented is attractive. It is better to make a thoughtful plan than to allow uncontrolled growth. However, it looks possible that some parts of the plan will be achieved and others not. For example, the plan to gain wilderness protection for a large area is wonderful, but difficult to achieve. Without wilderness protection, the increased access allowed by the transit improvements would cause a lot of damage to the back-country. I would hate to sign off on the whole package and only get the increased traffic.	Salt lake City	05/01/2015
	In addition to transportation for people I believe it would be very important for a means of transportation for people with pets as well. This comes in to play a great deal in the summer months when traveling to recreation areas.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	In general, I agree with many of the goals of the Mountain Accord, although having read the document thoroughly, I find it too vague in key areas, specifically the extent of ski resort expansion, and the fate of Grizzly Gulch.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	In my opinion, I think the proposed transportation concept D would be the best plan to build for the future of the canyons. An additional leg up and down Big Cottonwood Canyon should also be considered. The volume of personal automobiles now allowed to access Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons has strained the system to its limit. A European access model of electric trains connecting to existing transit systems in the Salt Lake Valley would serve the future of the area far better than another bus system, susceptible to delays from ever increasing automobile traffic, and also possibly contribute additional pollution in the canyons from exhaust fumes.	salt lake city	05/01/2015

	Increased Wilderness areas and other actions are needed to guarantee and provide for public access but limit and protect lands and improve the quality of visits and purposely reduce visits in currently undeveloped lands (already too crowded and impacted particularly in summer months), reduce development in most spaces. Consider actions and agreements to increase some summer time uses on/in ski areas that are not major watersheds to concentrate use for ease of management in those areas for such things and mountain biking, camping, fishing, casual visits, visit opportunities for those with access issues and those less willing to make the efforts to enter Wilderness and understand and abide by Wilderness rules. More forward thinking and practical transportation solutions including forgetting the senseless tram idea and instead increasing a fast rail option in I-80 corridor, and mountain rail in BCC and LCC without the use of expensive tunnels. Do not construct new roads over to Park City side out of any canyons and do not improve guardsman pass for cars! Instead find a rail solution along I-80 and up and over LCC and out and back in rail service in BCC and prevent private vehicles from using guardsman pass all together. Limit this road to a shuttle system, no cars but connected by rail! Improve bike access and safety on all existing roads including guardsman.	Salt Lake City	04/19/2015
	It could go beyond environmental protection and find specific site area improvements. I think it would be very valuable to clean up some of the old mine tailing in places like Grizzle Gulch and Silver Fork. Also, this may be 'down in the weeds,' but I think we could look at utility service improvements. If a train or something major is built, it is possible to bury power lines, improve sewer systems. For example, could power be brought up the canyon with a train system, allowing the removal of power lines that cross ridge lines. Overall, I think the blueprint is an good plan.	Salt Lake City	02/09/2015
	It is a complete give away to the industrial powers and resort industries. Leave the mountains alone. Stop building. It should not be focused on a "vibrant economy" or recreation, but instead on conserving what we have left.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	It is assumed that the purpose of the mountain accord is to reach the best solution, but we all know that it is a compromise. Protection of the fragile environmental integrity of canyons should trump all other considerations. Strengthening "the Brand" is code for making a quick buck at the expense of the long-term health of the environment	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	It is great there are so many organizations working together to create a Blueprint that will address the four areas of concern-recreation, environment, economy and transportation. The Blueprint is outlining some very general concepts and "big ideas" which will allow people to have a sense of the Mountain Accord's Purpose. As an out of state resident, it would be helpful if the blueprint had a better visual of present versus future scenarios. It's difficult to determine if these big ideas can be translated into real success and meet all of the organizations, government and environmental thresholds. It appears to be an overwhelming challenge and may have a better chance at success if done in phases.	Salt Lake City	03/04/2015
	It is imperative that any attempts to expand private recreational development (ex. Ski Link) be denied. We don't need permanent facilities to enjoy the outdoors. Nor do we need more accommodations. The canyons should be visited, not lived in. The enjoyment simply comes from the interaction between people and the natural environment. Those lacking the mindset to enjoy the canyons in their natural state should pursue other entertainment options along the Wasatch Front. That said, the canyons are being loved to death. There will be an ever increasing level of visitation by people traveling up the canyons in cars. Allowing buses only as is found in Zion National Park seems to be the only reasonable alternative. I fear that any plan, regardless of how well thought out, will never protect our air and water if we don't make Utah families aware of the impact of unlimited population growth. Large families grow exponentially. A fact lost on the majority of people. The result is exponential increases in air pollution and water consumption that cannot be met by an environment with static or even decreasing carrying capacity.	Salt Lake City	04/27/2015
	It is important that people from diverse backgrounds get to give their input on the proposed Blueprint. It does seem that there are a disproportionate amount of stakeholders who have a say in the Blueprint. It says there are nearly 200 of them. I think environmental protection groups should have an equal representation of input.	Salt Lake City	04/01/2015
	It is my belief, that though well intended, the accord as a whole is not only using extremes in their thinking, but also still seeing a very tunnel vision of what the Wasatch will be and can become. Putting a trail-system as a way for us to "environmentally" reach the canyons is not taking into account what this access can do for our canyons. Right now, one of the issues the forest service is dealing with, is how to dispose of human waste that is being currently deposited in the already heavy used forest. Now you propose to add even more access to these canyons which will surely increase this issue the forest service already has. This will then create demand for more infrastructure to be built in order to accommodate a demand that was created in the first place by placing these mountains to a greater access. If a rail system were to be put in place, where would those rails be put? What recreational areas would have to be destroyed in order to allow the passage of this rail system? LCC is already a small canyon, without taking into account a rail system coming through the its passage way. Would this really be the best thing for this canyon? To me the answer is no. Though I know first hand the issues that we deal with these canyons, right now the only way the amount of people that are reaching them is really only being regulated by the amount of parking slots you have up the canyon, take that away and you will have an influx of people that will have a great impact on these natural resources. I am not opposed to having better access to them, I for one will love for more people to enjoy the natural wonders that are in our backyard, but we need to approach this in a more reasonable manner. I've always been a big promoter of a better bus system, one that will make several stops along the road and allow people to access several trails in both LCC and BCC. The only time a bus goes up these canyons is in the winter, why not have it go year round? Another option, is to put a pay booth at the beginning of these canyons. Why not charge, and with that money ensure that these well visited resources have the money they need to be maintained. I would invest in more parking at the mouth of each canyon, this will decrease the parking slots needed along the main canyons roads. I believe that a better parking situation at the mouths of each canyon, better bus systems, and perhaps a toll payment will help ensure that the beauty of these canyons remains what we love. I am sure many oppose the toll, but really those that love coming will be willing to pay it. I don't see why a \$4/car fee will be such a bad thing to implement. Protecting our watershed, and the mountains that are a passage way for so much animal traffic should be this accord's priority. Not being involved in land trades to better the ski resorts interests (though I know they are the ones with big pockets). We have come so far in protecting these mountains, this is not and will not be the first or last time resorts seek to expand their already heavy impact of these mountains. Say you do give in into the land trade, and that you give Brighton the land it wants, Soltitude and Snowbird the go ahead to connect, what happens when all of this infrastructure is set in place and in 20 years from now there is now snow? Then we are left with ski abandoned lifts and we become no better than the Rockies with their endless amounts of failed ski resorts. Do I wish we had more snow, of course, do I love to ski and recreate in these wonderful mountains during the winter and climb/hike them during the summer, yes. I also wish everyone can experience them, but the worst things you could do is to put a ski lift to where no matter what trail you took, or where you went, there would be a ski lift greeting you on the side of the mountain. Ski lifts that will need roads to be maintained, more buildings to sustains them, etc. This project was very exciting to me at first, but now, it is taking a dangerous road that I am not sure I agree with anymore.	Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
	It is obvious that the central Wasatch is/will become overwhelmed with use in the very near future. If not already. To preserve the environmental quality is not really possible. Unless you wish to limit the use to current levels. To allow for increased use and maintain a somewhat quality experience the accord is correct in identifying a key issue as transportation. However it fails when the transportation solution must be "marketable". The transportation solution must be efficient, do able and sustainable. Not marketable. Also more regulation of activities will be needed. For example trails are enhanced when made "one way". Regulation and or separation of non compatible activities (ie down hill mt. biking and hiking or backcountry foot powered use and heli-skiing). This is a tiny area with intense use. Management of all activities is the only way to keep them sustainable.	salt lake city	03/17/2015
	It seems as though the Blueprint focuses most of its attention on this proposed transit line through the Wasatch. I wonder how environmentally sustainable this option really is considering that no limitations on vehicular use will be implemented as well. I agree that something ought to be done about the large amounts of cars that drive up and down the canyons daily but I do not think that a transit system will be any less invasive when you consider the extended line that would cut through the upper Wasatch to Park City. Have you thought about the already struggling wildlife habitat that would then be even more fragmented? Even though there is a growing number of visitors to the region, we should try to better encourage proper use by visitors first (there could be multiple areas of improvement of this) before we develop and destroy this area even further.	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015
	It seems like one of the critical components of the environmental sustainable transit will be seen when we know what the actual alignment of the rail and how construction is managed and finally how well the master plan deals with the interface of human populations, transportation and hydrology. It seems critically important the water quality is at the forefront of all these decisions and execution.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	It seems like the only goal is to make sure that Park City's investors make money. Opening the Cottonwoods to more tourism from Park City will destroy everything that makes these canyons special. The Cottonwood resorts are small and the current infrastructure is a natural limiting factor to what the canyons can handle. In other words, when the canyon is full, it is full. We understand that Sandy wants the tourism dollars, but it would be at the expense of the taxpayers of Salt Lake County. All of these proposals seem to be about making more money for developers and very little about improving anything for Salt Lake City's citizens or tourists. So, why are the citizens being asked our opinion when this is clearly about tourist dollars?	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	It seems like you've got all the right people involved in making these decisions. But it's not clear to me whether your ultimate conclusions will have the force and effect of law or whether those will only be "advisory" conclusions for the Legislature to consider. If it's the latter, I would be concerned that the Legislature will only consider what is politically expedient and not what best serves the interests of the people of Utah.	Salt Lake City	03/13/2015
	It seems to me that the blueprint takes into account the many issues and potential problem areas the central Wasatch faces. It is thorough, and well researched.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	It would be wonderful if these four aims could all be achieved simultaneously, but I fear that the focus will be more on economic growth at the expense of soils, watersheds, and wildlife. For instance, the transit corridor between PC and LC does not seem a very environmentally friendly idea...It won't be good for the wild character of the mountains and their animal inhabitants, that's for sure. The language to protect, restore, and adaptively manage our natural resource base is in the Blueprint, but will these concerns actually receive attention and, more importantly, funding? I hope so, but am skeptical...	Salt Lake City	03/17/2015
	It would seem that the proposed charter is really "Transit Driven" rather than "public development options" driven. The Blueprint meets the needs of the charter, but is the charter the correct one? It sounds good, but from what perspective? I think it should include in the charter the view of the family and the individual, not just the so-called stake holders of business and government and environmentalists.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	It's hard to rate how environmentally sustainable the proposed transit will be without additional details regarding which of the proposed options are actually chosen and then how they are actually implemented in practice. However, I do like the stated goals/objectives that were specified to guide the transit options proposed. I think they balance the competing goal and interests of the various stakeholders well.	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
	There may be an opportunity for a small hub of activity at Olympus Cove where considerable underutilized and vacant land exists. A towncenter that provides for 4 season access to the adjacent Wasatch could add to needed rooms for visitors. another location could be the gravel pit area at the mouth of Big Cottonwood. Establishing more centers in the Valley would mean less need up on the mountain. How does a town like Alta get real input? It seems they want to create a commercial core.	Salt Lake City	03/31/2015
	In winter make transportation from the mouth of the canyons part of the ski ticket price and then limit the number of cars that can drive up the canyon. In summer the number of motor vehicles can be increased but still there are limits and public transportation is necessary.	Salt Lake City	02/10/2015
	Keep busses and mass transit out of Millcreek Canyon!!!!	Salt Lake City	03/26/2015
	Keep the existing backcountry and open spaces available to the public in their current form, and not ruin the forest by expanding the number of resorts, roads, and other damage to the natural environment.	Salt Lake City	04/26/2015
	Keep UTA from making canyon access expensive or less accessible. Their plans are both environmentally and economically disastrous. Extra lanes for buses - BAD. Their buses are expensive, poor hours, poor frequency and run by folks who claim a lot and deliver little. They waste funds, pay themselves grandly (at the top) and destroy traffic flow. You can't even do a bike lane well in the canyons, don't think these guys are saints. No one could afford these buses/rail anyway. Family hikes in the Cottonwoods would be histroy.	Salt Lake City	03/17/2015
	Leave out the light rail in the canyons. No more proposed development by the ski industry. Once it's developed, that's it. There is no turning back. What really needs to happen is that our leaders stop giving out corporate incentives to continue the population expansion of this valley. It is already high density enough.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Leave the Wasatch front alone...	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Less cars and more public transportation options sounds great! I question the need to link up the back of the Wasatch with any of the major canyons.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Less traffic, even people in watersheds, like City Creek Close off to cars 1/2 the days a week	Salt Lake City	04/23/2015
	Mainly seems aimed to increase profits for ski resort areas. What is nice about the Cottonwoods side is that the majority of the out-of-town knuckleheads stay in Park City and Canyons. Brighton and Soltitude are nice because they're more of a locals area.	Salt Lake City	03/03/2015
	The health of the ecosystem must be considered above simply marketing the Wasatch Mountains that will lead to increased use. Low impact to the environment must be continuously emphasized in allowing varying uses.	Salt Lake City	04/28/2015

	Maybe Mountain Accord staffers need another European gondola ride from the study money to extend the study. 28th study! UTA's infusion of \$20 million dollars to get SLC to go along with a study to determine if they needed a bus or a train. Then the train ride is 80% subsidized, with a capacity of 2500 people/hour now lauded by the same mountain accord execs who have quashed all improvement and development via SLC Corp and the newest friends of Alta's burgeoning build out. All this after decades of SLD, SOC and SLCORP denying private property owners to utilize their property right Or develop. Now it's a billion dollar train ride, through the mountain. And save our canyons set themselves up to be the new friends of Alta--Alta development that is--while stripping others of property rights, litigation, threats of litigation and the type of bald faced lies Expectorid by more seasoned politicians, in places like Chicago. Mountains Accord has been a bombastic accorrdion of concessions to itself. Not only are your opinions not wanted, the process was used to have Ralph Becker orchestrate the phased of neutrality while having Karl Fisher of SOC be the front man on their own sale out of every previously held tenent used to deny property rights.	salt lake city	05/01/2015
	More detail on type of bus rapid transit is needed. Diesel exhaust spewing buses won't be any better for our snowpack or watershed.	Salt Lake City	02/07/2015
	Mountain Accord is a collaborative effort to make the best decisions for the future. It seems environmental organizations are underrepresented, with Save Our Canyons being the only non-profit environmental group listed. With the proposals for environmental stewardship including monitoring and restoration, it seems like more environmental organizations should be involved. The environment should be the foremost priority, as it is the basis for the remaining objectives of transportation, recreation, and economy. Without strict environmental protection, extreme degradation of the Central Wasatch will certainly ensue.	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015
	Mountain rail system? You are kidding, right? The cost (both environmental impact and fiscal) to build a rail system into the canyons far exceeds that of the much lesser cost of concrete to simply increase parking in "existing" ski resort parking lots with stacked structures. These existing sprawling lots can be land that can be better utilized to manage traffic control and solve the problem long term at fraction of the cost of developing a rail system based on "usage assessment" studies. How hard is that? Mountain accord seems to want to re-invent the wheel and impose rail system where one is not necessary at tax payer expense and uses obscure verbiage to "sell" it leading public to believe this is the best viable solution to handle "projected" increased canyon vehicular traffic in the canyon recreation areas. Oh, please... The reasonable solution is simple, and has clearly been over-sighted by those looking to validate their blurred vision of Utah's recreational areas. Please DO NOT push to destroy Utah's recreational canyons at the mercy of an idiotic proposal such as rails systems throughout the local canyons for resort access. This will have far greater negative impact on the natural surrounds than simply increasing parking within the areas where parking exists.	salt lake city	05/01/2015
	My basic position on the Mountain Accord proposed Blueprint essentially mirrors that of Wasatch Backcountry Alliance (WBA), Winter Wildlands Alliance (WWA) and Save Our Canyons (SOC). The proposed Blueprint is simply too favorable to touted, yet unproven economic development at the expense of the environment and dispersed recreation. As currently proposed in the Blueprint, the benefits simply do not outweigh the costs. I do not support an interconnection between Big Cottonwood Canyon, Little Cottonwood Canyon and Park City, or any combination thereof. This includes tunnels. The resulting direct, cumulative and indirect impacts to dispersed recreational experiences and the environment are potentially significant, while economic costs and benefits to the public are not known. As a next step, I strongly support development of a purpose statement that balances the "Systems" Mountain Accord is addressing, without giving undue bias to any one element or proposal. Only then can an environmental analysis that considers an appropriate range of alternatives be conducted. We believe this range includes measures designed to provide reliable, lowcost, low-impact transportation to both dispersed and developed recreational nodes in the Canyons. As drafted, the Blueprint needs much improvement - it simply places too much emphasis on development over preservation of the environment and dispersed recreation.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	My comment will be somewhat unhelpful but "environmentally-sustainable transit system" for increasing traffic/VMT is really a misnomer or not possible. Having said that ... if we build a system with as small a footprint as possible that meets the objective of reliable free flowing transportation of people then we, the users, will learn to use and be satisfied with the new system much like the Zion Park shuttle or other systems in Europe.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	No additional feedback.	Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
	No e of it is necessary. It will ruin our collective wilderness experience for ever.	salt lake city	05/02/2015
	No further resort expansion should be permitted. Open spaces are already extremely limited in the wasatch and the resorts have been given the lions share of the quality ski terrain. Further development permanently scars public land while enriching a very few. However, the proposals to improve public transit in the canyons is extremely welcome.	Salt Lake City	02/04/2015
	No more development in the Wasatch please. No ski resort expansion. Protect all undeveloped areas with wilderness designations. Transportation should proposals should seek to reduce automobile traffic and emissions in the canyons. More buses, avalanche sheds, tolls, incentives for car pooling and low emission vehicles should be considered. Trains and tunnels would be extremely damaging to the environment and so expensive as to not likely be feasible.	SALT LAKE CITY	02/12/2015
	No more development. Closure of the canyons to private traffic on weekends and high volume days. Only commercial permitted vehicles on those days and public transit. No ski area expansion. NO TUNNELS OR TRAMS CONNECTING PARK CITY TO COTTONWOODS.	Salt Lake City	02/24/2015
	no no no! on tunnels and overhead trams... I have lived and worked in Salt Lake for 40 years, and in the ski industry, in BCC, for almost that many... I do know first hand how things have changed... Overhead anything is intrusive and will NOT maintain our pristine recreation areas (have any of you been to Whistler? ) . And despite what people fantasize, traveling from the PC "back" to the Cottonwoods and back again is not a realistic scenario. People may currently buy Snowbird/Alta or Solitude/Brighton passes, but they don't go back and forth much. At the aforementioned Whistler, the gondola is handy if the snow is terrible on one mountain and one wants to try the other, but you can't go back and forth and get much skiing in. DON'T DO IT. Nothing but a gimmick and it is NOT a "transportation solution" . And tunnels ARGGHH. Yeah, the tunnel from Denver to A-Basin solves a lot of problems in bad weather, but do you want a freeway from Park City to Brighton? What will tunnels do to our water? What will that do to all the residences there now? A tunnel would totally alter, and destroy, the ambience in either BCC or LCC. If you are hell-bent on one or the other, at least a tunnel would not be visible from the back country, but would bring more traffic , not less, to the tops of our two canyons. NO!!!	Salt Lake City	04/26/2015
	No ski area expansion! No trains. Make a toll road. The mountain according stake holders should excuse them from this process. We can not have a fair process of the mountain accord is made up by the people who will profit from it.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	No ski resort expansion. The vast majority of the SL Valley citizens do not want any ski resort expansion now or every	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	No train up the canyon. Also, UTA should not be a part of the transit solution. They can't schedule to save their lives and we keep throwing money at them. They can't get me to work in a reasonable amount of time (or at all). Now they are throwing resources at vacation spots for rich people, instead of servicing the general population of SLC. UTA needs to be dropped from the proposal all together.	Salt Lake City	04/28/2015
	No trains / no tunneling / no new lifts / no interconnect	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	No trains are necessary for transportation in the Wasatch Front.	salt lake city	02/28/2015
	Not all aspects should carry the same weight. The Maslow hierarchy of needs comes to mind. Watershed preservation needs to come first and foremost. Economic development should come second, if there is any more room for it in the Wasatch. Unfortunately, recreation, the reason why we love our Mountains so much, should come last. This would mean that we favor the utilization of our mountains by paying visitors and use that money to pay for valley infrastructures and education. There is plenty of space still for the local populations to recreate in, a bit further. The Wasatch can only accommodate so many people and uses. Being a significant drinking water reservoir is its most critical role.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Obviously less vehicles driving up the canyons is better for the environment. Achieving that goal via more buses, rapid transit buses, and/or rail, should help. These can also hurt the recreation and could go against the charter's statement of being a steward of these resources. Everything depends on what "actually" is done. This is just a blueprint, that is vague and had no certainty in what will actually be changed/created. For the vibrant economy, is there a problem with it now? If it's a problem of getting people to come to Salt Lake, the problem has absolutely NOTHING to do with transportation to the resorts (any of them) from the airport. Far more people fly into Denver and drive 2+ hours to get to a ski resort. Why don't more people come to Salt Lake City, where we have 7 world class resorts within a 30 minute drive from downtown? Airfares. Airfares. Flights into Salt Lake cost a good amount more than flying to Denver, and that's why people will choose Denver over Salt Lake City. And let's not forget the fact that most people outside of Utah laugh at us over our ridiculous liquor laws.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	once it is gone, it is gone! I would favor every plan that limits further development, other than those types of things that improve the quality of the experience, light, noise, smoke structures, litter, fire, water degradation all reduce the quality, I understand that some development will take place, but I think the focus should be on continuing to keep the canyons a primarily day use resource, mitigating the need to house, feed, protect the increased number of people that will use the canyon in the future. transportation issues should include the most environmentally sound ideas, with cost being an issue. the transportation should be frequent, quick and reasonably priced. zion has done this with buses, milcreek has limited it with a fee. bike lanes should be expanded.	salt lake city	04/27/2015
	Once land is developed, it is lost. The central wasatch has limited resources that should be more important for financial gain for few.	Salt lake city	04/15/2015
	One thing I did not see proposed or discussed was the use of a permit system for access to the canyons during high volume periods. This could promote car pooling, provide additional funds for infrastructure support, and reduce the volume of "Sunday Drivers" on busy days who simply drive up and down the canyon without ever even leaving their vehicles.	Salt Lake City	03/15/2015
	OPPORTUNITIES & POTENTIAL BENEFITS Through Mountain Accord, we have the opportunity to be forward thinking regarding the predicted population doubling in the Wasatch and plan accordingly. Climbers have a seat at the table as a stakeholder in Mountain Accord and a voice in the planning process now and into the future. The SLCA aims to protect and enhance climbing areas and the surrounding environments. The Mountain Accord interest in federal land designations surrounding ski resorts will stop ski resort expansion and protect the Wasatch, permanently ending the battle over ski area expansion. The SLCA sees opportunity with a National Recreation Area or National Conservation Area federal land designation to protect climbing resources into the future. The SLCA recognizes that a mass transit system and trail network systems will cost a great deal of money and supports Mountain Accord seeking federal funding to implement these systems through federal legislation. Currently, the SLCA works with land managers and private landowners to protect access to climbing areas, and we support the Mountain Accord process to examine and carry out land swaps to better ensure access to climbing that is on private land. The Gate Buttress owned by the LDS Church in Little Cottonwood Canyon is one property the SLCA recommends for the Mountain Accord Cottonwood Canyon Taskforce to explore as a highly valuable recreation site. The SLCA promotes better climbers' access trails, therefore we are excited about the inclusion of a trail connectivity component in Mountain Accord. We recommend the inclusion of a climbing ranger and climbing management plan as part of a greater trails plan for the Wasatch. Mountain Accord is interested in projects that are shovel-ready and the SLCA is encouraged by the support for the Grit Mill & Climbing Master Plan Project- this climber access trail network will set the precedent for better climbing access trails throughout the Wasatch. The SLCA recognizes the need for funding to maintain and develop recreation areas in the Wasatch and is open to fees that directly support and improve recreational sites within the canyons. The SLCA is interested in getting more cars off the canyon roads and is interested in mass transportation ideas that serve dispersed recreation users as well as the resorts. The SLCA sees opportunity for better trailhead parking throughout the canyons because of Mountain Accord. The SLCA recognizes a need for an environmental monitoring system in the canyons and is in support of Mountain Accord's efforts to create this promptly to advise future National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) work. As a member of the Wasatch Legacy Project (WLP), the SLCA recognizes the need for a steering body for the Wasatch Front and Wasatch Back and recommends that Mountain Accord consider the WLP to fill this role. THE UNKNOWNNS Impacts to the watershed from new infrastructure for mass transit Ski area interests in 416 acres in American Fork how this will impact American Fork Canyon Mass transit with different possible routes in Little Cottonwood Canyon impacting climbing sites. A wilderness federal land designation could prohibit the use of power drills for re-bolting work on routes and make working on trails prohibitive	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Outlines fewer and most specific viable solutions for transit. Currently it puts all opportunities on the table and many of them are irresponsible for the watershed or will hugely alter the landscape	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015
	Overall I understand the desire to make a more efficient system for accessing the natural wonders that make Utah what it is. However, I do not believe that connecting roads and/or lifts is the appropriate approach. Many locals and tourists enjoy the backcountry and secluded nature that Utah provides with its many recreational outlets. All seasons of the year here provide people with numerous activities that can be enjoyed, but would essentially be hampered or ruined by massive changes to landscape. New roads, especially a connective tunnel, would more than likely increase traffic flow and become a major thoroughfare. Pollution is a major issue for the Salt Lake valley, especially during winter months. The most important change to improve air quality and reduce traffic is to invest in and expand public transportation options. Cities around the globe are taking steps towards combating climate change and reducing traffic by offering discounted or free public transit on poor air quality days. I think the Blueprint could better meet the purpose of the Mountain Accord mission statement by supporting public transit options.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Overall it is a good start with one major exception - Alta still has Grizzly Gulch down as "under consideration." Alta is essentially saying they want to do major development on what is now public land at their base area, plus have more water for making snow, plus have a train, AND, they want to keep the option of developing Grizzly Gulch open in the future.	Salt Lake City	02/21/2015

	<p>Overall Mountain Accord Blueprint: I applaud and support the collaboration of stakeholders in developing a comprehensive land use plan for the Canyons and Wasatch Mountains. Please continue this work. I do NOT support the proposed alternatives as they stand today in this draft blueprint. The proposed draft blueprint does not sustain and support a vibrant economy, diverse recreational opportunities, nor does it protect the beautiful character, natural systems, wildlife and water of the Wasatch. The draft blueprint should be substantially revised by implementing the proposed land transfers, by not expanding the ski area boundaries, by not connecting the canyons, and by removing and restoring Guardsman Pass Road. More details are listed below. Cottonwood Canyon Scenario: 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. 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 not understand the rationale for transfer of these public lands into private ownership. 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. 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). Transportation I do NOT support any transportation connection between Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons to Park City. 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. 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. I do NOT support building a tram, gondola or any other aerial transportation option to connect the Canyons to Park City. I support improving public transit transportation incentives and options for movement up and down Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon along current paved road footprints. I support removal and restoration of the I do NOT support transportation goal #4 providing new evacuation routes out of both canyons. This transportation goal should be removed from the list. One way up and down traffic is a normal and natural condition and limit on growth the Wasatch. If development cannot increase in the canyons due to safety concerns, development should be limited. Unnatural creation of alternative evacuation routes is unnecessary and does not consider appropriate development within the landscape.</p>	Salt Lake City	03/01/2015
	<p>Overall, I am disappointed with the initial position/posture of the MA Blueprint. A decade ago, the Envision Utah process revealed that the vast majority of Salt Lake residents favored limiting the expansion of the central Wasatch ski resorts and preserving this small but incredibly beautiful (and heavily used) for future generations. The MA Blueprint appears to move in the opposite direction, by creating a favorable climate for continued ski resort expansion, at considerable taxpayer expense, and equating the creation of a "vibrant economy" with this kind of expansion. The mountains, the water, and the population of the city are poorly served by the blueprint. Responsible stewardship. Considering the projected growth of Salt Lake City's population, the blueprint seems rather irresponsible in its determination to allow continued development in the mountains. It's a classic western battle for "what's left over," and the ski resorts are leading the charge. Planners need to step back and assess the larger issues, which in truth center on the fact that additions thousands of people are going to want access to the canyons, and these won't all be skiers. The proposed summer trail system will help, but the best option seems to be one of restraint, wherever possible. Hard boundaries should be created that truly preserve this resource for the future. Quality recreation. Again, quality for which group. Right now lift-served ski industry is anything but vital, and from what I read much of the profit for these companies (like Vail) comes from residential development. The blueprint needs to be democratic in the sense that it considers all user groups equally, and this means hikers, back country skiers, wild flower enthusiasts, and fisher people, as well as lift-served riders and side country users. It seems that the latter group is fading, while the others are growing. Something to think about. Vibrant Economy. As I said above, assuming that the only way to create a vibrant economy for the city and the area is by allowing the resorts to expand is wrong minded (as well as short sighted). There are other ways the Wasatch benefits the city's and the state's economy, and one in particular--and that should be considered carefully in this process--is the role the mountains and the recreation they offer play in attracting (and in continuing to attract) new industries. Right now, many industries (and this includes but is not limited to such outdoor companies like Petz, Black Diamond, Specialized) sell Utah as a place for investment because of its incredible backcountry/outdoor/natural environment. The canyons are right here, and available to people more so than in any other city (except maybe Los Angeles!). In the long run, preserving the natural experience, which means hiking without ski lift cables running overhead, will benefit the city/state's economy much more than helping a few ski resorts make some quick money (at taxpayer expense). Transportation. The train is a bad idea. It is too expensive, has limited carrying capacity, and limited flexibility in terms of dispersing users/riders. A bus system (natural gas or electric powered vehicles) with a dedicated lane, multiple stops (at various trail heads), is the best solution. Placing a fee on auto use (and parking) is also important, so that riding the bus is more attractive. Snow sheds work well in Europe, and it seems like a no-brainer that they should be installed here in LCC and BCCs. As a number of people have pointed out, you can get a lot of snow shed for the 2 billion it would take to run the train up these canyons.</p>	Salt Lake City	04/07/2015
	<p>Overall, I commend the efforts and results of the Mountain Accord Initiative to date. However, in some respects the Blueprint doesn't go far enough in providing a truly Bold End Vision for the Central Wasatch. For example, it talks about getting people out of their cars but in most cases provides only buses as the alternative. Several critical Trunk Rail lines are needed sooner than later to really get people out of their cars and enable people to start from any of the Economic Hubs, go Nordic or Alpine skiing, snowshoeing, hiking, climbing, mountain biking, road biking, even to work, and be able to return home or to their accommodations rapidly and comfortably from wherever they end up. The Mountain Accord Blueprint needs to lay out a complete end vision, and then come up with a plan to make it happen. Although we may not be able to afford everything in the vision at once, the critical pieces like rail trunk lines to Park City and along the eastern SLC Valley need to be in the plans for the next decade, not in 25 years. To me, a "World Class Transit System" means getting off a plane at SLC Airport, walking through the terminal to a train, and arriving at the top of LCC or Park City in 45 minutes. There are plenty of examples of this in Europe (Interlaken and Zermatt areas in Switzerland, Chamonix in France to name a few) where you can go from an international airport (Zurich, Geneva) to a mountain destination quickly and efficiently without the need of automobiles or buses. First, clearly paint a bold long-term vision; then we'll figure out how to make it happen.</p>	Salt Lake City	03/15/2015
	<p>Overall, the proposed Blueprint is too much skewed towards further development versus conservation. The focus must be on the least environmentally damaging interventions; the protection of watersheds, wilderness, and scenic ridgelines should be paramount. The developments pushed by the ski industry, in addition to benefiting only the ski industry and not the residents of Utah, are nearsighted. The ski business is not a growing business, the opposite. The changes in the climate (after this past winter I would dare anybody to deny them) are not conducive of investments in expansion / interconnection of ski resorts. They are just bad investments, period. In the longer run, conservation and preservation will prove the best investment of all, for all the residents of Utah.</p>	Salt Lake City	04/03/2015
	<p>Please address how the disputed areas will be handled instead of leaving them open for discussion - i.e. Grizzly Gulch. Please provide more content on where you want to put lifts and how many access roads will be needed to maintain the lifts. Also provide details as to where those roads would be placed. This report is vague at best, barely mentioning aerial transport. While progress has been made with this accord, it lacks depth and detail that is needed to garner support. Additionally - would a train be added while keeping the existing road open or would the road be shut down? That needs to be addressed. A train isn't a bad idea if the road itself is shut down, or access to the canyons is limited by shuttle. But to have both the road packed with cars and a train cruising up and down the canyon--that seems to be a very poorly planned idea. Additionally, please convince us that all of this is necessary for an industry that is steadily declining and more people are exiting the sport of skiing than entering into it. Also, is all of this necessary with the snow we have been receiving in recent years? We haven't exactly been having stellar winters. I do not see any of this addressed in the study. I do not support this plan in its current state.</p>	Salt Lake City	02/16/2015
	<p>Please do something about the traffic jams in LCC...more buses a train something.</p>	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	<p>Please have the transit system managed by someone other than UTA. Based on the current state of public transportation in Utah, it is clear that we need a managing body that understands the needs of all users. public transportation only works if it is available on a regular basis. People use public transportation if it is convenient, which means that it needs to be available even at times that don't maximize profit for the governing body.</p>	salt lake city	03/04/2015
	<p>Please keep the trains out of the canyon. Buses can be made as reliable as trains because it is the same organization running them. Just make the buses more dependable and reliable. Use additional funds to make the buses meet the need. Diesel or natural gas would be good bus choices. I have no problem with a small aerial tram from Alta to Brighton.</p>	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	<p>Please make the land parcels in Grizzly Gulch and White Pine high priority for transfer to public ownership.</p>	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	<p>Please protect the backcountry areas of the Cottonwood Canyons. They are a very special place. Sounds like you're trying to do just that!</p>	Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
	<p>Please see the detailed comments provided by the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance, which represents my feedback for purposes of this comment box.</p>	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	<p>Preserve the backcountry.</p>	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	<p>Preserve the precious backcountry and the peace and serenity it offers! Do not continue to propose development!</p>	Salt Lake City	02/19/2015
	<p>Pretty well, pending on the results of feasibility studies about impact, cost, wildlife corridors, etc</p>	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	<p>public transit up the canyons needs to be not only provided but an incentive should be given when used so that emissions and carbon footprints can be reduced</p>	salt lake city	05/01/2015
	<p>Really unhappy with some of the proposals. Couched in high sounding narrative - the actual actions are rather poor. High capacity transit in LCC - really poor idea. "and the resorts would get more water for snow making" - in a water constrained part of our country. A TUNNEL linking Alta and Brighton is also a very poor idea. This effort seems bought and paid for by the ski industry. Look at the long term climate change, decrease in snow etc. Tax payers will be holding the back for these initiatives.</p>	SALT LAKE CITY	02/04/2015
	<p>Recreation I am in full support of creating a trails network in the upper reaches of the two canyons. 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). Any new road/transit construction must have improved road cycling facilities (wider shoulders, exclusive bike lanes, disconnected paved bike paths) 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. I support the permanent protection of the Emma Ridges to Superior ridgeline from development. 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. I could be supportive of chairlifts and development into the American Fork Canyon depending on alignment and scope. 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 I am supportive of Brighton's formal adoption of Hidden Canyon, provided any chairlift reaches back towards the Great Western chairlift. I am supportive of increased connectivity between Brighton and Solitude in the SolBright area. 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 I am in support of modifying wilderness boundaries to accommodate new and existing sections of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. 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. Economics 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. I support enabling the ski resorts to expand their summertime activities within their existing footprints. I support enhanced modern avalanche mitigation techniques (ie Gas-X) above Alta. I do NOT support a chairlift on Flagstaff peak. 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-fat-to-declining market. Environment 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. I am in favor of a re-forestation effort on (particularly) the Emma ridgeline area. 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. 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>	Salt Lake City	03/09/2015

	The proposal is far to heavily weighted in favor of development and not enough weight for preservation. Possible Solutions to capture data and further discussion include: * What about optimizing rapid transit and private shuttle systems up BCC/LCC. * Possibly reconfigure road to minimize avalanche hazards and improve bus transishuttles from valley transportation hubs. Use disincentives for driving by limiting parking, charge for parking and charge for a variety of permits to drive on canyon roads. * There needs to be much more data to determine what the best ROI is for taxpayers. It is very hard to believe that trains and tunnels up LCC to BCC to PC benefit more total users, improves the economy and reduces more air pollution than using the money to improve the Provo to SLC to Ogden corridors so people can commute more efficiently, be more productive and reduce air/road related pollution. Prove it. * There needs to be more data to compare various transportation options as well. Using a corridor up Parleys to the Wasatch Back seem much more logical from a cost, environment, changed canyon character, water damage, than trains/tunnels in LCC. * Compare the ROI on the above options to a re-configuring of the LCC road to support an optimized rapid transit system. * While we want the ski resorts to grow and prosper they need to do so within current footprints. They can't expand forever...so let them figure out how to grow within limits vs once they have expanded and hurt the Wasatch Mountain experience.	Salt Lake City	03/02/2015
	Remove the commercial aspect. It ruins our mountains. There is currently enough development. Yes, transportation needs to be addressed.	Salt Lake City	04/27/2015
	Resorts are deeply subsidized by the public in the current system with USFS leases that are 80-90% below market rates. In no way, shape, or form do the resorts have leverage adequate to simply allow vertical development and horizontal encroachment into open areas. The private land in the Cottonwoods sucks compared to the public land utilized by resorts. Why the milquetoast approach on the part of the community leadership in allowing so many obvious revenue handouts to private companies at the expense of the majority of user groups. Do not let the resorts expand yet again. They already have world class operations that strain the transit and natural systems.	SALT LAKE CITY	02/15/2015
	Running rail up LCC is crazy and would destroy the canyon. If there is going to be a rail connection to Snowbird it should be from PC via Brighton. Ski area expansion needs to be squashed. NO MORE EXPANSION - its been going on far too long! Growth in Ski industry is in skiing backcountry/side country. NO MORE terrain that needs to be BOMBED daily to be made 'safe'. Resorts should sell land cheap to keep the sweatheart deals they already have on public lands. The resorts are big enough already. I have been skiing here since 1986, its why I moved here. With climate change, skiing has become limited to the upper canyons. What untrammeled/undeveloped land that remains must be preserved for future generations. They have made my life so much better. Development does not belong in the canyon!!! Please don't allow the mountains to be turned into a theme park.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	See below.	Salt Lake City	03/02/2015
	Since many things haven't been decided yet, these issues are hard to comment on. These are the things that I worry about: 1. Developers- if money is involved, there seems to be no limits to the destruction to the environment that they are willing to cause. Several examples: the conference center at the top of Hidden Peak. Short of an earthquake, this tragic eyesore will be a scar on our mountains into the unforeseeable future. While (unfortunately!) Emigration Canyon is not included in this plan, we can see by the hedge-podge of high rise condominiums at its entrance, how developers free for all might look in our other canyons 2. The power of large resorts such as Vail. Again, it seems that if you have the money, you will be able to destroy our mountains with relative ease. 3. Transportation- I would strongly support mass transit. Ideally, a trax line, but nicer and more frequent buses would be a great start. I do not like the aerial tram idea; too much destruction on the hill side. I do not support connection of ski resorts. I think this is totally unnecessary. 4. I would strongly support more bike paths; both road and trail. Road bikers should be able to get up and down our canyons with out the fear of being killed by someone talking on their cell phone. 5. While this may just be a pipe dream and is not presently included in your plan, we really should consider the elephant in the room: uncontrolled population growth! We can't continue to ignore this; whether it's this continuing encroachment and destruction of our natural world, water shortages, air pollution, traffic congestion, food availability, over crowding in schools, poverty, lack of health care, etc, etc, etc. Most of our problems are directly or indirectly caused by over population.	salt lake city	04/30/2015
	So far so good, but I'd lean more towards preservation and reduction of personal vehicles	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	Some how we need to think out of the box. I know our ski resorts are "world class but I would like economic develop to come more from the cited than into the mountain, of which we only have one, if you destroy nature, it won't come back.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Some transit proposals are well thought out (limiting access to upper portions of Millcreek), Cottonwoods plans however are not sustainable if not borderline ridiculous.	Salt Lake City	03/26/2015
	I wish to vote for a transportation model that uses a natural gas-powered shuttle bus system in the Cottonwood canyons(similar to the system in Zion National park ) with automobile passes for canyon residents. Also a light rail train to Park City in Parley's canyon on the I80 corridor. Light rail on Foothill Blvd/wasatch blvd connecting East bench residents living South of I 80 is a must.	Salt Lake City	04/15/2015
	Specifically call out that One Wasatch will not be allowed. The current plan allows for reasonable resort expansion, no additional expansion should be permitted. This is especially true for the grizzly clutch area. I feel that the millcreek shuttle is a great idea and should be followed through on.	Salt Lake City	02/11/2015
	Stewardship of natural resources: I fully support the proposal for a land swap, bringing into public ownership the 2,000+ acres - I also believe that the land deserves nothing less than wilderness designation, anything less would not put in place rigorous enough standards to assure lasting protection. Recreation experience: I wonder whose recreation experience these changes are being tailored to, it certainly feels to me, a life-long resident, that the experience is being tailored to out-of-town visitors who are eager for quick access to the mountains from both the front and back side of the Wasatch, and less to those of us who live on one side or the other. Additional attention to a comprehensive trail system is welcome. But with few details I can't really comment on whether those plans are adequate or address the real problems of multiple use, especially hiker/biker conflicts. Economy: I think above all this plan addresses economy and the desire for the state of Utah and the ski industry to capitalize on the mountains as much as possible - ringing every last bit of use out of a limited amount of space with little thought to climate change and the potential disappearance of the ski industry as winters bring less snow. I certainly feel that economy is driving this plan and is the biggest winner. Transportation: Where is the discussion of the environmental impact on the canyons of constructing a rail system and connecting tunnels and roads? Will the transit system be efficient and useful? Better timed and operated than the deplorable trax and bus transit system now available in the valley? (I still never take bus or train because its faster and more convenient to get places on my bike and I've never taken the train to the airport since the drive is 15 minutes from my house and the train, with transfer downtown, would take over an hour.) Would it be for locals, or once again a gimmick for tourists? Would it require increased parking at the canyon entrances?	Salt Lake City	03/18/2015
	The transportation proposals assume a link in the "Little Cottonwood/Park City corridor." Alta should not be connected to Park City directly. Mass transit can be responsibly used in Parley's, but tunnels and trains do not belong in Little or Big Cottonwood. Very little is said about how people will be encouraged to ride mass transit. Physical facilities (such as lockers) need to be built and significant price differences (either steep discounts on lift passes or large parking fees) will also help. But at some point the possibility of mandatory use of public transit for certain areas needs to be thought of.	salt lake city	04/28/2015
	Stop trying to connect everything in the Wasatch! Every lift, every road, every train, every tunnel that connects point A to point B destroys wildness and degrades watershed. Why are we looking to interconnected resorts in Europe as a model for our precious Wasatch? Remove the dollar signs from your eyes and take a critical look at those European interconnects, and all you'll see are lifts and ski cuts. Nothing wild is left there. Let's not repeat that mistake! All this talk of "compromise" -- the compromises were already made, long ago! Any more development in the canyons isn't compromise, it's outright theft of the precious little wildness that remains. The only real problem that needs to be addressed is transportation, and that can be solved with a bus system that actually works -- no need to spend billions on trains and tunnels that will only serve the 1%!.	Salt Lake City	04/04/2015
	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed blueprint developed under the unique Mountain Accord process. I appreciate your efforts to protect our treasured resources in the Wasatch Mountains. Although I see the need to begin to start a conversation within the community on alternatives for our future in the Canyons, I am stunned by the lack of basic background technical information justifying the Accords "idealized alternatives." Although the Accord has spent resources to produce glossy handouts, the tools to understand the proposals such as the interactive maps are clumsy and lack specifics. The public meetings have been carefully orchestrated to control messaging without opportunities for the community to share ideas or ask difficult questions. Before the Accord could with a straight face call their proposals a "blueprint," much more analysis and input needs to be gathered. Moving forward with an Environmental Impact Statement process from here is premature, and I urge the Mountain Accord to study the issues more in depth, make the information available to the stakeholders and allow more public input.	Salt Lake City	04/28/2015
	Thank you to all stakeholders, reviewers, and authors who have contributed to this project. I am deeply committed to the future of the Central Wasatch and I believe that recreation, economy, transportation, and environment factors are each important. Having reviewed the blueprint, I am concerned that transportation alternatives might include heavy handed and irreversible alternatives. I believe that connecting Park City to the canyons via highway, train, or tunnel will increase use and decrease environmental integrity in the Central Wasatch. If we accept the assumptions of the Accord--specifically projections of growth--then we must also accept that environmental integrity is the most critical factor in economic strength. For the Central Wasatch to remain an economic vehicle for decades to come, infrastructure in adjacent counties must be developed to provide alternatives for visitation. Human visitation and tourism in Utah is a system, and considering a vision for the Central Wasatch in isolation from surrounding systems is short sighted. For me to be enthusiastic and supportive about the Blueprint, I need to see that transportation will be limited rather than enhanced. This is the only way to preserve economic vibrancy and environmental integrity in the long term. Nate Furman Salt Lake City Citizen	Salt Lake City	04/26/2015
	Thank you very much for all of your efforts to see that these proposals get put through to keep access to back country while allowing ski areas continue with what that have and NOT expand all over the Wasatch mountains. We need a good balance. I am an active volunteer member of the Wasatch Mountain Club and have been for the past 25 years. Enjoying not just the back country for hiking and snowshoeing, but also for the wonderful vistas that the mountain provide. Too much additional ski lifts or other development will damage this valuable resource. Thank you again, Knick	Salt Lake City	04/17/2015
	The amount of car traffic up the canyons is a big problem; it contributes to poor air quality and congestion, taking away from the canyons. More easily and affordable public transportation is ideal. In addition, we need Grizzly Gulch to be undeveloped - it is such a big trailhead for backcountry skiing, and we need this land and area to be for the people.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	The backcountry touring options that exist now should be preserved; it would be tragic if resort ski area boundaries were unnecessarily expanded as part of all of this.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	The best and most responsible way to benefit local skiers, the local economy, and tourists is to connect the resorts via ski lift. Turning the Wasatch into a single ski area would make the Wasatch the most exciting ski area in North America if not the world. I've skied in France, Switzerland, and most of the US, and a connected ski area would be a truly transformative attraction. The idea that as a Snowbird passholder, I could explore the entire Wasatch with a small daily upgrade fee or go have lunch in Park City from Snowbird would be incredible. Even narrow advanced connections that minimized the "takeaway" from backcountry skiers would suffice, but connections should be an essential component of any long term plan.	Salt Lake City	02/10/2015
	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 indefinately 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.	Salt Lake City	03/13/2015
	The blue print appears to be well thought out, but we are dealing with the water supply for SLC, public acces for seniors. I grew up skiing at ALTA. I worked for six years at Snowbird after graduating from the UofU in 1971 in a management position. The ski resorts are a business. They want more people in the canyon to support ridiculous projects like the building on Hidden Peak. Develop natural gas transportation system with wheels to accomodate traffic. Dont build a rapid transit system. Development has ruined Park City. Save both Little and Big Cottonwood from ending up like Park City Resorts. Regards	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
	The Blue print could better meet the Mountain Accord by valuing nature, wilderness, and the environment over economic development. The Wasatch does not need to be turned into a Disneyland of the national forest. Meaning, trying to attract more visitors and expand resorts.	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015
	The Blueprint - fails to consider watershed impacts of proposed transportation and interconnect construction, -should put watershed protection and preservation of the environment above economic considerations -fails to discuss what limits or constraints will be required to preserve the natural or ecological values of the Wasatch	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015

	The blueprint DOES NOT preserve the legacy of the Central Wasatch whatsoever. An interconnected Central Wasatch will forever change their character and attributes that has made them world-famous. This blueprint clearly demonstrates the strong desire of city officials, county officials, and private entities to leverage such a precious resource for their own monetary gain. A responsible plan would be focused on changing use patterns and minimizing impacts of growth. It would also propose a plan based in fact. The transportation solution appears to be complete over-kill for the current and near-future. A responsible plan would identify the trends and propose strategies to address crowds as the needs arise. Instead, this plan will exacerbate and accelerate user impacts. The proposed major transportation solution will accelerate visitation and degradation of the resource. It will increase over-crowding of the Central Wasatch, degrading user experience, watershed, and viewshed. The proposed tax-payer funded interconnection is clearly being proposed to bring in federal dollars for its construction and profits of municipalities and private interests... All at the expense of preservation.	Salt Lake City	03/02/2015
	The blueprint fails the purpose of the Mountain Accord from the leading tenet of "responsible stewardship of the natural resources." Expanding development throughout the Central Wasatch has limited upside to the environment and a large downside. The upside of improved transportation options, could easily be negated by carving holes through the Wasatch mountains and adversely affecting their watershed and ecosystem. Purchasing private lands for conservation without trading for currently public lands is a better option for protecting the existing ecosystem of the Wasatch and our watershed.	Salt Lake City	03/02/2015
	The Blueprint favors profit over preservation. There needs to be more aggressive interventions to protect the fragile mountain areas from development. The current recommendations do not go far enough to implement a "limits to growth" approach. The current recommendations also seem to minimize the factors of change that seem to be unfolding with global climate change. Therefore, many of the assumptions for managing a fragile environment seem grounded in hopes that things will not get worse rather than the incorporating the protections that are needed if predictions for climate changes are within a reasonable possibility. Of particular concern is the limited commitment in the recommendations to require sustainable changes in the methods of transportation to access the canyons. There needs to be much more aggressive approaches to decreasing transportation pressures to all areas of the canyons.	Salt Lake City	04/13/2015
	The blueprint is an excellent starting point as more and more interests compete for the Central Wasatch, I only hope that the conversation stays in the hands of citizens and out of Vail Resorts, Doppelmayr, etc... NO to ONE WASATCH!!!	Salt Lake City	03/02/2015
	The blueprint is based on the notion that we can simultaneously "grow" the economy, "enhance" the recreational experience, yet preserve the wilds and our water supply. IT IS NOT GOING TO HAPPEN... the first law of Disney does NOT trump the first law of thermodynamics.	Salt Lake City	04/28/2015
	The Blueprint is far too skewed towards the continued development of our ecosystems and habitats for the purposes of an unsustainable tourism and real estate industry. Though a reasonable attempt has been made to address the concerns of many difficult-to-balance ideas and interests, the Blueprint tends to favor the viewpoint that profit is the best possible use of our home landscape. Tunnels, trains, and interconnects are a very small-minded way to address our transportation issues, which just happens to make our mountains more "marketable" to visitors from other places. We should be addressing the health of our communities--human and nonhuman--here first, not the interests of tourists or out-of-state corporations that depend upon tourists. Why does everything have to be predicated on encouraging growth? The report is predicated on an assumed massive growth of our population. This is, in fact, the main problem that this process is seeking to address--more people--yet there is no mention of what we could do to discourage this growth. Perhaps the route to sustainability involves less of us, not continuing to alter this place to accommodate our "inevitable" growth.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	The blueprint is impressive in many ways. It's difficult to predict how well it achieves a vibrant economy, because that is dependent on many factors in addition to the Blueprint. I worry about the light rail and bus options connecting Big and Little Cottonwood canyons and Park City. Each is a wonderful, and, to me, independent recreation area that doesn't need to be connected to another recreation area. Tunneling sounds both expensive and potentially harmful to the watershed. Bus provides more flexibility over time than light rail and allows for flexibility as the area expands and experiences economic cycles. It's difficult to anticipate the actual growth rate, as other economic factors and birthrate factors intrude.	Salt Lake City	04/23/2015
	The Blueprint is not very clear to the casual reader about what it is advocating exactly. I support above all environmental protection. Second, environmentally sound trails access for body-powered activities. Any aspect of this plan that will degrade the environment I strongly oppose. The economic idea of linking ski resorts is very likely one of these. We only have one environment. We have lots of people who have made (or who want to make) a lot of money in real estate, development, and recreation products and services, many of whom will put their own profits above the preservation of the mountains and canyons.	SALT LAKE CITY	05/01/2015
	The blueprint is well written and congratulations to everyone who worked on the blueprint. My fear, and the fear I think of a lot of us who love the back country is that ultimately too much will be given away to additional residential or commercial development and we'll lose access to more and more lands crowding the backcountry even further. So congratulations on a strong blueprint, but how do we work to ensure there is limited ski resort development and that we can keep more towers and train tunnels out of the Wasatch?	Salt Lake City	04/27/2015
	The Blueprint lays out what has been discussed at the board level. It is well designed and put together in an easy to use manner. One of the major points missing from the Blueprint is discussion of where the funding will come from. There is also information missing on the amount of backcountry skiers and hikers who use the resource away from the ski area boundaries.	Salt Lake City	03/20/2015
	The Blueprint outlines a plan which does a good job of balancing protection of natural resources while concentrating development within the resort boundaries. There is a lack of specifics about new wilderness proposals, which the Blueprint seems to accommodate by including land trades and excluding new development and ski boundary expansion into sensitive areas which are being proposed for wilderness expansion.	salt lake city	02/23/2015
	The Blueprint really just lists alternatives - many of them are poor.	Salt Lake City	04/27/2015
	The Blueprint recommends further studies. As this is the third study on the proposal, I would recommend not creating any more studies. It is time to act on the proposals at hand.	Salt Lake City	02/04/2015
	The Blueprint seems overly weighted towards the economic benefits at the expense (sacrifice) of the environmental/responsible stewardship objectives. The Blueprint seems directed to getting MORE people into the canyons for the promotion of business. There is NO need or reason to link the Cottonwood Canyons to each other or to Park City resorts. The blueprint should promote resort development at Park City Resorts and leave back country recreation and use (which has lower impact on the natural resources) in the Cottonwood Canyons (and Mill Creek and Alpine Canyons).	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	The bottom line is that development, once implemented is impossible to remove and restore. This is too slanted towards development rather than preservation.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	The chance of having a tram from BCC to LCC is what takes away the natural surroundings, environment, and recreation. So this possibility is the biggest fault of the proposed blueprint in regards to the purpose of The Mountain Accord, especially since it's probably the worst solution for transportation.	Salt Lake City	02/24/2015
	the connection of all canyons will only increase traffic on trails and lead to further degradation of our preserved wilderness; i also enjoy cycling up the cottonwood canyons and placing mass transit on the roads will make this ride more limiting and interfere with the enjoyment of the ride; i do NOT support mountain accord!	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	The economic viability of our recreational opportunities in Big and Little CW Canyon is tied to the ability to move people to and from the resort/recreation areas. Much thought needs to be given to the fact that traffic and parking are a problem because the transit system is not adequate and is a miserable experience. For instance, if I want to take the bus to Alta, which costs less and is more environmentally friendly, it not only takes 2-3 times the amount of time to get there, it is a physically miserable experience (tight spaces, poor ventilation, uncomfortable ride, etc.). I would rather pay more and arrive at my destination feeling ready to recreate. Advice: Make the experience pleasant and the problem solves itself!	Salt Lake City	03/10/2015
	The general format of the mountain accord is setup well. Considering the ideals of Recreation, Economy, Transportation and Environment covers the major areas of interest pretty well. However, the overall blueprint is still heavily weighted toward the economy. It's as if this proposal was submitted by wealthy people in Park City who want an easier way to get to the cottonwood canyons. In fact, that's exactly what this proposal is all about. In this day and age we should be putting more emphasis on the environment and over-indexing in our efforts to preserve our natural spaces. Without it, the economy, recreation and transportation fail. I am all in favor of better public transportation for the cottonwood canyons and for parley's canyon. I believe we should have a train that runs up all three canyons. I don't think people should be allowed to drive up the cottonwood canyons. I am all in favor of preserving more land and not selling public land to private corporations. I do not think we need to expand our recreation opportunities by building more chairlifts, tunnels or roads. The access in Utah is unheard of. The economy is continuing to grow in Utah, and it's not because of recreation.	SALT LAKE CITY	02/10/2015
	The health of the mountain ecosystem and the importance of watershed should always be the most important area of discussion. Commerce and profit, for once, needs to be put aside. This is an issue of great importance to future residence of this area.	Salt Lake City	04/26/2015
	The highest interest served in this whole process is and should be PRESERVATION of as much property and land in the Tri Canyon area as possible. Economic, travel, resort and private interests pale in comparison to the preservation standard. Proposals for a rail line up Little Cottonwood Canyon, and Lift expansion connecting the resorts and Park City, should be scrapped. No need for further study or expense of these issues. Parties that push such proposals - if they are on the board or executive committee - should stand down and no longer serve. The money involved in this process, payments to Laynee, are shocking. The proposed costs for a rail line up the canyons, shocking also, and certainly not in the public interest. Who is going to stand up for nature in this process. Everything else takes a back door. More wilderness needed, and a greater reverence for preservation amongst all of the parties. Vail, Snowbird, Alta don't own the canyons and they own the politicians or UTA or Hatch or Lee, that would push for Federal Appropriations. What is owned is the collective canyon ecosystem by the citizenry of both sides of the Wasatch. It's a crown jewel and all the scenarios to further carve it up, cut the walls of the canyons and launch lift towers over ridgelines, are an abomination. They not necessary, there is no overriding public demand, and they are not in the overall public interest. Salt Lake County, Salt Lake City, should put an immediate stop to the gargantuan plans re rail and lifts and scale back proposals, seeking first to preserve as much land as possible. I'm disappointed in the charlatan leaders that speak of their love of recreation and then in the next breath laud the ideal of more lifts and rail lines in the canyons. A false connection to nature and to what's sacred. Please, scale back the proposals, and push for preservation, more than anything. Else. Thank you SLeewis, SLC UT	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	The idea of connecting the canyons with a mountain pass from the Park City area to the Big Big Cottonwood canyon area is not a good idea. If this is allowed, development of these now not quite unspoiled areas will be developed and destroy the natural essence of this beautiful area which is a terrible idea. As for a train up Big or Little Cottonwood canyons I think this is a terrible idea, too. More express bus service is a great idea, however, to reduce automobiles in the canyons. And yes, I personally would use the express bus service.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	The importance of protecting the watershed which provides drinking water must be of utmost importance not sighted for "economic" gains. Really crowded days at ski resorts aren't that numerous and shouldn't be the driver of overblown "cool" transit plans damaging to the canyons and the environment. Transportation is a problem but not as HUGE as it is being made out to be and rarely rather than all the time.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	The main purpose should be preservation of the Wasatch Mountain's greatest asset: pristine vistas and the enjoyment of those in as much a natural way as possible (in my opinion, therefore, less roads, tunnels, buses, trains, and more trails for bikes and hikes, snowshoes and skis). Less development is a laudable goal. I want my kids and grandkids to enjoy these mountains as I have, without witnessing destruction of the wilderness by the building of homes, parking lots, hotels, and other developments. Our mountain landscape, and unique quality of proximity of our wilderness in Salt Lake City needs to be preserved in order to continue to market it as a wilderness!	Salt Lake City	04/26/2015
	The major failure of the Blueprint with respect to the Mountain Accord Charter is a failure to designate priorities. Protection and conservation of the environment should have been designated the number one purpose, with all other purposes designated secondary. By describing all the purposes as equivalent, the Blueprint creates a framework for possible environmental degradation, as long as other purposes are met. In addition, the Blueprint should include an explicit statement that all participants and stakeholders are relying on the fact that public lands in the Wasatch will remain public lands, never to be transferred to state control. I would suggest a "savings" provision that provides that if an when NFS lands in Utah are transferred out of state control, that the NFS lands in the Central Wasatch would not be included, and if included, would be transferred to control of a "trustee" of some kind obligated to carry out the Mountain Accord plan	Salt Lake City	04/02/2015
	The most important part of this project is improving transit, as this affects the other categories so strongly as well. I appreciate the stance of the mountain accord in being proactive in smart development, and I think the transit thing has to be done right. I think the light rail is a great idea, but why only LCC and not BCC? I've been a local for 2 seasons in the Wasatch now, and feel very strongly about fixing the traffic jams up the canyons. I don't understand the jaded local view point of "leave our canyons alone, there's so little left!"	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	The mountain accord blueprint frames the interrelated, and sometimes competing goals, well. The identified next steps for environmental stewardship and recreation are solid. But much of the economy and transportation blueprint seems shortsighted or unrealistic with respect to cost and overall benefit. The central Wasatch is a community sustaining gem in many ways. Ski and other outdoor tourism is important but that value pales in comparison to the importance of water resources and recreation to residents and broader business climate and quality of life.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015

	The Mountain Accord outcome I would like to see would focus on conservation of the land, Protecting our watershed and changes that would amount to a net reduction of development in the Central Wasatch. Land swaps that would concentrate development at the base of resorts in trade for minimizing private land in the backcountry seem to make sense both economically and environmentally. A Shuttle system involving buses or vans would be able to meet the varied recreational needs in the canyons. Trains are not conducive to multiple trailhead stops and are not as flexible as buses or vans for changing needs both over time and season. Plus the environmental cost of building rail in the canyon seems overwhelming for such small area. I don't support further connectivity for the resorts. There is no good way for this to be accomplished and the benefit would have nothing to do with those of us who live here. It is all for marketing a declining industry. I would also favor fees such as we have in Millcreek Canyon. It makes sense that those that use the canyons for recreation should help in the maintenance of those facilities that we enjoy. Money collected should be earmarked for improvement and maintenance of those canyons.	Salt Lake City	04/27/2015
	The Mountain Accord Process is important because Our Mountains have an amazing value to the community and need to be preserved. If other plans are brought forth, our only chance at keeping one of the most beautiful recreational areas safe will be put at risk, and NO ONE should want that.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	the mountain are for all people to used, we all need to take care but not have big brother look over for us.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	The mountain transit proposal seems reckless. I don't want a light rail, trains, or tunnels in nature. It will forever scar the canyons. The point of nature is that there is a little bit of sacrifice in experiencing it - I like the peace and solitude in the mountains. It should be more remote than a city. That's why it is designated as wilderness. Please try circulator buses that stop more often (at trailheads, resorts, campgrounds, etc) and see if they are utilized before investing millions in a train that will be devastating to the environment.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	The Mt Accord is trying to provide openness and transparency by having the community meetings. I attending one of the meeting and it was a total farce. It was a very controlled meeting and they only read the screened questions which they liked or were easy to answer. The one controversial questions was responded with "I don't know". We have the big executive committee made up of Cities, UDOT, UTA, ski resorts, politicians, etc. With the exception of Save our Canyons everybody will benefit financial with this proposal. There is always the saying of following the money. So it looks like these ideas will be jammed down the throats of the taxpaying citizens. I suggest any idea you want to implement it should be voted on, because the taxpayer will be subsidizing these private entities.	Salt lake city	03/11/2015
	The notion that any sort of transportation system from Park City to Brighton will IMPROVE transportation challenges or environmental impact in the canyons is a pipe dream. I am 100% in agreement traffic patterns and environmental impacts of transportation need to be addressed, and that it will be difficult. But the "poor" of users from the Wasatch back is almost irrelevant in this. A) they are minimal. B) for the sake of argument, they already drive around via I-80, which has an environmental impact. But it will only be increased if SL County folks drive UP I-80 to access the new transportation system, and C) it doesn't deal with the actual problem, which has nothing to do with users on the wasatch back, and that it that the canyons cannot support the EXISTING pool of users coming from the valley. Building a new "in road" into the canyons will only increase the number of users in the canyon on a given day, thereby increasing waste, etc. PLEASE DO NOT ADD A TUNNEL OR ARIEL INTO THE CANYONS FROM THE WASATCH BACK.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	The online "Mountain Accord" was illegible because it could not be expanded for reading. The web site was also unavailable. If this was an attempt at communication, it failed. I am also concerned by ski area land grabs, particularly below Great Western. Brighton Ski Resort has historically done a poor job of land management, allowing erosion to gut the runs and trash to accumulate year by year. Why should they be allowed to expand further until they clean up their act? I hope planners bent on maximizing development in the Wasatch will, at some point, remember that WATER is the most valuable resource that the mountains can offer. If you screw that up, nothing else really matters.	Salt Lake City	02/07/2015
	The only thing I see from the blueprint is even more people in our canyons. Then in 20 years we will want more access to the resorts again. Then what? Do the resorts go to the Forest Service and request more land to stick their lifts on? It has to stop. Making more parking and ways of getting up the resorts is just feeding a pig. Has anyone thought about just limiting access to the resorts? I know people want to limit access to the canyons and beanti in general, but why not limit access to the resorts? I guess you just follow the money and not the interests of the locals who spend more than just a few winter months up in the canyons.	Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
	The part I am most unsure of is the idea of a rail line up Little Cottonwood Canyon and through a tunnel to Park City. How much impact will that have on the canyon? I was very opposed to Snowbird's plans for some sort of roller coast over the road. Our canyons should not be turned into amusement parks. They should not be turned into train systems either. However, I trust the recommendations of Save Our Canyons, so perhaps this is the best compromise for all parties. I guess I'm having a hard time envisioning the transit up the Little Cottonwood Canyon. I am very interested in a central governmental organization for administering the central Wasatch, something that will prevent the canyons from being torn up by private interests. The Mountain Accord seems to be a good start towards that. Thanks for all this work and for thinking ahead. In general, I am in favor of this plan.	Salt Lake City	04/20/2015
	The plan should look more seriously at Zion style buses in LLC in the winter before looking at the more expensive, "pie in the sky" engineering projects. It will be important to preserve backcountry access for this though.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	The policy going forward should be NO NEW DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC LAND. The strain/strain on our small natural resources is already reaching a breaking point with four large resorts in two small canyons. With the impending change in along the Wasatch Front we should be working to preserve more and more land and resources instead of bargaining it away to the ski resorts. Their skier numbers are down and I think the logical next step is to discuss ski resort reduction rather than expansion to match their demand. With the fastest growing segment of skiing being in the backcountry, shouldn't we work harder to protect it?	salt lake city	05/01/2015
	The primary focus should be preserving what is left of the Wasatch rather than developing it for the ski industry's grandiose One Wasatch dream. To that end, moving people up the canyons is important and can be solved much improved but not by installing a frightfully expensive and destructive train system. Alta is NOT Zermatt and nor will it ever be. Likewise, there is no need to create the artificial "requirement" of linking resorts via a tunnel system. In my 20+ years of resort skiing I either went up one canyon or the other (or, on very rare occasions, up Parleys to the Wasatch Back resorts). Never did I have a desire to ski Alta and then pop over to Solitude for a few runs. That is a marketing dream (and a local's nightmare).	Salt Lake City	04/16/2015
	The priorities seem to be geared toward skiing and tourism, not wilderness preservation. More frequent buses, perhaps shuttle buses, seem a better option than construction of a train line.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	The proposal could be acceptable without the transit option of connecting Big Cottonwood, or Little Cottonwood, etc (although I didn't see other canyons in the plan - I may have missed them) with Park City or the Park City area. I think that this is a horrid idea and would destroy so much. I think that the only ones who would benefit from this would be the ski resorts. I don't blame the resorts for wanting to improve their business prospects but that should not happen at the expense of the canyons. The expense for this should not be carried by any tax or government help, if it does happen. I think improved public transportation in the canyons would be great. Express buses from downtown hotels and various gathering places to ski resorts should help as would better public transportation in general. Additionally, we should consider the unpredictable weather/snow that we have and will continue to have. Will those resorts be able to stay in business without decent snow? Perhaps they want to increase their business options, but once again, they should do that at their own expense.	Salt Lake City	03/25/2015
	The proposal does achieve a transportation link between Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon. Then the big question of what transportation means to get up Big and Little Cottonwood. And ultimately would this connect over to Park City. I would propose Gondolas and or Trams and Bus systems - as the costs would be more reasonable and provide spectacular scenery which you wouldn't get in train ride. A train to Park City seems to be the most logical connection from the SLC Airport	Salt Lake City	03/01/2015
	The proposal to move forward with either a tunnel connecting the Cottonwood Canyons to Park City or a gondola both seem a little absurd and undermine the notion of environmental protection. It seems like a purely economic move in terms of consolidating resorts and limiting backcountry access (Vail Resorts expanding from two resorts in Park City to a third in BCC). A much easier way to increase tourism revenue in Utah would be to change the liquor laws as opposed to drilling a hole through a mountain or building a gondola.	salt lake city	04/30/2015
	The proposed blueprint is a runaway proposal for developers. It spells out BILLIONS in public spending that only benefits a few of the developers. This blueprint fails completely to protect the watershed, nature health of the Wasatch Front. The board is "stacked" with developers, and represents very few who actually care about the Wasatch. Since when has Big Cottonwood Canyon been closed for more than a few hours? The argument that we need "Escape" routes to evacuate the canyon is a specious argument at best. The argument about "air quality" is flatly false. I look to the 8,000 new drivers every year on the roads in Salt Lake County and nothing you do to limit the traffic in the canyons will alter the pollution in Salt Lake Valley. A "TRAIN" you have got to be kidding... right now the public has to subsidize TRAX at the tune of \$72/per person/per ride...!!! UTA is a bloated bureaucracy (the director makes over \$500,000 per year and hundreds of UTA employees make well above \$250,000/year... we need less TRAX, and much smaller UTA salaries before I could ever support a train... Land swap... come on This is only about making an industry that is less than 1% of the Utah economy rich. Dump the Billions into better schools (the US now ranks last in the industrialized world in MATH and SCIENCE)... maybe dumb voters are the reason this blueprint is even being considered.... I am now convinced that the Mountain Accord is a thinly veiled guise for a publicly funded amusement park called the Wasatch Front.....	Salt Lake City	02/24/2015
	The proposed Blueprint is extremely vague and I did not find it helpful. It sounds nice to have all the stakeholders involved, but the devil is in the details. I fear that the survey results will be mis-used because of the vague questions. I prefer human powered recreation and thus would push for as much land as possible to be in the public domain, and would oppose expansion of ski areas. Likewise I am a proponent of public transit as long as the system is designed well. Anything we can do to minimize carbon emissions is a good thing and will benefit everyone, including the ski areas. While some of the warmth from this season is due to natural variability, some of it is also due to climate change and it points to large future impacts on ski areas. How will the ski areas propose to stay in business in 50 years when the ski season is dramatically shorter or non-existent? (CCSM model projections of springtime snow depth in North America under RCP8.5: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r8L00AYyHqY">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r8L00AYyHqY</a> )	Salt Lake City	03/17/2015
	The proposed transit system looks like a quilt of political influence. Trains here, buses there, ski lifts over yonder. The Mountain Accord is on the correct track they need to take the concept further and make a few people mad as opposed to the current hodgepodge proposal trying to keep everyone somewhat satisfied.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	The purpose of the mountain accord is to provide a framework for achieving "responsible stewardship of the natural resources" and "quality recreation experiences." In order to better achieve both of these goals, the Mountain Accord should provide a framework for responsibly and fairly ending the very heavy mineral extraction activities currently taking place in Parley's Canyon and the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon. Both of these gravel mines extract an extremely heavy toll on the environment, creating visual and air pollution, permanently altering the landscapes of our canyons, increase traffic on our mountain highways, and take up invaluable space that could be used from scenic, recreational, and transportation purposes. The Blueprint for the Mountain Accord should provide a means whereby both of these gravel pits can be acquired as public property and rehabilitated in a way that can be enjoyed and used by all members of the public. Clearly, these gravel pits are parcels of private lands operated by private owners, and they must be fairly compensated if their land was acquired. But gravel mining is wholly inappropriate in the beautiful, vital, and environmentally sensitive area of the central Wasatch. The Mountain Accord should provide alternatives where the public could acquire these lands, either through sale of the lands on the open market, or through eminent domain.	Salt Lake City	02/04/2015
	The purpose of this email is to give you my general comments re the proposed plan: 1. I am not in favor of any public-private land swaps unless the parcels received by the public entities are placed in wilderness designation so that they are totally protected from development. 2. I think the idea of a tunnel is a bad idea and under no circumstances should any tunnels be paid, in whole or in part, with public funds. 3. The idea of improved public transport (whether bus or rail) is worth exploring further so long as any resulting transportation is frequent and free or has only a nominal charge to stimulate use and there are mandatory limits on auto traffic up Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons and the private development does not increase auto travel or auto parking in the canyons.	Salt Lake City	03/18/2015
	The purposes are inconsistent so to ask how the blue print achieves the purposes is to ask what purposes you value most. I prefer preservation to economic development or to recreational experience opportunities with the belief that a higher quality experience should be preserved at the cost of convenience and development.	salt lake city	04/30/2015
	The stated purpose of the Mountain Accord is to "preserve the legacy of the Central Wasatch Mountains." This is a highly laudable goal, because this mountain range is priceless. To preserve the legacy of the Central Wasatch Mountains, we preserve what is left of the Central Wasatch Mountains. I rate the Accord very poorly because its actual purpose is to "preserve the legacy of the Central Wasatch Mountain Ski Industry." Only the promotion of the ski industry makes any sense for boring holes through mountains, building railroads up canyon floors, and expanding resort development. Resorts and developers may be the loudest and most influential voice at the Mountain Accord table, but they represent a trivial fraction of people who value and treasure these mountains. So please...remember what legacy you say you are preserving, and represent the real constituency of the Central Wasatch Mountains. Please don't trade the Mountains for anything. It's a bad deal.	Salt Lake City	02/10/2015
	The train and tunnels concept for transportation is ridiculous and is the worst possible approach to canyon transportation; it is the most expensive, most environmentally damaging, least flexible, would take the longest to put into service, and will do the least to reduce the number of cars driving up the canyons.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	The Transportation Alternatives should favor cost effective solutions (e.g. bus rapid transit) over high capital outlay solutions (e.g. light rail).	Salt Lake City	02/25/2015

	The transportation plan involving the cottonwood canyons and possibly the park city area is the critical decision. Right now there are too many possibilities included and that makes your blueprint very hard to judge. I hope the environmental impact statements of each proposal are conducted in a fair and judicious manner and that the public will be able to see all impacts and have the ability to weigh in on the plan to be selected. Also we are going to continue to see poor winters like this one due to global warming. Has that been factored into the planning? If anybody on this Accord is in denial about global warming that should be grounds to remove them from the process. It simply isn't up for debate anymore regardless of what a lot of idiots think. I applaud the Accord's goals of meeting these 4 criteria but I believe it will be hard to balance and deference should be made to protecting natural resources and the natural environment. I would only be in favor of a proposed improvement for economic, transportation, and recreation interests only if it also at the same time improves the natural environment within a reasonable timeframe. The birds, the bees, and the trees are more important than some new condos or making it a little easier for an out of towners to have the "perfect" ski vacation.	Salt Lake City	03/26/2015
	The Wasatch mountains are an incredible source of beauty, nature, and recreation right at the backdoor of everyone living in the surrounding area. Whether you hike, ski, bike, or just look up at the mountain from the valley, everything possible should be done to preserve and keep these mountains pristine.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	There are positives and negatives so it is hard to give an overall rating, but the expansion of ski areas and installation of aerial trams over the Wasatch is a big negative that affects my evaluation of Environmentally sustainable Transit, Quality Recreation Experience, and Responsible Stewardship of Natural Resources.	Salt Lake City	02/04/2015
	There is a lot of pressure to build a Little Cott. - Park City corridor which I am not in favor of. Also, no more expansion of Solitude into Silver Fork or Alta into Grizzly Gulch. User fees seem practical and we need more efficient express buses	Salt Lake City	02/06/2015
	There is a need to understand ridership numbers for public transportation up the canyon. Besides a persons moral/environmental conscience, what incentives will there be to take transit over personal vehicles?	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	There is not enough details to decide what changes would be appropriate. Most citizens are not going to have the time to review details, but depend on other organizations to look out for the public interest. My biggest concern is that what I'll call the "money interest" views the resources in Utah as nothing more than something to make a profit from. They must be put in check by governments and environmental organizations. I do like that there is an attempt to bring all stakeholders together to come up with an agreement rather than lawsuits. Thanks.	Salt Lake City	03/15/2015
	There is something special about the action required to get yourself up to the mountains. The people who arrive at the top of one of the canyons have come for a purpose and have taken time to plan and figure out how they are going to make it work. No matter how simple that planning might be they had to think about it. Your transportation system changes that. I am very much for reducing the amount of cars up and down the canyons. However, connecting all the mountains through tunnels and contrived interventions goes completely against the intent of your goals. Use what you have, don't create more. More is not responsible stewardship, environmentally thoughtful, or providing a better recreational experience. It seems more like a bid at "look at the cool thing we created here in Utah." It will take away the little bit of sacred that is left in the Wasatch!!	salt lake city	02/06/2015
	There needs to be no further development to connect the Canyons/Park City Mountain Resort ski areas or the Deer Valley/Solitude ski area. No development or opening of roads or trails should be built across land where it does not exist today. No public lands should become private.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	There should be no more expansion of any of the ski resorts and base facilities. Shuttle buses would be fine if people are allowed to drive early in the morning for long hikes. Skiing has a poor future due to climate change and expense. This proposal seems more like corporate welfare to the ski industry. The Wasatch is for everyone, not just the wealthy. Please no more development in the Cottonwood canyons. I could care less what happens to Park City. It is already ruined.	Salt Lake City	02/08/2015
	This appears to be understudied and rushed. We need good facts before doing something expensive and permanent. Little Cottonwood Canyon is unlike any place on earth. Lets not rush this!	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
	This is a disaster for our environment. The whole valleys culinary water is being risked for the sake of commercial profit. The taxpayer dollars going towards funding this may or may not pay out in the future, but our backcountry will be lost forever. We don't need more corporate land grabs. Keep our backcountry open to the community who actually lives here. I can't believe this is even a proposal. Insanity. Corporate greed raping our landscapes at its worst.	Salt Lake City	03/25/2015
	This is a terrible idea. This blueprint is written to try and not step on anyone's toes and say all the right things. You can clearly see this is not what will actually happen. This is a money making scheme for the resorts as well as for the state to boost tourism and corporate. It is being done for the wrong reasons and will ruin the reason I moved to Utah which is the incredible mountains. There is a reason skilink has already failed!	Salt lake city	02/05/2015
	This is an effort by a limited number of well placed corrupt individuals in government and industry to exploit the wasatch for PERSONAL gain and enrichment. It has nothing to do with all the fluff they are trying to sell. It all comes down to Money for these greedy individuals who if they had their way would sell their mothers for a dollar.	Salt lake city	03/15/2015
	This is my second comment on the Mountain Accord and these comments are specifically directed at the proposed Alta land swap. "The Mountain Accord as written includes no mountain lands owned by the Alta Ski Lift Company, most 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 forward 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. "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. 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. "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 have to pay to enter the town of Alta? "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. The plan does not address this issue; it says the Grizzly area is still under negotiation. "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 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 and admirers 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	Salt Lake City	03/11/2015
	This is no accord at all. The proposed developments would spell the death of backcountry skiing in the Wasatch and would usher in a new era of big-money development and environmental degradation. The current transportation system in the Cottonwood Canyons limits traffic to the resorts - a desirable outcome so as to limit the human impact on the environment and to ensure the canyons are not transformed into a theme-park-style zoo of people and commercial interests. As a long-time backcountry skier and hiker in the Wasatch, I'm saddened and worried about these plans, and I hope the interests of a few wealthy developers will not be able to squander taxpayer dollars on their profit-driven projects.	Salt Lake City	02/28/2015
	This is worse than anything else that has been thought of to date. Leave well enough alone. Keep the backcountry pristine.	SALT LAKE CITY	02/05/2015
	This money is a complete waste and there are numerous other projects that could use these funds that benefit Utah's citizens. This would absolutely affect the environment in a negative way while only somewhat helping a small group of people that ski at these resorts.	Salt Lake City	02/12/2015
	This plan describes far too much development. I enjoy using the existing services in the canyons and Park City but I see a plan here that allows for unprecedented development in the Wasatch with little-to-no protection of our resources. The services described take too much out of the hands of the public and put it under control of the government and private owners.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	To preserve the legacy of the central Wasatch means to preserve the Wasatch as it is. Development, more transit, degrading the waterways, and packing more people into the Wasatch cannot "preserve the legacy of the central Wasatch." The blueprint is hard to interpret as a specific plan, especially because it is necessary to refer to all of the supporting documents. Are the "Private Lands to Secure for Protection" in the blueprint getting the same recommendation or support for Wilderness status as the "Private Lands Under Consideration to become Public" in the Cottonwood Canyons Scenario? Is that, environmentally, the correct understanding? That these lands will be recommended for Wilderness designation?	Salt Lake City	02/24/2015
	Trails are an important part of life on both sides of the Wasatch. We need more trail funding, more robust planning, and a commitment to getting people to trailheads where they can have a quality trail experience outside the sensitive trip-canyons area of the Central Wasatch.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Transit up the canyons at the moment is completely fine. Buses work and so do cars. Instead of promoting a different form of transportation promote car pooling and safe driving.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	transportation- The blueprint proposes Exorbitantly expensive proposals for solutions. in the case of tunnels connecting LCC and BCC to PC, unnecessarily. I worked at Snowbird for over 20 years, and didn't see any use or need to be connected to PC. all this interconnect is marketing schemes. Not something skiers/tourists really need. Any polls showing it favorable is STILL just marketing HYPE. which is all fine to talk about, has been talked about for nearly 40 years. But when you talk about spending a BILLION \$ to dig tunnels, NO as a long time skier in LCC, skiers have always talked about a rail system up LCC, but it has always been a dream because of \$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$ and all the talk of Buses, rails, tunnels, as in all public transportation, they are underutilized because Americans don't want to get out their cars.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Tunnels and trains in the canyons is not a reasonable transportation option. Use fees would likely control traffic as effectively without the environmental disruption. Electronic readers like in HOV lanes or tollbooths all over the East Coast would keep traffic flowing while limiting use.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	We certainly need a long range plan for the Wasatch. We are so lucky to be able to recreate in such a special place so close to Salt Lake City. I like that the plan tries to balance so many needs and desires: water quality, air quality, a trail system, public transportation, etc. What is not addressed is a complete end to ski area expansion once a resolution is reached. Ski areas are insatiable in their quest for never ending expansion. What worries me is that there is quite a bit of private land available in the Big and Little...these holdings are wild cards and it makes me reluctant to trade off public land without an idea of the possibility of development on those private holdings.	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015
	We DO NOT NEED a tunnel (or ANY access) from Little to Big Cottonwood - it would be environmentally irresponsible and benefit only a few	SALT LAKE CITY	02/05/2015
	We don't need this, the mountains are already crowded and can't handle more development. Start a new development in another area with private land and more space. Why ruin what you have?	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	We love the "wild" Grizzly Gulch and are concerned that it and other areas will not be so wild as recreation-for-profit attempts to capture these spaces. I do not see how ski expansion serves the purposes of the people. The NATURAL wonders of Utah will foster tourist dollars, not more development. I am all for mass transit, but any rail system in our narrow, water cut canyons would be outrageous... Any thinking person could see that if they walked or biked the canyon. The only rail would work would be if auto traffic was discontinued. We have a HUGE responsibility to preserve wild places. That won't be done through compromise, but through appropriate sacrifices of personal preferences and possible financial gain.	Salt Lake City	04/23/2015
	We must do all that is possible to preserve and protect what is left of our fragile wildlife and their environments, and for generations to come. This means quickly securing our delicate lands, and the non-human inhabitants who make their home there, from the damage of human intrusion, before it's too late! If we lose our wild lands, we lose our humanity along with it.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	We need to ensure that the transit system that is proposed has little or no impact on the canyons. That will be tough to sell to a lot of people.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	We need to see cost versus benefit analysis.	Salt Lake City	02/21/2015
	Well.... I disagree with the focus on transport systems and economic growth. Please manage for wilderness and preserving the existing use and property owners like me.	Salt lake city	04/29/2015

	<p>When the Mountain Accord process was initially proposed I was enthusiastic and optimistic. I fell in love with the Cottonwood Canyons in the early eighties and the affair remains strong. Yet over the last three decades I have seen the impact of a dramatic increase in users despite the efforts of the Forest Service, Town of Alta, Friends of Alta and many others to mitigate said impact. Clearly something needs to be done. My comments address the following: Overview - the unique nature of the three primary core Wasatch areas of Park City, Big Cottonwood Canyon, Little Cottonwood Canyon. Transportation in the Canyons. Transfer of Private Lands to Public Entities. Transfer of Public Lands to Private Entities. Water Issues. Cost. Overview - The three main areas (PC, BCC, LCC) of the core Wasatch each have unique characteristics that offer both locals and visitors distinct and special experiences. We are not Europe nor should we try to be. We are Utah; let's celebrate and preserve the special characteristics of each of the three areas. The mountain accord as proposed would destroy the individual character of each of the three areas; the combination of ready access via rail line and increased developable space in the base areas would create a much more homogenous experience across the zones. Additionally it appears to me that what began as a transportation plan has been hijacked by development interests as a real estate development plan. I am in favor of a sensible transportation plan. I am opposed to a plan that opens the door for significant additional development in the Cottonwood Canyons and has the additional unfortunate consequence of diluting the unique experience offered by each zone. Transportation in the Canyon - A rail interconnect is a bad idea. As described above it will result in a much more homogenous experience across the three areas. It also would take a long time to come to fruition and would be extremely expensive. Fortunately there are better solutions. Note again that a rail interconnect is extremely expensive. The cost is measured in billions of dollars and it will likely take decades to plan, approve and build. The problem exists now and needs to be resolved. Adding a dedicated bus lane in LCC would cost millions not billions and could be completed in years, not decades. (Note: A billion is one thousand times greater than a million. This dramatically lower price tag should appeal to our congressional delegation that claims to be fiscally conservative). Transfer of Private Lands to Public Entities - The idea of preserving lands from future development is appealing. It would be a relief to be assured that the Grizzly Gulch Area and the Emma through Flagstaff Ridge in LCC would be safe from development pressures in perpetuity. Unfortunately transferring private lands to public entities would not create this assurance. Large parts of the existing ski terrain in the Cottonwood Canyons is on permitted public land. The political pressure to develop these areas would not cease as a result of the mountain accord and future Utah congressional delegations will likely find themselves pressured by the existing resorts and other developers to open up these public lands to additional development. The only way to assure these lands remain safe from development pressures is to have title in the properties pass to a not for profit entity like the Utah Land Trust. Otherwise the transfer will be a development delaying tactic and nothing more. Transfer of Public Lands to Private Entities - Alta has retained its unique character over the past several decades through the dedicated efforts of the Alta town office, Friends of Alta, and the broad community of people who have come to love Alta for its relatively wild and undeveloped nature. Yet much is changing. We have seen Vail resorts take control of the Canyons ski area and take ownership of Park City Ski Area. We have seen Deer Valley acquire Solitude, Vail, along with other ski area operators, has figured out the formula to dramatically enhance shareholder returns by creating comprehensive base areas with a full range of services including lodging, dining, shopping and entertainment. The land swap as envisioned which would pass title of much of the land in the Alta base area to the Alta Ski Lift company would be an economic bonanza for the shareholders of the Alta Ski Lift company. It would also make the Alta lift company far more valuable to an acquirer like Vail Resorts who need developable land in the base area to build it out according to their model. This would come at the expense of the broad public who owns the area, through governmental entities, right now. I have no idea what the Alta Ski Lift company plans to do and count many of the individuals managing the resort as friends. However I do not think it is appropriate to provide an economic bonanza to a private entity at taxpayers expense. Additionally such a transfer would allow development space at the Alta base for development and acceleration of the homogenization of the three core Wasatch areas which I oppose. Water Issues - I am not sure what the political process was that resulted in</p>	Salt Lake City	03/07/2015
	<p>Where you mention transit systems...is that including interconnect and ski lifts? This section is vague and doesn't identify what those alternatives are. I am strongly opposed to interconnect and additional ski lifts and/or gondolas. However, I think a train, rail system or increased bus usage to and from the canyon areas is warranted to decrease traffic, allow for growth and to prevent the environment from being destroyed. Interconnect is TOO much. Our mountain range is far too small to house such massive expansion of ski lift chains. Ski lifts require access roads and maintenance roads, all traversing through our watershed. Let's limit the "crazy" ideas and focus on something sustainable that won't result in our mountains being destroyed. Interconnect is bad. Other transportation options are warranted. We are experiencing record warm winter temperatures and very little snow. What sense does it make to build a series of ski lifts when the snow is not falling as hard and fast as we would hope it to? Let's focus on conservation of our limited resources, not exploitation of them. Major expansion and development should be limited. We only have one Wasatch. Let's not cover it in buildings and lifts for tourists. We live here. They only visit.</p>	Salt Lake City	02/06/2015
	<p>While I indicated "very well" for each of the criteria, this rating would be dependent on degree to which each portion of the Accord is executed. For example, "increased environmental protection" on public lands could be interpreted in many varying degrees of conservation designation. It would serve the goals of the Accord and the welfare of the people of Utah if this was interpreted to include the maximum environmental protection, or in other words, wilderness designation. Similarly, "an environmentally-sustainable transit system" would be better served with tunnels than any aerial route and with rail or bus rapid transit over normal buses.</p>	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	<p>While I support more private lands becoming public for conservation purposes, tunneling through the mountains seems like a pointless and incredibly invasive approach to transportation in our beautiful mountain range.</p>	Salt Lake City	03/18/2015
	<p>Will additional transit be eco-aware? More research and quantifiable data is necessary to move forward with any focus.</p>	Salt Lake City	03/06/2015
	<p>Vibrant economy should not take precedent over quality of recreation activities in the canyons. The states growing population will ensure addition impact on resources without reasons and Park City. New resort areas, bus schedules, etc.</p>	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	<p>Building tunnels through pristine and protected wild land areas is no way to "protect the environment". Connecting these resorts doesn't even make sense. Brighton, a resort that's mostly snowboarders, being connecting to Alta, a skier only mountain isn't going to benefit from this situation. Valuable backcountry terrain will be damaged as well.</p>	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	<p>Economically, the Mountain Accord will likely be successful. However, it will be at the sacrifice of the environment. Opening the canyons to an increased flow of construction and late traffic will cut into the landscape and disrupt the ecosystems of the Wasatch.</p>	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	<p>I agree with Lin Alder in this article here: <a href="http://www.sltrib.com/opinion/2446902-155/top-ed-before-expanding-ski-resorts-w/">http://www.sltrib.com/opinion/2446902-155/top-ed-before-expanding-ski-resorts-w/</a> He said, "The smartest long-term economic development scenario is one that capitalizes on where mountain culture is going - backcountry terrain - instead of where it has been. The Wasatch backcountry will continue getting more crowded. The smart economic bet is on keeping backcountry available for the next generation." Doing this would also help protect the environment and the water shed as the pressure to it grows. And it will make it available to all not just those who can afford to pay to be there. Please push to preserve every square foot of our wilderness. Stop any more future growth of private land ownership in these mountains. And if any private land is being sold in our canyons please buy it up to make it public land. Roll back the private and corporate interests. PLEASE PLEASE make it possible for all of our children children be able to enjoy those mountains for many generations to come.</p>	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	<p>I am like a lot of people who left Utah for advanced education and came back for the recreational opportunities. Lots of people in my profession make more money than I do because they chose not to return. The loss of money is more than compensated when I make dawn patrol laps before work. 7/10 times those laps are done in Grizzly Gulch. I am never the only one in the parking lot. Any resort expansion invades heavily used backcountry space. And if you think the backcountry is limited to a few weirdos try parking at Mill D or Spruces or Bear Trap or White Pine or Grizzly Gulch after 9 am on any Saturday once the snow flies. Weiridos, I'll grant you but there are lots of them. I've been backcountry skiing since the early 90's and have watched the explosion. There is no place like the Central Wasatch in the world. Montana, Wyoming and Idaho have more wilderness but lack the public access. The resorts are not hurting. Look at the money they are currently willing to throw around in lawsuits and acquisitions. They don't need an interconnect and more lifts, with a few exceptions, removes an irreplaceable resource. I will add that in looking at prices to take my family of 6 skiing I'm thinking of buying everyone an avalanche beacon. I would support land swaps with resorts in order to permanently protect places like Grizzly Gulch which is the last easily human powered accessible north facing area above 9000 feet left in the Central Wasatch. I know some of it is private land and some of it public. I support property owners rights but if Alta wants to expand there let them give up public Forest Service land on which they currently operate. How about Albin Basin? I would support a lift expansion in Honeycomb Canyon for Solitude providing it does not actually extend the range that inbound skiers are going. No opening up Silver Fork or Solitude skiers. In other words the lift will not begin lower than the Honeycomb Return lift thus effectively opening up the East Bowl of Silver Fork and west side of lower Silver Fork to side country access. Look at where the avalanche deaths are increasing and you'll see it's mostly coming from people leaving resorts and getting in trouble. The rail proposal, especially the idea of tunnel, I find dangerously amusing. A proposal to build a really expensive transport system to benefit a couple corporations? I would laugh if I didn't worry it would actually happen. Expand the bus service! Currently to get a bus to Alta without 2 exchanges or driving to the canyons and leaving my car at the park and rides I have to get my family to the stop at 7:30. No buses currently stop at trailheads. We already have most the infrastructure, let's use it. Interconnect has been a dream for the ski companies for ever. NO! If Park City and Deer Valley want to drop their ropes I say for it. Sol-Bright and the lift between Alta and Snowbirds Mineral Basin are fine. Hardly anyone says them. New lifts or gondolas going over ridge lines to connect the canyons is a terrible idea. HATE HATE HATE this idea in any form. OneWasatch, Ski Link, Interconnect or whatever you want to call it, it's a terrible idea.</p>	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	<p>I read every word of the accord. It was one big transit system and 'economy booster' proposal wrapped up in jargon about protecting the wasatch and maintaining the wasatch wilderness. How is plugging a hole in the mountain and everything that comes along with road widening and more people in the canyons at all a way to preserve what we've got? I spend a great deal of time backcountry skiing and mountain biking right up by where this park city train is planned to go. Let's say I want to take my kids back there in ten years. How do we tell them that the train was to help that place get better?</p>	Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
	<p>I think the Blueprint does a good job of explaining its purpose with pictures and descriptions but it could also suggest a few ideas that are not completely taking away what is already there.</p>	Salt Lake City	02/11/2015
	<p>Preserve Grizzly Gulch. Use Bus Rapid Transit in Little Cottonwood Canyon. No trains. No tunnels. More designated wilderness areas.</p>	Salt Lake City	03/15/2015
	<p>The blueprint said that it would use buses...buses do not meet the vision, we need light rail.</p>	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	<p>This is no more than a Band Aid to grow the resorts using tax payer dollars. No many real issues are being addressed.</p>	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	<p>I would hate to see new roads/tunnels connecting LCC and BCC to Park City. I don't feel that is the direction we want to be headed. Not sure if it's less impact, but I would prefer to see a gondola that could not be used to ski - transportation only - connect the resorts. Better yet, leave it how it is. It should be a priority to protect the back country character of the upper cottonwood canyons.</p>	Salt Lake City - Salt Lake	03/12/2015
	<p>The proposed blueprint is a thinly veiled outline for additional development of the central Wasatch Mountains: it proposes ski area expansion and methods for increasing human visitation and impact in the canyons. To better meet it's purpose, the blueprint should permanently prohibit expansion of ski areas and limit daily human entrance to the canyons, by any mode of transport. In addition, due to the air pollution caused by vehicles with internal combustion engines, these vehicles should be completely restricted from operation in the canyons for at least two to three days a week.</p>	Salt Lake City (East Millcreek Township)	05/01/2015
	<p>The Proposal for a train in Little Cottonwood Canyon needs far more details. How would the already narrow road accommodate the train? What about the environmental impacts of the train? Wouldn't a high speed - natural gas powered - bus system in a dedicated lane be as effective as a train and not as environmentally impactful? The preservation of the Mt. Superior Ridge line should be preserved from Twin Peaks and Stairs Gulch up to The Wolverine ridge including Grizzly Gulch without allowing any further ski lifts or private development. There needs to be more emphasis on preservation and not as much as development and ski resort linking ideas. These Mountains have many hundreds of Ridgelines and they should have sensible protections that are permanent and preserve the wild nature of the Wasatch Mountains and back country. These Mountains are our watershed and close place for escape to serenity and silence. There should be strict limits on off road motorized travel that are maintained. Please preserve the wildness and the refuge of these canyons, ridge lines and valleys as our escape from the man made machines and city and engine noises. We all need and can benefit from keeping the Wasatch mountains preserved as they are. There are plenty of accommodations in hotels and dining and homes to serve and grow the current and future demand. None of resorts and mountain towns ever completely sell out. There is plenty of recreation and tourist infrastructure to accommodate present and future demand.</p>	Salt Lake City (native)	05/02/2015
	<p>Expanding public (rail) transit within City limits specifically to sugarhouse and liberty wells area, as well as beyond the airport would provide huge opportunity for more efficient transit for those of us who live within the valley and desire to clean the air we live in daily.</p>	Salt Lake City (Sugarhouse)	02/04/2015
	<p>Any concept to connect Park City to the Cottonwoods should be put away. If you want to destroy what is there - continue but you will never be able to bring it back to how it is today which is not even close to how it was 20 years ago. Stop this proposal to connect everything, now before it gets out of control. Any idea to charge a fee to enter or use the canyons makes no sense. People have money to spend it will not detour visits at all. As stated in you plan - increase visitation ?? You are trying to limit congestion yet you want to increase visitation. You cannot have both. I do not know if this is feasible and if it is should have been done years ago. Very large multi level parking facilities at the mouth of each canyon. From there you can have bus service up and down. Which needs to be reactive to those who wish to get off and on at most any point of interest at any time, that is how people like to travel the canyon. Stop Look whenever ever, come and go as and when they please. Some sort of rail service up little cottonwood - and do not allow cars at all thus saving on avalanche control and no traffic congestion. A tram from Sandy to Park City who's money making losing idea was that. What would it cost to build, to ride, to operate? Lets be realistic! Just some possible ideas off the top from some one who visits the canyons often. ks kennyg.</p>	Salt Lake City, Utah 84047	02/25/2015
	<p>I am not in favor of a train that cuts through the ridge between Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon. It is too expensive, and too detrimental to the natural environment that exists there. I am in favor of better public transportation in the canyons, but think that an enhanced bus system would be a much more effective use of funds and be better overall. There just aren't enough people who would use a train on a daily basis to justify the cost and the environmental damage that would occur.</p>	Salt Lake City / Alta	03/12/2015

	Utah has a vibrant economy without ruining that that a relatively few enjoy with the dreams of a few to tame the 11 thousand foot peaks at our doorstep. Please do not Disneylandize the wilderness and near experiences in the Wasatch Mountains that are already easily available to over 1.5 million people along the Wasatch Front. Like Democracy, most people don't give a damn. In fact roughly 95% of the people, who live near, do not use the Wasatch mountains and they are ignored other than appreciation as the beautiful backdrop the mountains give to city and suburban dwellers. It is so wonderful that this wilderness is available to us who love it and live here because it is so relatively accessible. Please do not ruin what the Wasatch offers to us without destruction on the whim of developers.	Salt Lake City use mostly Little Cottonwood Canyon	05/01/2015
	At this point it is difficult to make a good assessment, it seems to be early in the process, the proposed changes don't have concrete direction or even very much supporting information as to costs, environmental impact, but the goals and the evaluation steps to meeting those goals are clearly published and will hopefully help the community better understand this along the process. Visually/aesthetically, the blue print doesn't "look" much different than the way we view salt lake right now, it's difficult to see the impact of proposed changes.	Salt Lake City, 84105	02/12/2015
	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 hanggliders, soeeflyers and speed riders, and basejumpers. As board members maybe aware Utah is a world class destination for these sports and participants travel from sound 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. Flying sports in the wasatch can easily be documented to be a usual and customary use. 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 Mt 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 basejumps. 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. 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 would appreciate the chance to discuss this facet of future proposals in greater detail with members of the executive committee.	Salt lake city, Mt Haven	03/12/2015
	Connecting Sandy to Park City via LCC and BCC is a bad idea, as is connection for connection's sake. Bus is cheaper and more flexible than rail and aerial, and increasing traffic at the top of LCC and BCC is the opposite of "an environmentally-sustainable transit system."	Salt Lake City, UT	02/24/2015
	Hello and thank you for the opportunity to provide comments about the proposed blueprint for the Mountain Accord. Cottonwood Canyons scenario - I generally support the proposed development swaps which would allow ski areas to expand near their bases while preserving and protecting Superior, Emma ridge, Flagstaff, and White Pine. It is essential that Grizzly Gulch also be preserved and protected. It's important to recognize that the status quo already advantages the ski resorts with much of the high elevation, north facing terrain that provides the best skiing. In a year like this, when snow below 8,000 feet is sparse, I've become frustratingly aware that most of the prime terrain is already occupied by ski resorts, forcing backcountry users to crowd into a few small areas. I have no issue with ski areas developing their bases, within reason, provided appropriate environmental considerations are taken, and protecting additional land for backcountry ski terrain is important to preserve the recreational value of the Wasatch. I say Grizzly Gulch must be included because this trailhead is an important access point by which backcountry skiers can safely access much of the rest of the terrain in upper Little Cottonwood. Grizzly also offers access to the most diverse terrain of any backcountry area in the Wasatch, from steep chutes in Wolverine bowl to mellow slopes perfect for beginner backcountry skiers to a safe summer road that is often used by snowshoosers. Every time I went to Grizzly Gulch this winter I noticed that it was crowded with backcountry skiers, cross country skiers, kids, families, snowshoosers, etc. I think the unique nature of the terrain here (safe, approachable, beautiful, fun) is why it would be such a loss to the recreation community were it to be developed. Transportation - I support more transportation options along the Wasatch Front, coupled with incentives to use them. A few of the proposed options stick out to me as the best because they would have a big impact at a reasonable cost - shuttle service via Millcreek - year round local bus service in BCC - fast transit from the airport to Park City - high capacity transit in eastern SL Valley. A few options seem unreasonably expensive and designed mostly to serve the needs of the ski resorts. While I agree that we need to find solutions to the traffic in the canyons, I think there are much smarter ways to use our resources than building a tunnel. I think we should increase the capacity of the existing transit routes we have before spending money to build new ones - by running more frequent buses up existing routes, optimizing service to encourage people to use them, and potentially keeping Guardsman pass open in the winter to provide access from Park City to Big Cottonwood.	Salt Lake City, UT	04/26/2015
	I answered "Undecided/I don't know" to all of these questions because I feel that the Blueprint does not provide enough information to evaluate the statements. It does not address the specific environmental impacts of expanding ski areas (putting in lifts, generating additional snow, etc.) or widening the road to provide a bus lane or a train. I feel that the specifics of each of the proposed changes could make a large difference in the viability of various options. For instance, if there is a train built up Little Cottonwood Canyons, how much would it cost to ride, and would there be easy access to parking at the mouth of the canyon (or easy connection to other public transit)? If the train was faster than driving, and free, and if there was a toll to access the canyon, I might be inclined to ride the train. But if the train carries a cost that is greater than the cost of gas for driving up the canyon, I don't think that I would use it. I'm not sure that expanding a bus lane would provide much benefit - I haven't observed a large problem with the buses sharing a lane with cars. Running buses more frequently might make me more inclined to use them, or having expanded parking at the mouths of the canyons for people using the buses. Again, a financial incentive would be needed for me to utilize a bus system. One question I have regarding a potential train up the canyon is whether it would stop at backcountry trailheads, because I primarily use the backcountry trailheads rather than the resorts. With regards to the proposed expansion of ski area boundaries, I'm uncertain as to why the resorts need to expand - some days are quite busy, to be sure, but I'm not sure that additional terrain would provide an additional draw to skiers/boarders, and thus I'm not sure that it would generate significant revenue. With the climate changing and climate models predicting reduced snowpacks, is resort expansion really a good idea, even purely on economic grounds? Similarly, I'm not sure that adding a tunnel between Big and Little Cottonwood would provide a big enough benefit to offset the costs. People would use the tunnel, but would it actually cause significantly increased use of the resorts? One of my main concerns in viewing this proposal is that the integrity of the backcountry be maintained. There are proposed "trades" of backcountry terrain for resort expansion, but I believe that a significant portion of what was once all backcountry has already been allotted to resorts. Resort skiing fills a key niche in the recreational community, but I think it is important to preserve the wilderness setting that makes the Wasatch so unique. Along with this, I believe that preserving the natural ecosystem - for water security, if nothing else - is important, and that expanding/connecting the resorts may jeopardize this.	Salt Lake City, UT	03/17/2015
	I don't like the idea of either light rail or another lane dedicated to bus only in Little Cottonwood Canyon. Would it be possible to increase bus service available, provide more parking at the base of the canyon, and use the road as it is. I also do not like the idea of a tunnel or air transport between canyons. Why should this be desired at all? If you want to hike or ski in one of the canyons there is plenty of terrain in each canyon for local activity. If you want to stay in one canyon and recreate in another canyon you would spend more time transporting than recreating.	Salt Lake City, Ut	02/25/2015
	The one aspect that I have not seen discussed is aesthetics. The road cut that goes up little cottonwood canyon is very significant and significantly detracts from the alpine character of the area - I would love to see a transit solution that is geared to fitting in with the aesthetics of the region.	Salt Lake City, UT	02/23/2015
	While I heartily applauded the MA as a valuable FIRST step, it is a disappointing baby step. The heart of this blueprint SHOULD be a viable 21st century transportation plan for the Wasatch Front and back that directs government and private entities to address transportation PRIORITIES. Currently, the MA pretty much has it backward, in identifying transit needs in Little Cottonwood Canyon as the highest priority. In my view, the biggest priority, which will have the most noticeable effect on all of the MA analysis areas, is a comprehensive mass transit system that will serve the Wasatch Front and Back and dramatically reduce the number of vehicles and vehicle miles in the area. While the MA gets a part of the solution right (the proposed mass transit system up Parley's Canyon), it misses the most important priority—the Salt Lake Valley—and instead, implicitly, focuses small-bore on Little Cottonwood Canyon. The transportation system we need has to start with the CORE—a "backbone" of commuter rail (light and medium) that encircles the Salt Lake Valley (i.e., along the I-2-15 alignments), with a REAL mass transit system that operates where people live, and when they work. People should not have to walk more than 0.25 miles to get to a bus stop, and the system should operate 20-24 hours, 7 days/week. MA should set aggressive/aspirational goals for reductions of vehicle miles traveled, PM2.5 emitted, and CO2 generated/released. If we do not get a handle on this, environmental quality, quality of life, economy, and recreation will all be beside the point: too many people idling in traffic creating even more emissions that will continue to undermine our health and quality of life. And too much CO2 to contemplate even having a viable ski industry, much less water to drink. That die is already cast, actually, but failure to deal with this only condemns our children to an even MORE hellish (temperature wise) future. Getting back to MA's transit priorities, the development of a viable mass transit system will solve the car and parking problems in both Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons, Kimball Junction, and everywhere else. Get people out of cars and cars off the road, provide them with mass transit to get where they want to go when they want to go there, and viola! no more parking problems or red snakes in the canyons! This is likely "out of scope" for the MA, however, if MA's conclusions are altered to identify regional mass transportation planning and implementation as the highest priority to solve the problems identified in the blueprint, and if the MA then becomes the impetus for real political and social will to solve this problem, it will be a valuable document. If not, and if it is finalized with "cherries on top" (cog railroads up Little Cottonwood Canyon, etc.) as the highest priority, it will be a travesty of planning, a waste of public resources' time, and just another foot of dirt on the grave of things it purports to want to conserve. Thank you for the work you have done, because you have gathered a lot of data, and made a start of identifying options, but if I needed to condense this whole thing down to one statement, it would be "Get your Priorities straight. It's all about the Transportation." Thank you for the opportunity to comment.	Salt Lake City, UT	04/24/2015
	Work with ski areas and USFS to build recreation opportunities around the transit systems. Hiking and biking trails that traverse from canyon to canyon with a ride on transit connecting them. Transit stops at the ski lifts, with parking lots further away, etc.	Salt Lake City, UT	02/04/2015
	Do not expand existing borders of ski resorts. There is a growing interest in back country skiing for the younger generation for two reasons. It is less expensive and exercise intensive. We need to preserve the undeveloped space that is left in the small Wasatch areas.	Salt Lake City, UT 84121	04/30/2015
	I think there is still a lot undecided. The transportation alternatives are all worth studying, but I don't think there is a compelling case yet for rail transit as superior to bus rapid transit in the canyons given costs and the effect of a limited access rail bed on recreating and wildlife. Creation of new trails is very welcome, but some difficult to evaluate without more specific plans. It is disappointing that the blueprint does not specifically mention the types of users of public transit and there needs. This makes me wonder if only foot traffic and skiers are being considered. Other uses of the canyons that should be considered are mountain biking and in millcreek canyon, dogs. There may be other users I am not aware of as well.	Salt Lake City, UT 84109	04/03/2015
	Focus should be on quality not quantity and on protecting the environment and water shed. As the ever expanding ski industry continues it should be kept in mind that the cottonwood canyons are a very fragile and finite area which already have developed a great deal of commercial ski terrain. We can't possibly keep expanding resorts as demand and popularity of skiing continue to grow and still protect the fragile environment and water shed.	Salt Lake City, Utah	02/25/2015
	Stop making - marketing Park city as the Bedroom for all of the wasatch canyons. We who live here and have done so for since birth should have the most say as to how and by whom the canyons are used. Too much is slanted toward outside money interest groups. Listen to the true locals. More ski lifts will not cure anything it will just add to the issue / problems - tks kennya	Salt Lake City, Utah	03/16/2015
	Sorry, I want to support but as a pro-business registered Republican, there are too many un-answered questions.	Salt Lake City	04/08/2015
	Even though expensive, the train option up Little Cottonwood, with connecting tunnels to Big Cottonwood and Park City is my preferred option. Any option which reduces the number of cars in the canyons is positive and the train option would offer and a unique and exciting way to access all these canyons have to offer in a non polluting and sustainable way. If the Europeans have found a way to do this why can't we?	Salt Lake County (Canyon Rim Area)	04/28/2015
	MA purports to be "balanced," but the proposed Blueprint is anything but balanced. It expresses no intent whatsoever to respect private property rights. Moreover, it shows no trust in private enterprise to achieve its purposes. It is a blueprint for more government control by public employees who have nothing personally at risk and who likely have no real world experience. MA's final Blueprint needs to be improved by expressly stating its intent to respect private property rights and to have government employees do so. In addition, it should seek ways to enlist the support of private enterprise rather than merely seeking to control it.	SALT LAKE CTY	04/30/2015
	It would be a travesty to put a train up Little Cottonwood Canyon. Building a train would do irreparable damage to the environment and beauty of the canyon. The canyon does not belong to the ski resorts, the ski tourists or the local skiers. It belongs to the everyday Utahn. If something must be done to upgrade the ski experience and deal with existing issues, a gondola system connecting the resorts should be carefully studied as a preferable alternative. It would do far less damage to the environment and not block access to Little Cottonwood or other canyons for any Utahn. As a state, we simply cannot afford to spend billions to build a train up the canyon. Some people say that this money will come from the federal government. If the federal government gives money for this project, they will consider that their obligation to help Utah is met. If we can get billions, that money should be used to upgrade, repair or expand the transportation and road system throughout the Salt Lake valley, particularly on the west side. If we had any "extra" money, it should certainly go towards education or other top priorities that would benefit many more of our citizens. Putting a train up Little Cottonwood Canyon is a terrible idea, designed to benefit just a few of the wealthiest among us at the expense of other pressing needs. Ravaging this spectacular canyon to benefit this small segment of our population is not only indefensible but inexcusable.	Sandy	05/01/2015

	Early on in Mtn Accord meetings there was talk of not killing the goose that lays the golden egg in the Central Wasatch. Big changes to this environment cannot be undone. Connecting the Cottonwood Canyons to Park City via tunnels and/or rail would alter the unique environment of those canyons in irreversible ways. Connecting Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons via tunnels is fine because these 2 canyons have a similar population density and recreational uses. Putting a train up the Cottonwoods would also damage the environment of those canyons. Better bus systems and fewer cars are needed in both Cottonwoods along with incentives (yearly fee pass) for people to leave their cars behind and use the buses. A train up Parley's Canyon makes a lot of sense. There are many more people traveling up and down that canyon on a daily basis. Yes, it's a little slower than cars, but most commuters will make that small sacrifice to avoid bad weather and/or negotiating traffic.	Sandy	03/10/2015
	**** I believe the best overall plan to access the Park City area from SLC is with buses a rail system would have a devastating effect on the wildlife and natural resources. **** A Tram or gondola system would work well in the little and big cotton wood canyons as long as there would be loading stations on/off at recreation sites throughout the canyons, hiking / biking / back country access, as well as express routes direct to the ski resorts. **** The rail system could be expanded to access central terminals for each of the transit systems - Tram and buses.	Sandy	04/30/2015
	1) Definitely bring Grizzly Gulch to protected status via public ownership 2) Move bicycling lane improvements in all canyons to the top of the list. Millcreek, Parleys, LCC and BCC. Incentify bicyclists while de-incentifying autos. Set aside discounted camping options for cyclists who cycle in. 3) Toe the line to the utmost on NOT allowing ski resort expansion / connections. Increase independent study of supposed greater marketability being touted by the ski industry. The growth being reported may be localized but skier visits and numbers across the board remain stagnant and in decline. Those in the industry site growth but the growth is only taking visitors from one area to another not creating overall industry growth. 4) Survey user groups on their mode of transportation and why they do not use public transportation. Gain public buy-in in conjunction with resort management buy-in to public transportation that is mutually beneficial to both user groups.	Sandy	05/02/2015
	1. Until the United States government has a balanced federal budget, and is operating with surplus funds, it should be considered an act of high treason punishable by death or exile to entertain the notion of blowing money we don't have as a nation. Our elected officials, have the sacred stewardship of protecting the rights of ALL the people. Not save our canyons special interest groups, resort owners, and all vested parties who will profit and make fortunes off of this disgraceful project. 2. Save our canyons?????what hypocrites. They obviously have under the table deals with the power brokers who would willingly sacrifice this canyon and allow its total desecration for some sort of underhanded trade off or concession on another area they are more interested in. 3. The de-watering of Little Cottonwood stream by Murray City is irrefutable evidence of the irresponsible management of resources by a government entity. They harvest the water to reduce the cost of electricity to their citizens. They own the rights. They have the power. Yet, they refuse to leave a small portion of water running in the native stream bed to preserve the natural habitat. The trees, fauna, and animals have been dying for years, and the destruction advances every year due to lack of water. If they cannot exercise the self restraint to leave a tiny amount of water to sustain the habitat of the canyon, how are other self vested government entities and special interest groups to be trusted to do any better with the entire canyon impacted severely not mildly, or partially but total. 4. Transportation: Require the resort owners to purchase private property in the valley and use their own privately owned property for employee parking, and require them to operate natural gas or electric/hybrid buses to shuttle their employees. This will reduce traffic substantially and reduce exhaust emissions. (Run on natural gas on the ascent, and electric power on the descent. 5. Require resort owners to provide open areas of federal or state lands controlled and operated by them for public access to hiking, horseback riding, OHV, camping, etc. The national forests are designated as "lands of many uses" The control given to private parties of public lands always involves somebody getting rich. Wise leaders long ago understood the need to protect our resources for all generations of American's. This does not do that. Imagine Bryce Canyon with a train running through it, The Grand Canyon, Yellowstone, Glacier etc. etc. etc. being developed to ultimately make wealthy people more wealthy. How long before we have car lots, Mega-plex theaters, McDonalds etc. in our national parks and forests? Summary:As a lifelong resident of Utah, a Little Cottonwood Canyon resident for almost 30 years, and as one who respects and wants to protect the great outdoors for all to enjoy for generations, words cannot convey my extreme opposition, disgust, anger, fear, and sorrow at the monumental travesty you are all planning on showing down our throats. Shame on you all. This is the dumbest thing you politicians and special interest groups have ever come up with. work on your budgets, crime, and services. Leave our natural resources alone.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	A "vibrant economy" should not be at the sacrifice of environmental issues. Development is not always better. Bigger is not better.	sandy	04/07/2015
	A key factor in regard to this is whether or not Alta agrees to the proposed land swap in Grizzly Gulch. With this swap, Mountain Accord has done an admirable job in meeting the goals, with this swap, it gives dispersed recreation and the environment little protection.	Sandy	02/26/2015
	A number of questions: It appears that the vast majority of "preservation" energy is devoted to LCC. How does increased access and restricted growth of available resources benefit the skier experience? I have skied at Vail and in the East and it is not enjoyable. Public funds should not be used to improve the profitability of the ski areas! What specific projects are planned for the 108 units of water at Alta? Has adequate parking been secured for the planned shuttles, buses and train passengers up BCC and LCC? Current parking is inadequate on high demand days without the addition of more options. A tunnel from the East to LCC would only serve to increase demand on inadequate facilities at Snowbird and Alta which you are restricting from further expansion. How does this serve the skier experience? In the future, please construct the document in a linear fashion -pg 1,2,3 etc rather than requiring links. Also, please restrict a web document to one screen width. Having to scroll back and forth is not a benefit for the reader. Thanks	Sandy	02/09/2015
	A rail system will trash the canyons. Use a shuttle bus system during the busiest times of the year. Lots of stops, no private vehicles unless you have a permit (own property, etc.) like in Zion NP or in Aspen, etc. Rail is overkill for this pristine, fragile, smallish area.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	About time we connect the Cottonwoods with Park City. Excellent plan that takes the environment into account!	Sandy	05/01/2015
	Adding trains and lanes up Little Cottonwood Canyon is not the right idea. The negative impact it would have on the canyon far out weighs any benefits this plan provides. How about more affordable busing options with more convenient schedules?	Sandy	03/07/2015
	After attending several meetings my concerns are deepened that the proposed blueprint and proposed transportation plan would simply destroy the Wasatch mountains and specifically Little Cottonwood canyon. The canyons are at their limits now in being able to handle the large volume of people currently accessing them. Adding capacity to increase the number of visitors will tip the scale beyond what the canyons can realistically handle. I have seen no studies as to the carrying capacity and environmental impact.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	As a hiker and hunter, I would like to see as little change to the mountains as possible. One of the problems is roads, traffic, and parking. We need to keep cars out of the mountains as much as possible. Replacing them with behemoth buses will mean widening and straightening roads, which I am against also. We need a system that allows environmentally friendly transportation, perhaps smaller natural gas or electric buses. There also seems to be a tendency to put profit and development as a top priority instead of preservation.	Sandy	02/13/2015
	As a local, I am opposed to adding more opportunities for "vibrant economy" (ie. more shops, restaurants, lodging etc.). I want to keep the canyons more pristine and unshelished to enjoy for hiking, skiing, biking etc. We live here and have to deal with the growth...tourists shouldn't take precedence over citizens who love the canyons and have a vested interest in keeping them unspoiled. You can't UNDO overdevelopment!!!!	Sandy	03/15/2015
	As a long time resident (1980s) and backcountry user and father of three, I generally think the facilities at the resorts are more than adequate and would not like to see further resort expansion. I drove for Canyon Transport up and down LCC and BCC for almost a decade. I applauded the concept of an avalanche shed light rail up LCC, Accessing Solitude and Brighton and on to PC. Such a line would have to have rider triggered stops at climbing areas, backcountry trailheads and backcountry exit points. The amount of traffic and lack of parking is getting pronounced. Even before I was a professional and still driving for canyon, it was difficult and risky to estimate the amount of time needed to exit LCC to catch an afternoon flight. Traffic caused by storms and powder chasing skiers or late in the day spring avy risk foiled many families attempts to ski in the day and catch an evening flight home. This is a big deal for a 4 to 5 day family ski trip. The visitors that I drove for I think about 8 seasons had little interest in an on skis interconnection between resorts, but they greatly valued getting a few hours of skiing in on arrival and departure days. I think ease of movement between resorts and from resorts to the valley could be a more successful marketing pitch for the resorts than more lifts and more terrain. In lieu of a train I would approve of a bus/commercial vehicle only approach like Zion NP to be tied in BCC and LCC. But you would have to be able to stop and be picked up at multiple spots. Such a system should also connect at the same point so that trips that started in LCC or BCC could use the transit to be picked up in BCC or Millcreek respectively and returned to the same starting point.	Sandy	02/10/2015
	As a Person who works and recreates in both Cottonwood Canyons I agree with the need to appropriately solidify a long term plan. While much of what is being discussed so far seems reasonable the one item that stands out as objectionable is the rationale for a rail system serving Little Cottonwood. The affect of constructing and maintaining a rail system versus benefit seems to go against other stated goals. I certainly agree that the current method of inadequate bus service for both canyons does not serve well however a better use of continued improvement of (then) current buses and scheduling would serve long term goals far more efficiently. Environment-friendly people moving technologies will continue to improve and schedules that include bottom to top and multi-stop offerings can be properly scheduled to accommodate seasonal needs. Y	Sandy	04/26/2015
	As an everyday skier, I would love to have better transportation up the canyon. Traffic and parking is becoming an ever worse problem. The bus system is not the answer. They are slow, pollute, and don't afford me the convenience that would make me stop driving everyday. I think that a Gondola system up LCC would be the answer. No road closures for avalanche work or closure due to accidents. I have heard that a rail system is what is being proposed. If it is in a tunnel or sheltered would make it more viable.	Sandy	03/14/2015
	I was impressed with the environmental proposal, satisfied with the recreational proposal, scared of the other two; but that is because my main concerns are these first two. I am satisfied that care is being taken to preserve "my" mountains.	Sandy	02/17/2015
	By not doing it.	Sandy	02/05/2015
	Continue to consider items that may need to alter. Stay as flexible as we can for the future. We are not sure what the dispersed recreational hubs may need to support. They will most likely be different for each season.	sandy	02/23/2015
	Destroying our mountains for economic gain is not the way to make Utah a better place to live.	Sandy	02/26/2015
	Do not add trains or trams to our canyons to connect ski resorts!!	Sandy	03/05/2015
	feels like Pandora's box. I would suggest keeping park city resorts and those in the cottonwood canyons separate. It is the link between the wasatch front and back that I object to.	sandy	03/01/2015
	First off, I can tell that a tremendous amount of thinking and time has gone into this document, thank you. What I don't get is that this didn't seem like a blueprint at all. It read as a pre-cursor to a blueprint until I got to the Proposed Next Steps section at the end. There were ideas and thoughts, but nothing seemed to be committal or concrete. I don't get a sense of a plan that will be implemented, but rather, ideas of a plan. When I read phrases such as: "The Blueprint could deliver new mobility options" or "The Blueprint would offer a care- fully designed approach to permanently protect treasured landscapes and provide opportunities for active, healthy lifestyles and connection to the outdoors." I am not left feeling like there is a blueprint in front of me, but rather, just ideas of what could be in the blueprint. So, I am not seeing a "blueprint" at all in its literal sense. Again, the Proposed Next Steps helped clear up what items will be actionable and not just talked about.	Sandy	02/12/2015
	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 haven. 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.	Sandy	03/11/2015
	Grizzly Gulch/Catherine's Pass areas must be kept undeveloped. The small resort expansions are acceptable if future expansion by any resort is permanently banned by law. The proposed rail system for transportation is not acceptable. A bus system, similar to that used in Zion, would be easily instituted, cost effective and very efficient. The further destruction to the canyons to install a rail system and the massive cost of a project like this is unacceptable. This idea seems to be a poorly conceived marketing scheme from the ski industry. We have enough lift served skiing in the Wasatch. Please preserve the remaining wilderness for future generations!	Sandy	02/16/2015
	Here is my idea: use the Snowbird Tennis club area or the plaza on Highland and 94th South as a nice "landing pad and shuttle launch" for clean air shuttles that go up the canyons. These can be nice coffee shop and hang out areas for people to park and take quiet, roomy shuttles that go directly to the lifts of the resorts or trailheads up both canyons. Gondola type transport seems more viable between the resorts over the passes, but please...NO extra lanes or trains going up our canyons. They would destroy our trails--some of the few natural trails. As it is already there is no where to park when hiking. Wouldn't it be great to ride a bike or drive to a cute and quaint little village, and be able to easily board a shuttle to take you anywhere up the canyon without the hassle of parking then schlepping all your gear? I say put the expense in a nice town square center, shuttles and bike lanes and over the pass gondola AND save our trails, wildlife, sanity, neighborhood feel of our precious canyons.	sandy	03/03/2015
	Humand I'm a member of the Granite Community Council. I live right on Little Cottonwood road and therefore in the direct path of any transit proposals. Honestly, I don't want a train coming up the road, I don't see how it could run without it having a direct impact on where I live and likely forcing me to vacate a house I love. Having said all that, I know there are interests greater than mine and I'm prepared to support a sustainable long-term use of the canyons that many people can enjoy. I'm very fortunate to be able to access the canyon without the use of my car because I live so close. Not everyone can do that, and they really should have access. I also realize there are too many cars coming up the canyon. On avalanche control days they are lined up in front of my house for hours. Bottom line: I'm keeping an open mind.	Sandy	03/05/2015

	How could a train up Little Cottonwood canyon be environmentally friendly? The destruction of the natural terrain will harm wildlife as well as disrupt there natural resources and patterns of living. Little Cottonwood canyon is a large water shed area how many chemicals will be spilled or seeped into our water over many years to come? In addition, a train will not add to the beauty that we all love. The traffic up the canyon is only at it peak 10-12 days a year (fresh snow days). To spend billions of dollars to destroy our canyon, disrupt wildlife, harm our water shed, and take away from the beauty of this land makes little sense. I love skiing at Snowbird and have been a season ticket holder for 10 years. I would not consider saving 10 minutes of drive time to the resort 10-12 days out of the year and ride a train. Other options to consider would be to widen the road by one lane going up the canyon. Increase electric bus options on heavy snow days. Please consider other options....and save our canyon!	Sandy	05/01/2015
	I agree with the purpose/goals of the Mountain Accord.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	I am completely against any plan considering building a train up little cottonwood canyon. It would destroy the peace, beauty and fragile environment of this narrow canyon. An improved and increased bus system could very easily handle increased ridership. At the same time it would save a billion of our tax dollars and preserve the natural beauty and Eco systems of the canyon.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	I am not convinced that a rail system between the ski resorts is necessarily a good idea for the environment. However, it may be preferable to the proposed ski-link plan. That being said, I am happy to see plans to improve transportation between SLC and Park City. There should certainly be both a light rail and improved bus system in place to facilitate both growth and reduce traffic issues. I would especially like to lend my support to the piece of the plan which recognizes that we must develop already urban areas, rather than create new developments in rural/wilderness areas.	Sandy	04/30/2015
	I am not happy with the blueprint due to the transportation proposal in LCC, the proposal to link the canyons, and the possible loss of my favorite back country ski terrain. Please see my letter in the next section below.	Sandy	04/30/2015
	I am strongly opposed to making Little Cottonwood Canyon a major transit to Park City. The bottom of Little Cottonwood Canyon is very narrow and installing additional lanes and/or a rail line up the canyon would dramatically change the nature and current available uses of the canyon. The proposed blueprint is far to heavily favored on resort development, tourism and economic growth and does not do enough to preserve the pristine nature of our canyons, particularly the Cottonwood Canyons. Tourism may be important to the State, but I am more than willing to pay double the share of my family and myself in increased taxes to cover the incremental revenue tourism brings to the State. The Cottonwood Canyons are not a Vail or Lake Tahoe or Park City, they can not accommodate the crowds and influx of tourists, regardless of attempts to mitigate impact. The resorts can cap the number of skiers per day like Deer Valley.	Sandy	03/14/2015
	I am very concerned about redevelopment in the Wasatch and am worried that there is an over-emphasis on business and transportation. From my perspective, the emphasis should be on preserving, not developing. However, I do agree that concessions need to be made to allow for growth. I'm just nervous that money is playing too big a roll. Any new development will mean unalterable changes to the mountains. We need to tread very carefully to preserve this irreplaceable resource.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	I believe in attempting to get people out of their cars and on to rapid transit. The downside to skiing Little Cottonwood is definitely the road. We need to make it more accessible to public transportation...more rides, more buses, a light rail. And I believe we will need to restrict access to the canyon by car.	Sandy	04/06/2015
	I believe more mass transit that can be provided in the Canyons will have significant benefits. Limiting the use of POV in the canyons will necessitate the development of staging areas for persons intending to use the resorts.	Sandy	03/12/2015
	I believe that if you are planning to use a train for transportation, the only logical choice would be to have a train up Parley's rather than Little Cottonwood Canyon. There is no way to put a train up that canyon and still maintain the pristine canyon that we now enjoy.	Sandy	03/12/2015
	I believe the current proposal doesn't provide enough protection for the wilderness. Once you take the wild out of wilderness then all you have iserness; which isn't a word. We need to preserve what's left of the wild so we can't keep wilderness alive. However, I do think the approach to offer more mass transit options up the canyons is a good one. The long term benefits will outweigh the costs. No lifts connecting PC to the Cottonwoods please. I think there should be an opportunity for hotels in the cottonwood canyon area to thrive instead of allowing them to struggle when Vail visitors take over the PC market. We need to preserve the diversity of the resorts.	SANDY	02/23/2015
	I can add none. Likely, future advances in technology, like teleportation, battery capacity, hydrogen, etc. will provide even better solutions to the challenges faced here.	Sandy	02/14/2015
	I consider the process to be a farce. It is apparent that there is no true open access to the process and that the intent do the MA is to cram a train system up little cottonwood canyon. I cannot believe that you truly think such a project would be beneficial to the canyon. It would be destructive and intrusive and would benefit a very few business interests. The UTA want a big project but spending billions on this is simply wrong.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	I don't think we need a train and tunnels in the mountains. When I ski, I don't need to spend time transiting to another ski resort. Buses are doing well.	Sandy	04/24/2015
	I feel that both train and extra lanes up the canyon would harm the environment that exists in our canyons. We have larger canyons and larger roads (Parley's and Provo) to provide access to Park City and Deer Valley. Our local canyons would be spoiled by these two solutions. We can maintain the quality of our canyons with an increase in the bus schedule. As a residence of Granite community at the base of Little Cottonwood Canyon I will strongly oppose bringing Trax lines into our community. I know that all of my neighborhood and the surrounding neighborhoods would fight having a line in our area. It is not worth the lose in our property values and the increase transient traffic. We are a residential area. Trax has no place by the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon. We are not a commercial area. We have no business or retail areas. Bringing Trax through just to feed the canyon would inconvenience and hurt many residents of this area that chose to live here because it is a quiet, laid-back environment. Many of these residences that would be close to Trax lines are worth millions of dollars. Trax would drastically impact these properties.	Sandy	03/16/2015
	I found a lot of what is in the "blueprint" to be highly confusing. First off, I suggest that the term "blueprint" itself is inaccurate and misleading because the proposed "blueprint" is actually many alternate proposals, and I don't think that any one of them actually qualifies as a "blueprint". In my view a "blueprint" is, as defined in the Merriam Webster Dictionary (2nd definition), "a detailed plan of how to do something"; in my opinion the MA Blueprint has very little in the way of detailed plans. I'd say a lot of it is "blue sky" rather than "blueprint". I also felt overwhelmed by all the choices presented. I found it difficult in many cases to even understand the difference between what was proposed, proposed but dropped, merely a pipe dream, or not even open for consideration. Of course, producing detailed plans for all the alternatives proposed is probably impossible at this point in time. But, the MA Blueprint is missing even the grossest of cost estimates, time lines for development, and probabilities for approval by regulatory and funding agencies. Given all that lack of detail, I found it very difficult to form judgements on many of the alternatives proposed. So, I think ways "how the proposed Blueprint could better meet the purpose of Mountain Accord" include - more details on (gross) cost estimates, time lines, and probabilities for approval by regulatory and funding agencies. I have a general comment regarding what I consider inadequate attention by MA to the effects of climate change on snow sports. It seems to me that many of the MA proposals assume snow sports participation, particularly at ski resorts, will continue to be the same as today or even increase. Even as nationwide on-snow ski resort usage declines and most large ski resorts have been shifting their revenue production towards more non-snow-related activities (real estate, golf courses, other summer activities), MA seems to assume the demand will continue or even grow. I think you've missed the curve. As climate change reduces snowfall, especially at resorts below 8,000' such as the Park City resort bases, I think snow sport user participation at ski resorts will probably significantly decline in the next decade. It seems to me that MA has not even considered that as a possible scenario. Do you really think building railroad lines and stations or constructing BRT lanes or a tunnel in the canyons is even worth considering in light of likely climate change?	Sandy	05/02/2015
	I know this is in there, but I'd like to stress the idea of building new trails on the bench. Trails are cheap, and they'll minimize traffic in the mountains from people who just want a quick dose of nature.	Sandy	04/16/2015
	I love the Transportation option D with rail connecting SLC to PC through Parley's and LCC!!!	Sandy	02/13/2015
	I strongly oppose any ski resort expansion beyond those shown in the map from solitude and Brighton. I'd prefer that those expansions not occur, but can swallow them if a rail system is really going to happen. The ability to easily move from PC to the cottonwood resorts at night and on bad storms or times of hazardous avalanche conditions would create the most positive impact for locals and visitors alike. Getting caught in or stuck out of LCC is more than a minor concern for many visitors. I drove LCC and BCC for Canyon Transportation for 7 winters. Resorts should be connected by transportation routes, not ski lifts. The era of hiking is over in the wasatch, there are simply way too many backcountry skiers now to favor the short client list of WPG.	Sandy	04/20/2015
	I think a tunnel and train system is excessive. Why is it necessary to have significant additional connections connecting park city/heber/midway to provo, slc and ogden? We have several existing points connecting these city's, efficiently. I think the biggest opportunities is to limit automotive traffic, by increasing eco friendly shuttles, clean buses, car pooling, etc... The canyons create a natural division between to areas, why disrupt that, when it is home to a sensitive eco system that provides our water and a home to many species. We do not need to connect everything to ensure a healthy economy. We can make enhancements and still find business opportunities through smart and modest development. Locals and tourists can meet all of their recreational needs by visiting the places they enjoy the most, without excessive development like a tunnel and a train.	sandy	04/01/2015
	I think solving the transit problems in our canyons is the most crucial aspect of sustaining the unequalled resource we have here. The Blueprint appears to recognize that the four areas of focus (economy, transportation, environment, natural resources) must be in harmony. I guess the most expensive part of everything proposed is transportation. Currently the UTA bus system is a near total failure due to its lack of dependable, timely, and comfortable bus service. The current bus schedule is a joke - a bad joke - that does more to encourage personal transportation than encourage shared/public transportation. The bus schedule needs 1, to be more consistent (i.e., 2 trips per hour), 2, have a longer season (i.e., stopping ski service in early April is idiotic), 3, have more flexibility (i.e., extra buses on "powder days") so people can actually count on the bus being at the park & rides close to on-time and having a seat available. A long range plan that includes not allowing personal vehicles up Big & Little Cottonwood should be considered. This is not realistic until a continuous, timely, and safe light rail system can be provided. I focus on transportation because without solving this issue, the other focus on the Blueprint cannot be achieved.	Sandy	03/14/2015
	If you connect Park City to the Cottonwood Canyons with a much easier to use system, people in Park City (tourists and residents) will flock to the better skiing conditions in the Cottonwood Canyons to the detriment (too many people) of regular Cottonwood Canyon users. Am I being selfish- yes. Realistic- yes. And who pays for this- probably me.	Sandy	04/30/2015
	I'm still not clear on the real purpose of MA. Seems like MA wants to add more traffic to Little Cottonwood and Big Cottonwood Canyons in hopes of bringing in more \$ to the ski resorts while paying little to no attention to the environment. Did I get that right?	Sandy	04/14/2015
	It appears that decisions have already been made. We need a more flexible system that can evolve over time as technology evolves (improves). A bus system that used natural gas vehicles or battery powered vehicles is much cheaper and more flexible. Flexible for both expansion and for different needs for summer versus winter recreation. Also, on a dollar spent, spending this kind of money would reduce emissions 1 a per unit basis if spent in the valley.	Sandy	02/23/2015
	It does not provide increased access to and protection from further construction efforts in the Little Cottonwood Canyon area.	Sandy	03/09/2015
	It is difficult to comment on the proposed blueprint because it isn't clear what the blueprint is actually proposing. The only part of the blueprint with discernible substance is the transportation plan which shows several alignments for proposed transit through the Wasatch Mountains. This portion of the plan shows a transit line from Little Cottonwood Canyon to Park City. It doesn't appear that there is any scientific basis for the addition of this proposed line that is backed up by transportation modeling. Currently it is very easy to get from the Wasatch Front to Park City via I-80 with very little delay. If the community desires to install a transit facility from the Wasatch Front to Park City it would make more sense to put transit in Parley's Canyon where an existing corridor is already in place and where environmental impacts would be more limited than the potential impacts of a new line in Little Cottonwood Canyon. It seems that a transit line between Little Cottonwood Canyon and Park City would have very limited benefit to citizens of the Wasatch Front (who already have easy access to Park City via I-80) and would only benefit Ski Resort Owners who want to promote more traffic to their resorts in the winter. This would produce very limited economic benefit to average citizens in Utah and would primarily benefit large ski corporations, many of whom are located outside our state. In addition, most climate change models predict that the Wasatch Mountains will see limited snow precipitation in the future which would make an investment in ski area expansion very risky. It is also very risky to alter groundwater patterns and the Wasatch Front because Park City already has contaminated water due to historic mining practices. If this groundwater were to be altered to enter the Cottonwood Canyons, it could potentially contaminate one of the primary sources for drinking water on the Wasatch Front. I am opposed to a transit connection between either of the Cottonwood Canyons and Park City and believe that if transit is used it should utilize Parley's Canyon for a route. In addition, I see any expansion of transit or roadway capacity in the Cottonwood Canyons to only benefit ski resort owners and not average Utah citizens. This plan is very similar to One Wasatch in that it is a thinly disguised plan to link ski areas in Utah in order to support the ski industry, but not benefit other recreational users of the Wasatch.	Sandy	03/17/2015
	It makes more sense to use electric buses to shuttle people up the canyon. Like at Zion National Park for example.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	It will be very important that any transportation expansion be the most minimal in terms of disruption to the environment and habitat of animals in the middle Wasatch. The construction of Light Rail seems that it would be extremely disruptive. I would advocate more of a shuttle bus system in the canyons like what is done in Zion's National Park.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	I've lived in Sandy for 42 years. This is a bad idea. What's wrong with the way the canyons currently operate? If we want to ski we drive up the canyon. There's such an emphasis on protecting the watershed but you want to put a railroad up the canyon. Makes no sense and reeks of special interests that trump public interest.	Sandy	02/15/2015
	Last night's meeting was a joke, none of the questions we asked were answered, no open discussion was accomplished. This seem to be a technique to ram thru a bunch of mountain development plans with no input by neighbors.	Sandy	02/12/2015

	The environment is fragile. LCC doesn't have enough water as it is, without adding what will be a huge demand. Why does MA get to make the decisions that impact all of us? This feels illegal. It needs more time and public awareness, including being put to the vote by all of UT or at least the Wasatch Front. Who will pay the costs and how much are the costs? Millions? More than that? We don't spend enough money on schools - why should we spend huge money for a small percentage of people to ski? The biggest problem I see is that a group of 26 people or whomever was assigned to be on the committee by someone of (undetermined name(s) get to make a decision for all. Last time I checked, this is a democracy. The huge cost to the environment, the neighborhoods and the actual cost to carry this out is too much for a small group to get to make that decision.	Sandy	04/15/2015
	Leave the canyons alone!! Developments do nothing but DESTROY nature!	Sandy	03/15/2015
	Leave the canyons the way they are!	sandy	03/09/2015
	Leave the mountains alone! No more development! Leave the private areas private! We're killing the sense of serenity in the mountains that are so easily accessible from the Salt Lake Valley. Less is more. PLEASE do not connect the resorts, do NOT build a coaster. Leave the mountains natural (as they are now). NO MORE.	Sandy	02/20/2015
	Light rail to resort areas	sandy	03/11/2015
	Light rail up LCC will ruin our most precious resource with destruction of environmentally sensitive areas, not to mention the noise pollution, that benefits too few people and the ski resorts at a ridiculous cost. BRT makes so much more practical and environmentally sound sense that could connect to nodes in more centrally located commercial areas of Sandy and Cottonwood Heights. It is also a more adaptive option that can evolve with the changing needs and seasons of the canyon with relatively very little up front investment. MA needs to stand up to UTA and the ski resorts interests and protect LCC for the majority of Salt Lake residents who value the canyon for all of its other uses.	Sandy	03/17/2015
	Linking the canyons' transit lines together is too drastic and destructive a solution. Keeping their access separate makes them unique and preserves some sense of a pristine and rugged backcountry experience. Connecting Alta to Brighton would be a HUGE mistake. Brighton to Deer Valley is already linked in summer months. Park City Resorts also have a sense of exclusivity that won't be helped by increased traffic via Big Cottonwood. I love the idea of having car traffic limited in the canyons. I have often thought that installing something like we have in Zion's National Park featuring stops in areas of heavy recreation, while allowing those that live and work up the canyons permits to drive. Further vehicle access would be allowed by paying an exorbitant fee. Better biking and pedestrian lanes along the roadside would be helpful.	Sandy	03/16/2015
	Looks like an ideal blueprint for the PRIVATE ski resort owners with no consideration for other tax paying citizens or homeowners living near the impacted areas i.e. have the public foot the bill for expansion of private enterprise! Find a way to justify increase in use in an already over used area .	Sandy	04/04/2015
	MA purports to solve a problem where there is none.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	Make it a priority to purchase all private property in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. The alignment of the mast transit should be along the road. The canyons should be closed to private vehicles during ski season.	Sandy	04/26/2015
	Mountain Accord has jumped many steps without a thorough environmental evaluation. Without knowing more than any of the executive committee truly knows now, there can be no responsible manner to permit a development plan to proceed to the next phase! How can MA responsibly approve a "go ahead" when we still do not know who will be the "applicant" or who will be the lead or co-lead agency in the EIS? There are so many things about MA that remain unanswered, even mysterious and since tax monies have been used to fund MA there should be a published accounting of where every penny of these monies have been expended! When the MA transportation committee was polled with a show-of-hands vote, the 94% preference was for express, low emission buses rather than trains. The MA executives summarily dismissed and eliminated that idea in favor of what strongly appears to be a predetermined conclusion of a train in LCC rather than what their own advisory committee preferred. This smacks of certain individuals trying to create a legacy rather than a workable solution and responsible environmental stewardship of one of Utah's many treasures! The integrity of MA has suffered significantly as a result of their attempt to haphazardly rush through what should be a meticulous, pains taking process, that leaves no doubt in any mind that any conclusion reached is truly in the best interest of the environment and the people of Utah rather than commercial interests that put tourist dollars ahead of protecting Utah for Utahans! As a Utah native, this smacks of a battle to deprive Utahans their rights first rather than for the tourist's one or two week vacation! In other words, we are all expected to help subsidize the ski resorts by sacrificing our canyon! Utah should not be for sale to the highest bidder!!! When we see the manner in which the MA executive committee has handled the rollout of UTA's plan for a train up to the ski resorts and since many of the MA executive committee are elected officials, one has to wonder if they are similar stewards of their elected offices?	Sandy	04/16/2015
	Mountain Accord needs a different purpose. Mountain Accord seems to serve its funders; UTA & ski resort owners. Taxpayers pay for the upkeep of the canyons, and should not have to pay more to have them destroyed or to have limited access to recreation. Stewardship over the land is not helped by destroying it, carving into it, sending a train by the watershed, or leaving any huge footprint in it. We need a system like Zion's National Park with more buses for Little Cottonwood Canyon. That should be the solution with more parking outside the canyon possibly in Salt Lake or lower Sandy. Extra lanes or a train would be a huge footprint in a little canyon, not to mention it would cut out recreational needs of Utah residents. Since cars will not be limited it is just more of packing the canyon full. The new transportation will be too expensive to ride, and will not help the residents. The maintenance would be a burden on taxpayers as well. It seems that the major transit system only benefits UTA and the owners of the ski resorts. I do not want to pay for that as a tax payer, and I do not want the money taken from education as an educator.	Sandy	04/30/2015
	Mountain Accord. The "Key Actions" seem to be to "encourage development", "generate economic growth" and "ensure Utah's tourism". This entire project seems to be generated as a money maker for all of the KEY PARTICIPANTS. This is a money maker for many people that have decided to promote a sham of an environmental coverup to shove more people up the canyon. If there really was a concern for the environment, water protection and all animal life and resources, you would not try to find a transportation system that crams as many people up the canyon as possible. This is being pushed forward without the adequate study of the long term effects on the canyon ecosystem. No one has studied how many people should or ought to be allowed up the canyon. This idea shouldn't be to force as many people up the canyon as possible, but how many people the canyon can accommodate while still preserving one of the great natural resources of our state for FUTURE generations. The all mighty dollar should not be the determining factor, yet it sure seems to be at this point. The ski resorts and the Sandy City hub are sure on board to make money off of Little Cottonwood Canyon without adequate study or consideration for this soon to be exploited natural resources and current canyon residents. As part of the public, one of the things I love about going up the canyon is to get away from people. Enjoying the quiet views and beauty of nature. Entering the mountains is an escape from city life. I do not agree with the idea of shoving more people up the canyon along with destroying the canyon to widen roads and make way for a train. The canyon should be kept. Has anyone considered the effects on property value and sense of community from a relatively quiet canyon community to a major thoroughfare all to get a few more skiers up a canyon on a few days a year? It takes longer for most home owners to get their homes approved in the foothills region of the canyon because of concerns of damage to the environment and wildlife than you are allowing for public debate for this entire Mountain Accord project. There are incredibly strict building requirements for putting a home in the canyon, yet these same concerns don't seem to comply to a major transportation project that will have huge and irreversible effects of destruction to the canyon. This is a premature vote on an improperly studied proposal. Approving a plan without adequate study and appropriate explanation of plan details seems not just inappropriate but borderline corrupt.	Sandy	04/19/2015
	My concern with the transit system up the canyons is why would we propose to spend millions on a trax system when we don't have nearly enough busses running up and down the canyons. On a weekday, trying to get a bus is super challenging and they are not nearly frequent enough. It is also challenging to get a Mountain Accord to succeed and noble is its cause. I am concerned about a trax system going up the canyons and the environmental impacts caused just for construction. I also understand how damaging environmentally a stack of idling cars can be from the mouth to the top resorts on a powder day.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	My impression of Mountain Accord differs from how you present this. What I see is a complicated plan which at the heart changes ownership of some properties in the areas around the commercial ski resorts in exchange for taxpayer funded rail transportation to the ski resorts. The principle economic beneficiaries appear to be the Ski Resorts, primarily Alta and Snowbird at the expense of taxpayers and to the detriment of residents in and around Little Cottonwood Canyon. This troubles me.	Sandy	03/06/2015
	NO additional lanes, trains, tunnels, etc.	Sandy	03/09/2015
	No extra lanes or trains up Little Cottonwood canyon. Only more busses, and a more flexible bus schedule.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	No extra lanes! No trains up Littlewood Canyon! Please protect our community!	Sandy	03/14/2015
	NO LANES NO TRAINS! THEY WONT SOLVE ANY OF THE ISSUES! THIS BLUEPRINT IS ONE SIDED. IMPLEMENT SOMETHING LIKE ZIONS HAS.	Sandy	04/29/2015
	No lanes, no trains in little cottonwood canyon.	Sandy	03/03/2015
	No more trax! It is terrible and a waste of money.	Sandy	02/20/2015
	No train or rail up the canyon, don't disturb more terrain More buses and flexible schedules will impact the canyon less Why try a major overhaul when you haven't tried to keep it simple? If the simple fails other methods could be considered.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	NO TRAINS OR LANES UP LITTLE COTTONWOOD CANYON	Sandy	04/29/2015
	NO TRAINS-NO TUNNELS!!! That just helps the ski industry to the detriment of everyone else. Zion has more visitors and gets along fine with a shuttle bus system. My grown kids need cheap recreation choices such as hiking up and down LCC. Four lanes and a train will destroy the simple beauty and enjoyment of the canyon. I doubt the wildlife such as the goats will like it either. What about Little Cottonwood Creek? I don't want to lose looking at a wild mountain stream because the ski resorts wants to bring in a bunch of out of state skiers. I don't think a single dime of public money should go towards a private ski industry. The ski industry is in decline, and the public shouldn't be expected to prop it up. I shouldn't have to worry about getting run over by a train while trying to enjoy the canyon. What about the bikers? Are you trying to destroy their use of the canyon? Skiing is such a small part of the year. We shouldn't be gearing our transportation plans to their needs. They should pay for their own shuttle system to get skier and employees up the canyon. Locals should continue to be able to drive their private vehicles up the canyon to sightsee, picnic, see wildlife, pull out for a rock climb or hike without some train or four lane busy road. The only transportation plan I support is private vehicles plus year round additional BUS Shuttles. The Mountain Accord people have been trying to slip this by the public without a full explanation of the practical effects it will have on those who use LCC and the people who live at the mouth of LCC.	Sandy	03/12/2015
	Not favor business interests over the sensitive environmental nature of the canyons.	sandy	05/01/2015
	Not one dime of public money should go towards rail or tunnels. More buses, yes. Keep the freedom to use personal transportation. It is not up to the public to help the ski industry. The ski industry doesn't share any profits with the public. Stop pretending to want public input. Start answering questions about eminent domain.	Sandy	02/14/2015
	No trains, tunnels in the canyons or foothills!	Sandy	03/12/2015
	Putting up light rail in Little Cottonwood will destroy the view of the canyons and destroy existing trails.	Sandy	04/24/2015
	Road Expansion and moving mass transit will destroy the canyons, hurt the water shed and be a disservice to all Utahn's. It will make the owners of the resorts wealthier but will degrade the quality of the skiing due to the heightened level of availability.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	Running a train up little cottonwood canyon would greatly increase the commercialization, which it turn would decrease property value, and affect the trails, and landscape negatively. It would be a terrible sight, to see a train running up through little cottonwood. Defeats the purpose if the mountains.	sandy	05/01/2015
	Save trails, develop no more land...Protect wild Utah! No connection from Alta to Park City...it benefits no one!	Sandy	03/16/2015
	Secure Grizzly Gulch from Alta. This area is a Key to public recreation at the top of Little Cottonwood Canyon.	Sandy	02/12/2015
	Ski resorts and other businesses have had a negative impact on the canyons over the last 40 years. Lets stop this trend. There are better ways to get people up the canyons on existing systems.	Sandy	04/30/2015
	Sounds like the heading of this Feedback question states the priority! which is mountain accord... and its mission to "Cram as many people into the canyons as possible with disregard for the majority of people who prefer natural beauty of the canyon, and who aren't in a rush to Shave 10 minutes off their commute to the resort at the cost of adding another car lane and the destruction of scenery to do it, same goes for the train, what a joke. Mountain accord can butter up their website all they want with all this conservation bull crap, but at the end of the day if either of these proposals go through there is nothing conservative about that. The mountains and canyons are perfect how they are and locals can appreciate the natural quiet beauty they offer. Many of us don't want a little Lake Tahoe rush here.	sandy	03/16/2015
	Stupid idea! Waste of money.	Sandy	03/28/2015
	The Accord answers one and only one concern and that is moving skiers into the resorts. The stated purpose of this accord is much broader but your answers are narrow. The environmental questions about Little Cottonwood Canyon are not met by massive transit projects. I have observed and participated in the traffic of this area constantly since 1985 and from my observations the traffic problems are confined to 12 - 20 days a year. And the result of the traffic is a wait time for those going to 'play' of an hour or two. How is this a multi-multi million dollar concern for our state when others around our area can not get to and from jobs and services without 5 day a week 52 week a year delays of equal time.	Sandy	02/13/2015
	The benefits will go to a relatively few people. What they don't put in their pockets will trickle down to the rest of us. A train will destroy the canyon environment. An additional bus lane could be added in certain spots to reduce transit times. Consider one way traffic at peak times.	sandy	04/20/2015
	The blueprint should include a broader scope for sustainable economic development to go alongside the purpose of preservation of the watershed and natural environment. Look what has been done in the mountains of Switzerland for a good example.	Sandy	04/30/2015

	The Blueprint was full of pretty pictures and color points, but incredibly vague and very difficult to translate into a real image of the future. Perhaps this is all that is possible at this stage of the process, but perhaps this is also why there have been so few comments on it. Overall it feels as if there is the hope for much needed protections for some parts of the canyon but at an enormous expense of additional development in other parts. Frankly, it seems like a plan to provide the resorts with many opportunities for growth while providing pretty scenery.	SANDY	04/29/2015
	The financial and economic gain is largely in favor of the stakeholders of the resorts and development companies that would benefit from an increased flow of traffic and tourism from the Blueprint. The upside from the proposed Blueprint would all go to the stakeholders of the resorts and development companies. The Blueprint as it is currently written is a plan to increase the amount of revenue generated from increases in population and paid use of the Wasatch Mountains. The Blueprint could better meet the purpose of the Mountain Accord by limiting the use of the Wasatch Mountains to preserve the water and wilderness that would be ruined by increased traffic.	Sandy	05/02/2015
	The full environmental costs including increased transit footprint and greenhouse gas emissions (including materials and construction) should be estimated at this point in the study.	Sandy	02/18/2015
	The legacy of the Wasatch comes from its nature. Conservation and preservation of the Wasatch environment (flora and fauna) have to be explicitly named the King and Queen drivers of all that MA does.	Sandy	04/14/2015
	The Mountain Accord personnel care not about public suggestions or alternatives these questionnaires request input on so I will not proceed to fill out further forms. It became apparent through the first 4 Mountain Accord public meetings I attended that although the printed purpose of the Mountain Accord sounds very intelligent and appealing it's life truthfully is economic gain and power.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	The problem with this whole proposal is that the land swaps and other fairly reasonable suggestions are intrinsically tied to a flawed transportation plan. There is no way the large footprint of a train going up the Canyon will not have a significantly damaging impact on the environment of the entire lower Canyon. Making Little Cottonwood Canyon a transportation corridor is a flawed plan. There are many other more reasonable plans using increased bus service, car pool incentives and so forth that will allow flexibility depending on the season and significantly less impact on the environment. The cost will be profoundly less expensive. The congestion issues are literally 10-20 days total per year. I have no problems with the suggestions for the upper Canyon in regards to watershed, land swaps etc. But to have these plans dependent upon a train coming up the Canyon can only suggest this is being brokered and manipulated by big ski business and grandiose thinking by UTA and not the great partnership that is being portrayed!	Sandy	03/13/2015
	The project is at huge risk of failure due to the approach. Far too much is being focused on putting in a billion dollar plus system. This is going to be overly expensive. There are far less expensive solutions like bus or dedicated shuttles, the cost to put a Cog or train that will not be able to provide the service (one track suggestion) is really a bad idea. Secondly the canyon and roads are narrow, people live, work and play in these mountains to force this train or rail up the canyon is going to take more land and will have greater environmental impact that just using electric or natural gas vehicles that can carry people and make many more trips. Lets think logically about this. It is nice to dream about being something else, but let get real all we really need is a bus system that is effective in the movement of people from the valley to the mouth of the canyon, and then we need an effective simple system to move people up the canyon in an orderly way. No one disagree with the fact that we love our canyons, we do however do not want to see them destroyed creating something that is not needed.	Sandy	03/08/2015
	The proposal has been created with the interest of the ski industry and those with a financial interest in that industry. It does not represent the best interest of the general population of the Salt Lake City and surrounding areas. The proposal to build a train up LCC is absurd. I believe you should provide an incentive to share rides or ride the bus with tolls and parking fees for vehicles with fewer than 3 occupants. You should increase the frequency of buses using the existing road and build parking facilities at 6200 South and 9400 S and 20th E.	Sandy	04/20/2015
	The proposed deal will sacrifice Little Cottonwood Canyon by transforming it into a transportation corridor and will destroy much of its natural environment, appeal, and beauty. It would be one thing to build a rail line if there were no existing road, as such infrastructure might be necessary to allow Utahns to access and enjoy the canyons. However, doubling up on infrastructure in the canyon unnecessarily destroys the natural environment and beauty of the Canyon. Doubling up on infrastructure will likely stress the natural environment and may threaten existing species, wildlife corridors, watersheds, and other natural conditions. The proposed deal represents an elitist plan for the Canyons that will benefit only a small number of Utahns at potentially tremendous cost both to average recreational users and taxpayers. One of the primary focuses of the deal is to preserve backcountry areas for dispersed recreation, a goal which benefits a vanishingly small percentage of Utah residents. Only about 7% of Utahns and the number that have the time, training, and resources to backcountry ski is much smaller. Yet, in order to benefit the admittedly small ("dispersed") number of people who can take advantage of backcountry skiing, the proposal sacrifices the beauty enjoyment of the lower part of the canyon - the part that Utahns likely access most frequently, including trails like the Quarry Trail along Little Cottonwood Canyon. For most Utahns, the Canyons are a journey and an experience, and destination resorts like the ski-resorts are largely beside the point. Utahns love their canyons for the ability to hike with their families on trails that can be accessed from the valley quickly and for other similar recreational opportunities. Scarring the beloved Canyon landscape with additional, irreversible infrastructure development is contrary to the interests of these many Utahns who enjoy using the lower Canyons and benefits only a select, powerful, and wealthy few with the resources to take advantage of expensive skiing opportunities. Moreover, all taxpayers will be saddled with the enormous cost of this additional and unnecessary infrastructure. Additionally, this destruction of the Canyon is being suggested to address traffic congestion that is really only problematic on a few particularly busy ski days each year. The proposal flies in the face of good science and policy about confronting climate change risk. In the face of the risks and uncertainty associated with climate change, Utah should be investing its resources in robust, resilient strategies that allow us to respond flexibly to changing conditions, rather than committing massive amounts of money to an irreversible infrastructure project that may well be inconsistent with future needs and may saddle Utah's citizens with a project with no return on investment. Whatever one believes about the anthropogenic causes of climate change, there is little doubt that the climate is changing. What that means for Utah remains to be seen, but there is substantial risk that we will have many more winters like this one, in which limited snowfall and warmer winter and spring temperatures mean that ski resorts struggle to remain economically viable. There are also far more important risks associated with this potential climate change, including water shortages, increased wildfire risk, and inadequate capacity to store and collect water in existing reservoirs (which were designed to handle late snowpack melt rather than spring rains and early spring runoff). No one knows exactly how climate change will affect Utah, and in the face of such uncertainty, wise public policy requires choosing strategies that are resilient and "robust" - that offer benefits across a wide range of possible future scenarios, including those that we all hope will not come to pass (and this is true even if one doubts that climate change will materialize at all). Wide policy-making in the face of uncertainty also favors incremental solutions, rather than long-term, irreversible infrastructure investments. Incremental solutions allow adaptation to evolving conditions, rather than locking communities and taxpayers into expensive investments that no longer serve current needs and will not provide any reasonable return on investment. Of course, sometimes-even in the face of uncertainty-we have no choice but to make long-term, public infrastructure investments. In this case, however, there is no such urgency. Any need for increased transportation in the Canyons can be handled by incremental solutions like increased busing, shuttles, or perhaps "transportation system management alternatives," which meet short-term needs but allow us to remain flexible and nimble in responding to changed conditions. We should not saddle ourselves to an unnecessary and massively expensive long-term infrastructure when uncertainty and risk counsels incremental, adaptable solutions that can be altered to adjust to changing conditions. Building additional permanent and expensive infrastructure up our canyons will almost certainly increase the pressure for future growth. The public will demand a return on its infrastructure investment, and that return is most	Sandy	04/29/2015
	The Wasatch Mountain Range is a relatively small range. It is already difficult to enjoy the mountains without encountering some sort of development (ski resorts, cabins, roads, etc) Further development will ruin the beauty of the range even further. I agree that traffic is becoming a serious problem in the Cottonwood Canyons. I strongly feel that further transit development is not the solution. Energy efficient/electric powered buses, similar to those in Zions would solve this problem with the least amount of environmental impact.	Sandy	03/17/2015
	There are many less intrusive solutions that have not even been discussed, let alone tried. No where has Mountain Accord considered how the proposed blueprint will impact the lives of Wasatch Front citizens. This should have been the number one criteria. We suggested early on that a fifth study group be added to do that. We received no response save "that's a good idea". Mountain Accord has done a masterful job at manipulating the process to get to the answer the executive committee wanted, rather than listening to the citizens of the Wasatch Front. As such, the blue print is useless. It is a manipulation. Even those on the 4 committees agree. They were never allowed to meet together to see how to merge their different areas. Divide and conquer. Always works. You should all be ashamed to be part of such a faulty process.	Sandy	02/25/2015
	There is no need to connect all the canyons for the convenience of the tourists at the expense of those of us who have grown up hiking and skiing in these mountains. The easier it is to get to the canyons, the more people will flock to these areas. If we are trying to limit the environmental impact to our wonderful natural resources, more people in the canyons is counter to what we should be trying to achieve. It is obvious that this proposal has been made for economic/tourist reasons, not for those of us who live and work here.	Sandy	03/16/2015
	They need to think there may not be water to support this and the move of the prison	sandy	05/01/2015
	This blueprint represents a lot of really good, collaborative work. Well done! I would be interested in participating in this effort.	Sandy	04/18/2015
	This is not a blueprint. It's a ramrod approach. If you don't like it we'll ram it down your throat. The recreation and water issues are primary to me. There is only limited water. You can't create more water. For example: you say you'll create more water for homesites at Alta. How will you create that additional water??? NO ASPECT OF THIS PLAN ADDRESSES CONSERVATION. This entire blueprint is geared at FORCING GROWTH -- not just dealing with growth -- but encouraging growth. Bringing more people to the mountains by transit does not solve the water issue. More people (no matter how they get there -- by transit or if they're dropped off from a space ship) will use more water -- not just in the restaurants but to simply flush the toilets. That increased use of the limited water has NOT BEEN HANDLED in the blueprint. You've avoided it all together. Shame on you! Let's talk about transit. Before we build the mountain, you should run a test with existing buses. Do not take the bus because the waits are too long. Run buses every 15 minutes. Experiment. See what happens. You might say it's too expensive to run buses every 15 minutes. But it's a test that you can run. Do it!!! See what happens -- then you can work from a reality check. It's stupid to bore through the mountain or develop transit and then discover that nobody uses it because waits are still too long! This Blueprint is terrible because it fails to start with the most basic issues -- such as limited water. And it fails short because it fails to experiment with existing systems (transit). Right now it's a land developer's wish list and to heck with reality and conservation of resources. BAD, BAD, BAD. Shame on you.	Sandy	04/30/2015
	this proposal is deficient in that it lacks adequate trails and paths for road and mountain bikers!	sandy	05/01/2015
	This proposed Blue Print is so high level, it just seems like vague eye candy. There is not real meat or substance to the blue print. I am more concerned that cycling has been mostly ignored in the blue print. Cycling is only mentioned once. You have thousands of road and mountain cyclists that need to thought about too. All of the canyons are classic road climbs for road cyclists and we need to be able to keep cycling these roads.	Sandy	04/30/2015
	This will be a disaster for our canyons and our scarce water resources. Please leave trains out of our canyons! As a Sandy resident I can't stress how bad this will look. Why not just build a better bus/shuttle system like they use in Glacier NP or Zions NP? These can be run with electric or CNG buses without changing the look of the canyon permanently.	Sandy	04/30/2015
	To achieve "an environmentally-sustainable transit system" could never include ripping up our beautiful canyons for a train or making the roads any wider than they are currently. We need to look at utilizing our bus systems more effectively and get better control of the vehicular traffic situation. For example, all resort employees should mandatorily have to use the buses to get to work. And, how about shooting for avalanches in the middle of the night?	Sandy	02/26/2015
	Too many bicyclists want to ride the canyons, but many die each year doing so (including my neighbor). This is senseless... we need dedicated, separated bike paths in the canyons. Winding narrow roads with bad shoulders, increasing car and bus traffic and distractions of scenery and revelry are just too dangerous. This has to change. Please put dedicated bike paths up the canyons... please. Seriously, please. If you don't believe the canyons are heavily travelled by bicyclists, check out the Strava "Heat Map" of the Wasatch Front: <a href="http://tabs.strava.com/heatmap#12-111.7846740.62664/btuebike">http://tabs.strava.com/heatmap#12-111.7846740.62664/btuebike</a>	Sandy	05/01/2015
	Transportation is a huge issue for me and my family. The idea of trax going up the canyons and tunneling through the mountain all the way to park city is too invasive on our natural resources and threatens the very reason why the wasatch is so amazing. I'd have to say Trax as a whole is not a success. First it is too expensive for a family to regularly ride, and second every time we do we are surrounded by homeless and kinda scary people. The bus system going up the canyon is what needs to be approved. On a Saturday there are only 3 buses that go up LCC from 9400 so. in the morning. We have been turned away multiple times because they were too full. Let's try and improve what we already have in place, before we take such drastic measures.	Sandy	03/11/2015
	Tunnels cost too much money and will never happen. Light rail up little cottonwood to much money once again. If money grew on trees these are great ideas!	Sandy	03/12/2015
	Lowest impact lowest cost greatest return is to get skiers in Park City over the mountain by lift not all the way around by car, bus, tunnel. No cost to taxpayers increased access with only a few towers.	Sandy	04/30/2015
	We do not need anymore mass transit in little cottonwood canyon area. No more people will use the area anymore just because you install a train going up little cottonwood canyon	Sandy	04/30/2015
	We do not need anymore mass transit in little cottonwood canyon area. No more people will use the area anymore just because you install a train going up little cottonwood canyon.	Sandy	04/30/2015
	We need to limit "Tourist" marketing We need to save Little Cottonwood Canyon, no train, no road widening The Tunnel from Brighton to Alta with Little Cottonwood Canyon closed in Winter is a good idea Using Utah tax \$\$\$\$ to attract tourist to clog our canyons is a bad, bad idea	Sandy	04/13/2015

	<p>We strongly object to both the process and substantive conclusions of the Mountain Accord deal. These comments represent only a few of the many important issues that this proposal raises, in part because of the difficulty of getting good information about what is actually being proposed (and the true cost to taxpayers of that proposal) and because of the shortness of the timeline for public comment. The report fails to adequately consider alternatives or adequately explain why some alternatives are being excluded from further consideration. The report fails to adequately consider alternatives or adequately explain why some alternatives are being excluded from further consideration. For example, one of the most obvious solutions for managing traffic in Little Cottonwood Canyon is increasing bus service in mixed traffic up Little Cottonwood Canyon. This alternative, however, like many others has gotten short shrift in Mountain Accord's analysis. Specifically, the Transportation Purposes and Alternatives Report available on the Mountain Accord website proposes to drop this alternative from further consideration based wholly on a conclusory assertion, with no accompanying analysis or facts, that this alternative succeeds only in "reducing avalanche-related risk and delay" and would "fail to meet the other 13 purposes." No explanation is given as to why this option would not "reduce auto use and congestion in Little Cottonwood Canyon," "reduce vehicle emissions in the Cottonwood Canyons to improve air quality," "reduce parking impacts on environment, safety, and economy," "support land use goals for reduced sprawl and concentrated development," "improve access and connections for pedestrians and bicyclists," "protect or enhance the natural and scenic resources of the Cottonwood Canyons," "protect and enhance community character" or any of the other articulated goals for the plan. It defies logic to assume that more frequent and better timed bus service, coordinated with bus service schedules throughout the valley, would not decrease auto use, vehicle emissions, and parking demands in Little Cottonwood Canyon. This failure to grapple fairly with the issues at hand suggests a rigged, agenda-driven analysis rather than a careful, fair consideration of potential alternatives. Moreover, one wonders how the proposed approach "protects watershed health, water supply, and water quality" better than increased busing, given that the negotiated proposal requires providing increased water for culinary purposes to Alta and increased water (in unquantified amounts) for snowmaking at the resorts. Additionally, while Alternative D, transportation system management alternatives—which "are combinations of incentives for transit use and disincentives to auto use, without adding new transit guideways or expanding roadways—is mentioned as an alternative that will continue to be considered, the Report evinces very little actual consideration of this alternative. It seems that a deal has already been struck between the existing players (who do not represent all relevant stakeholders) and that other alternatives are falling by the wayside without careful study. There seems to be little actual data in the report, so it seems unlikely that any alternative has received enough consideration to be eliminated from consideration at this stage. The report also fails to prioritize the many listed goals in any meaningful way and assumes that increased tourism in the Canyons is an unmitigated good. No sense of relative priority is given and the report fails to explain why certain "unique traveler experiences" in the canyon should be given equal weight with reducing congestion and parking demands. Relatedly, the report also assumes that increasing tourism in the Canyons is an unqualified good without any explanation for why that is so. The proposed deal will sacrifice Little Cottonwood Canyon by transforming it into a transportation corridor and will destroy much of its natural environment, appeal, and beauty. It would be one thing to build a rail line if there were no existing road, as such infrastructure might be necessary to allow Utahns to access and enjoy the canyons. However, doubling up on infrastructure in the canyon unnecessarily destroys the natural environment and beauty of the Canyon. Doubling up on infrastructure will likely stress the natural environment and may threaten existing species, wildlife corridors, watersheds, and other natural conditions. The proposed deal represents an elitist plan for the Canyons that will benefit only a small number of Utahns at potentially tremendous cost both to average recreational users and taxpayers. One of the primary focuses of the deal is to preserve "backcountry areas for dispersed recreation," a goal which benefits a vanishingly small percentage of Utah residents. Only about 7% of Utahns ski and the number that have the time, training, and resources to backcountry ski is much smaller. Yet, in order to benefit the admittedly small ("dispersed") number of people who can take advantage of backcountry skiing, the proposal sacrifices the beauty enjoyment of the lower</p>	Sandy	04/29/2015
	<p>what type of transit is planned for lcc?</p>	Sandy	02/04/2015
	<p>While good for increasing business \$, we dont need more crowds in Little Cottonwood Canyon resorts as a result of connecting with Ski lifts. We dont need the Park City crowd over here. However improved transport like a shuttle train is a good idea. it would be good to merge Snowbird and Alta to one large resort.</p>	SANDY	03/12/2015
	<p>Why Little Cottonwood Canyon? There are so many other options available to reduce the traffic in Little Cottonwood Canyon and still expand the utilization of our mountains. We could divert the access to the ski resorts in Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons by developing access from Wasatch and Utah Counties including the addition of, what looks to me like, fabulous ski terrain on the other side of the slopes. I do understand that what I propose would not support the focus on economic growth to only Salt Lake County. If that is the intention, as many people expect, of Mountain Accord, then Mountain Accord is a farce and all the pious rhetoric is only window dressing to mask the real intent of Mountain Accord which is to bolster the balance sheets of Salt Lake County and UTA at the expense of one of our greatest natural resources, Little Cottonwood Canyon. Please show us that I am wrong in my accusations, and not focus the Mountain Accord efforts on Little Cottonwood Canyon, but spread your proposed solutions to include other avenues.</p>	Sandy	02/24/2015
	<p>Why spent so much money to manipulate the economy especially in a segment that pays some of the lowest wages. The proposals for transportation are way too expensive and families with children will not want to use a train or take the bus. They would prefer to drive with all their gear snacks and lunches</p>	Sandy	04/30/2015
	<p>Widening of the little cottonwood canyon road and adding light rail will ruin the beauty and feel of the canyon and destroy some existing trails and recreation areas. Please do not make this mistake!</p>	Sandy	03/27/2015
	<p>worse! Allow more lenient rental/short term and nightly rentals to accommodate the increase in tourism. Provide more public transportation. Allow for more commercial development such as tea houses and hostels in the mountain regions.</p>	Sandy	05/02/2015
	<p>you aren't preserving anything by ripping up the mountain and peoples homes, you will take away from the natural beauty of little cottonwood canyon by taking the natural away and adding man made items.</p>	sandy	03/05/2015
	<p>Your objectives are wrong. Trying to stiff more out of State tourists up the big and little Cottonwood canyons is wrong. The correct objective is to save these fragile canyons for the use of present and future residents of Utah. Plans to ensure</p>	sandy	02/28/2015
	<p>I am frustrated to see that there is no other way to access Little Cottonwood Canyon than through Alta. That means that if there is even one member of any family who is snowboarded the whole family is stuck. If I'm a tourist and someone who wants to spend their money wisely I'm not going to bother buying a pass that my whole family can't fully enjoy the benefits of. Please rethink the proposals to cater to ALL outdoor enthusiasts. Thank you for your time.</p>	Sandy	05/01/2015
	<p>I believe that a key part of the mountain accord should be to preserve the "wild" experience one gets while in the mountains. As such, I don't think a train or aerial tram belong in the mountains. A bus service that is fast, efficient, and cheap would be able to use the already existing roads in the mountains, hereby limiting construction noise and resultant noise and physical pollution. In addition, it would be able to be implemented very quickly. Even limiting the daily amount of cars allowed up the canyons or implementing a mandatory amount of people required per car would make a huge difference.</p>	Sandy	05/01/2015
	<p>If by "transit system" you mean clear sustainable bus system up Little Cottonwood Canyon for instance it makes a lot of sense. If you mean a rail system instead it makes no sense what-so-ever. If by vibrant economy you mean Sandy's "Ultimate Basecamp" development with promised access to the Wasatch as if it's a commodity to be offered and bought, it becomes outrageous.</p>	Sandy (Salt Lake County)	04/16/2015
	<p>Very difficult to conclude due to generalities and unsubstantiated claims. I anxiously await more detail. When assessing the goals of the Accord, my belief is that the watershed comes first, the broader environment comes next, recreation possibilities after that, then transportation and the economic benefits. From what is written, it seems like these interests are considered to have equal weight. I don't agree.</p>	Sandy (Wasatch Resort, LCC)	03/17/2015
	<p>I think it is vital that our communities look at future Mass Transit alternatives, something other than driving cars up and down the canyon. I applaud the efforts being made by all involved parties and look forward to seeing this become a reality.</p>	Sandy City	02/16/2015
	<p>very worried about Little Cottonwood Canyon and proposed transportation especially a train not enough info on route and it's impact on the canyon</p>	sandy ut	04/30/2015
	<p>I do not want to lose access to the most beautiful mountain areas in the world for picnics, and recreation such as hiking. I am not in favor of a train being placed up either canyon, and feel that a few changes on the current roads are more favorable for families to enjoy these areas. I am not in favor of a double lane highway either, but believe that certain areas could be made more adequate for passing lanes etc. I do not want a train nor double lane highways up either Big or Little Cottonwood Canyon.</p>	Sandy,	03/10/2015
	<p>1. The blueprint only includes a plan that is not only environmentally detrimental to Little Cottonwood Canyon but is also extremely expensive for Utahns (most of whom do not use the ski resorts). Less expensive and less environmentally damaging alternatives need to be included. 2. There are far better uses to which these funds could be used that would benefit all Utahns. A better bus service would serve the same purpose and be a lot less expensive. 3. The blueprint does not protect watershed health, water supply or water quality. 4. The plan will only benefit a small amount of Utahns. 5. The last two winters have had below average snowfalls. This may be the case in years to come making mass transportation a non-issue. 6. There are more Utahns that use the biking and hiking trails than use the ski resorts. Having the head of a train running through the canyon would greatly diminish the experience as well as pose a safety hazard. 7. It is not wise to build a new rail line on a mountain that is sitting on a major fault line as well as prone to rockslides, mudslides, wildfires etc. The present road is already at enough risk of these hazards.</p>	Sandy, UT	04/17/2015
	<p>all of the possibilities are covered the public needs to respond and the best cost effective solution needs to be discussed.</p>	Sandy, UT	03/26/2015
	<p>Alternate, flexible transportation plans need to be developed and tested before numerating the options for the EIS.</p>	Sandy, UT	02/23/2015
	<p>Do not implement the initiatives within the Mountain Accord. Do not implement mass transit, the building of tunnels, and development of green space. Our streams/rivers will be covered over. We will not have the pristine conditions that we have now. Houses, condos, hotels, stores, and other facilities will be planted within these mountains. We need wide open spaces. We need an escape from the pollution of the Wasatch front, where we have one of the highest particulate levels within the country. We will lose access to the canyons. We will be cut off to hiking trails. Where are our representatives? Why aren't they looking out for their people? I am one of them. I would like someone to look out for my family, my neighbors, my environment, for everything that is good in these mountain ranges.</p>	Sandy, UT	02/28/2015
	<p>Eliminate plans for building light rail in Little Cottonwood Canyon and anywhere else it is being considered. No connecting gondolas between resorts.</p>	Sandy, UT	04/30/2015
	<p>I think a "bus system" to/in the canyons will never work very well because people generally view bus service as inconvenient and complicated. Instead, I recommend a shuttle service, in which a vehicle (it can be a bus) continuously drives from the bottom of the canyons to the top (and back). This may require more parking lots at the bottom of the canyons, but would be worth it. The shuttle system may even need to be free, in order for it to be viewed as a painless way to access the upper canyons.</p>	Sandy, UT	03/14/2015
	<p>It seems as if there are still a lot of unanswered questions. Such why would we gain private lands &amp; then lose public lands? Also why resorts would be receiving more access to water for snow making? It doesn't seem to outline how we are going to conserve this precious resource. There is a lot of information to process here &amp; I might have overlooked something too.</p>	Sandy, Ut	04/26/2015
	<p>Placing a rail system in the Cottonwood canyons as well as tunnels is going to ruin the canyons. All that needs to be done is to provide more frequent bus service in the summer. Connecting the ski resorts via a lift system will ruin the canyon environment. t vacationers on a 2 to 3 ski day ski vacation don't even ski the entire ski area they are visiting. What makes you think if you give the option to go to seven different resorts they're going to do that. It's a novelty that will wear off with the result of the environment having to pay for it. With regards to the "vibrant economy" the ski resorts provide why is it that the ski resorts are paying their workers the same wages they were over 20 years ago and lift ticket prices have quadrupled. Very little of the ski resort sales benefit the community</p>	Sandy, ut	03/15/2015
	<p>The conceptual framework of Mountain Accord is flawed as it pits human created constructs of economy against the natural environment. This is illogical as the Wasatch Mountains are a limited resource that can very quickly be destroyed and never return to its former state, and the economy is a human construct that has no limits or bounds and can be strengthened in a variety of ways. Mountain Accord in many instances is sacrificing the non-renewable resource of the remaining wilderness of the Wasatch mountains for "economic development" that will benefit very few at the cost to the environment, which benefits all. Any economic development promoted or payed for by public entities must be egalitarian and try to benefit the many, while reducing environmental and social costs. The Wasatch Mountains have undergone a continued siege of development and infrastructure expansion over the past 50-100 years, and it is time to stop expansion into the remaining wild and undeveloped areas that are left. Compromise after compromise has eaten away at wilderness quality lands, and it is time to stop the compromising. The Wasatch Mountains have been compromised enough. Finally, there has been little inclusion of environmental and social justice in the discussions of Mountain Accord. The participants have primarily been affluent citizens who have a limited perspective on how Mountain Accord can benefit all citizens of Utah. The Mountain Accord should include triple bottom line thinking, which does include the environment and the economy, but also includes social justice and welfare. The Wasatch Mountains cannot be just an elite recreation area for those that can pay the &gt;\$100 ski tickets. These lands are a public good that needs to be available to all and protected by all.</p>	Sandy, UT	05/01/2015
	<p>I don't think anything should change. I've been in Salt Lake Metro area since March, 1978 and things have just gotten more developed and worse for an enjoyable life!!! We need to go back to better use of our natural resources!!!</p>	Sandy, Utah	04/26/2015
	<p>I fully support the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance recommendations on the Mountain Accord proposal. No interconnect tunnel or train. Increased interconnect only serves to increase commercial development. Commercial development is something that should NOT be a priority in such a special environmental area. Keep the ski areas within their current boundaries. Increased ski development is contrary to the economic and environmental protection for these unique areas. Perform land swaps immediately in Mt. Superior, grizzly gulch areas to maintain the ridgeline as a park effects in LCC. Keep the Soltitude Honeycomb lift to it's existing foot print. Improve the bus access, dramatically increase number of buses and instal a reversible bus only lane on the existing road with environmentally esthetic avalanche sheds in high risk areas. A train and tunnels is a totally non stater economically and time frame wise DO NOT ALLOW THE MOUNTAIN ACCORD PROCESS TO BE MOSTLY AN INCREASE COMMERCIALIZATION PLAN. The lands you have are unique and must be preserved.</p>	Sandy, Utah	04/27/2015

	One of the greatest draws for employers and employees to the Wasatch front is the close availability or wilderness experience and recreation. As one who has enjoyed hiking in our Wasatch for many years I realize that means must be developed to reduce the impact of increased visitation on the environment. I greatly support the idea of frequent bus or shuttle service (every twenty or thirty minutes) and either disincentives such as fees or outright precluding of private vehicles up the canyons. Mill Creek parking and parking at many of the popular trailheads is already in short supply. I am very concerned about the potential environmental impacts of any inter-canyon construction. Certainly there is some economic benefits, but I question how construction, tailings etc. would be handled. If this can be accomplished without destroying or degrading critical habitat and wilderness quality, then I support it. Also, for improvement of trails and wilderness monitoring, perhaps a vote could be had to provide additional funds could be assessed for the needed construction, trail construction, maintenance, and monitoring.	Sandy, Utah	03/03/2015
	Where is equestrian access even considered? Horse trails are getting wiped out by development in the valley and we need to look at the canyons to preserve equestrian access for riders in the most populated areas in the State.	Sandy, Utah	03/16/2015
	I've lived in Little Cottonwood Canyon for 15 years - the proposed Blueprint drives significant traffic, disruption and environmental degradation to an area that is by virtue of its toplogy very narrow and fragile. The Blueprint drives toward more construction, facilities and traffic through a canyon under the auspices of economic growth and environmental and water preservation yet isn't clear on the preservation aspect of the plan. For example, Alta currently has challenges with visitors staying on the path. The plan doesn't include additional resources to monitor the fragile ecology of Alta.	Sandy/Little Cottonwood Canyon	03/14/2015
	No rail near or in the canyons. Never a connect to Park City area. No tunnels in mountains	sandy/unincorporated SL county	05/01/2015
	To whom it may concern I think the canyons are too fragile for the large scale integrated transportation plan you outline here. I am against linking the resorts. I am in favor of light rail in Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons. I am in favor of buses in the canyons. I am in favor of a fee for vehicles to enter the canyons. That model worked well in Millcreek. Call if you have questions. Jeff Whiteley, 801 943 3648 Sent from my iPad.	Sandy	03/16/2015
	I don't like the idea of any "fees" or "parking/pricing strategies" for the Wasatch. You should not have to pay a dime to access public land in the Wasatch. The good thing about having access to the Wasatch Mountains is that it is FREE recreation. I never use Mill Creek just because they charge you at the entrance. I think the tunnel idea is crazy, too expensive and too much engineering (plus were in an earthquake prone area). I think the tunnel concept in the plan distracts from an otherwise mostly good plan, the tunnels are ridiculous and should be completely taken out. I don't want my taxes to pay for tunnels and I don't want to see that much construction in the Wasatch. I do like the idea of a light rail system/train route up the canyons and to Park City though. I would prefer light rail over bus or any tram/lift connectors of the canyons. I would support a light rail system to Park City and up the canyons. I think that should be the focus for the transportation portion.	Saratoga Springs	04/30/2015
	I would like to see much more on transit. To truly reduce our car reliance, we'll need to be bold and aggressive to tackle this challenge.	Saratoga Springs	04/25/2015
	I don't see how the supposed need to connect Alta with Brighton and/or Park City outweighs the impact to the landscape, watershed, and backcountry recreation, unless it's via a very deep tunnel.	Seattle, WA (formerly SLC, UT)	02/05/2015
	A railroad would be obtrusive and unnecessary. The road could be widened, at least in places, and bus service would more meet the needs of users by being more frequent in times that are needed. We live here, because we have skied, hiked, and camped in the Wasatch Mountains, right in our backyard, while living in a vibrant city. Don't mess up things with a railroad.	SLC	04/29/2015
	As our longtime (approaching 90 years!) non-profit wildlife-oriented group has previously stressed this effort has continued to fail to add wildlife value (and human-related safety) to its lists... As we feared, we still see NO evidence of ANY participation by ANY legitimate partner to represent our ongoing fears for both wildlife, nor the potential conflicts humans that have been ongoing, and are apparently NOT going to be resolved through the Accord's efforts - mostly it is ALL about making money! It is note worthy that in a public announcement by a representative of the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources at a recent Utah Wildlife Board Central Region Advisory Committee meeting that their Division had basically "written off" any optimism for any progress relative to this Accord, and had not really participated in the effort to deal with wildlife/human interactions! We find the Accord's lack of at least trying to find ANYONE who would attempt to represent the ongoing issues that often result in the death of both wildlife and humans alike. We take that to mean that the Accord does not REALLY care about wildlife/human interactions. So far, we see all of the Accord's statements relative to wildlife to be "classic" smoke-and-mirrors, flowery, general statements that will NOT result in any real solutions to obvious problems - embarrassing at best! We offer once again, and for the final time, an opportunity to engage us, and our decades of experience in dealing with Wasatch Canyons/wildlife issues... Salt Lake County Fish and Game Association, 801-596-1536	SLC	03/12/2015
	By finding ways to shuttle more people to the backcountry, how are you protecting it?	SLC	02/04/2015
	Decreasing traffic and congestion is critical to quality of recreation and environmental preservation. I am in favor of mass transit up the canyons and would add traffic restrictions or fees at certain times.	slc	04/12/2015
	Do not support expanding ski resorts or creating tunnels. These proposals hurt the environment and take away from the fastest-growing ski demographic which is backcountry skiing. In addition this blueprint will obviously be of significant cost with questionable and likely marginal economic benefit.	SLC	04/27/2015
	HERE IS OUR 'STATE' CHERISH ITS NATURAL WONDERS, CHERISH THE NATURAL RESOURCES, CHERISH THE HISTORY AND ROMANCE AS A SACRED HERITAGE FOR YOUR CHILDREN AND YOUR CHILDREN'S CHILDREN, DO NOT LET SELFISH MEN OR GREEDY INTERESTS SKIN YOUR 'STATE' OF ITS BEAUTY, ITS RICHES OR ITS ROMANCE. -THEODORE ROOSEVELT	SLC	05/02/2015
	I am opposed to the connection of transit by road, rail, or tramway between the Cottonwood Canyon and the Park City ski areas. Construction and traffic will diminish the quality of the watershed, fragment contiguous terrestrial habitat, and diminish back country qualities. I am in favor of mass transit plans on existing roadbeds including rail between Park City and SLC.	SLC	04/26/2015
	I believe your plan is great! Well-reasoned & balanced with great vision for future needs. I have a hard time believing that it will ever come to fruition though, once it comes time to actually pay for building light rail up LCC. There are always too many other needs, & this will be seen as another argument for eastside vs westside, rich vs poor, recreation vs resident priorities. I hope you have plans in place on how to fight those battles, because I would love to see it happen!	SLC	03/11/2015
	I do not support the Mountain Accord Blueprint. Here are a few of my thoughts on the blueprint. 1) Ski resort visits nationwide are flat. A billion+ dollar investment is not a wise use of dollars, especially considering the last few years of below average snowfall. Backcountry usage has skyrocketed. If Utah is so desperate for ski tourism, this seems to be an obvious way to expand ski tourism to Utah, appeal to those that DON'T want to use the resort. 2) I cannot conceive of a way that this proposal will be paid for by anyone other than the Utah taxpayer. Why on Earth should I care about making travel to the ski resort easier for tourists? If the transit system is paid for by private investors, how do we prevent the cost from being overly expensive to local citizens? Ski tourists already bring a billion dollars to Utah every season, WITHOUT a train, mass transit system, or resort interconnect, why change a model that is already working? 3) The Cottonwood Canyons are the watershed for Salt Lake City, any additional development will negatively affect the water quality for hundreds of thousands of people. 4) Cars cannot be replaced with transit unless it is reliable and fast. Car usage should remain unrestricted for those not interested in resort usage. 5) The opinions of people who DO NOT live in Utah should be disregarded. If those people want to ruin the outdoor spaces in their home states with gondolas, trains, and ski lifts, that's their business. Utahans need to take a long view on development and realize that natural attractions are a huge part of tourism. 6) A pay for use system is unacceptable. Taxpayers already fund the Forest Service through federal taxes, in my mind, I have already paid for access.	SLC	04/09/2015
	I don't like the idea of connecting Park City to Big and Little cottonwood canyons. Though I do think that there should be transportation up and down the canyons, just not connect them all together.	SLC	03/08/2015
	I feel the only benefits will be to the developers, big business, and political leaders of the state of Utah. Once again the losers are the general public, tax payers, environment and the animals within that environment. Have the factors of acid mine drainage, the disposal of the tailings from the tunnels, the heavy metal that will be exposed, the mass-wasting and the sewer water contaminates, to include the deposition of great amount of TDS, changing of the waters pH, the disruption of the water shed, the disruption of the ground water flow. Have the construction damage to the environment been evaluated, we are suffering the consequences of the Kennecott mining. And will for century's to come. Will the results become a new super fund site as now Kennecott is, as Vitro is as the actions of people just like the ones proposing the Mountain Accord have become, leaving the toxic waste and remnants to be once again cleaned up by tax payers. I would ask you to explain to whom and to the amounts of the financial gains would be benefit. Nothing is done in this world with out great financial gain to some group. As we all know heavy metals cause cancers, acid-mine drainage in to our ground water (as that is Park City) is a major cause of cancers, mutations in our children. Digging such tunnels will expose great amounts of leads, arsenic, and other toxic metals. I feel that if this project the Mountain Accord if allowed to go through, it will be yet another stupid mistake, by the people the public has entrusted to do the right thing for the environment and the people of the state of Utah. But as in the past it is the future generations that will have to clean up the mess and suffer the consequences, but as the saying goes "STUPID IS AS STUPID DOES"	SLC	04/23/2015
	I genuinely feel like the water shed protection is a major concern for MA. However I feel like the MA fails to come up with a viable transportation solution. The amount of money, hours and natural resources it would take to run a train from PC to LCC does not seem like an environmentally conscious plan at all. There seems like there is a mad rush to do something big... to go from zero to hero as far as transportation. In my opinion it's just not necessary. There are things the resorts could implement tomorrow if they wanted to, to improve the situation. Let's make steps toward the goal... steps that aren't as permanent as tunnels and trains.	SLC	03/16/2015
	I notice an aerial tram between Solitude and Park City. This does nothing to relieve traffic congestion in the canyons! It is a gimmick proposed by the ski resorts and it will detract from the beauty of the canyons and IS NOT an environmentally sound transit system nor does it promote environmental stewardship. I am unalterably opposed to this ridiculous idea which will cost tons of money and serve no beneficial purpose to the wildlife, plants, air, or animals.	SLC	03/02/2015
	I support the idea of transfer of parcels of prime backcountry ski terrain to the public in exchange for land near the resorts' base areas that can be used for development. Significant thought should be given to limiting traffic by limiting &/or charging for parking. I am very opposed to the tunnel idea. This would divert significant taxpayer funds to enable development. The current roads could be modified with avalanche tunnels, and all season bus service could be enhanced much more cheaply and without the substantial impacts of the proposed tunnels. I am very opposed to mountain rail system. Electric buses, with overhead catenary would reduce emissions.	SLC	04/14/2015
	I think that the train/ski lift connect from the Wasatch Back to the Wasatch Front is a mistake. Existing roads should be improved and mass transit enhanced.	SLC	03/18/2015
	I want better transit up LCC, will the new rail system build be to great a danger for the health of the canyon or is it crucial we change the way we have been doing things.	slc	04/30/2015
	if the goal is to keep the natural beauty and legacy of the Wasatch mountains then I believe the solutions need to be less invasive, at least to begin with, pouring any new lanes our a train up little Cottonwood canyon would completely destroy it and it's legacy. There is a reason why during the Olympics in SLC it was decided that boo events would be held at Snowbird or Alta. That reason was because a good solution for changing that road couldn't be found. The is not room to widen the road or to build a train and still have a road because if the mountain on the north and the creek and homes on the south. I believe a bus system that runs consistently and frequently during heavy tourist months should be looked at and sampled before we talk about changing everything Little Cottonwood Canyon. Climbers, bikers and hikers are not going to want to continue using the area for recreation if they have to do it with a high speed train going by ten ft. away or within a few ft. of a 4 lane highway.	SLC	04/30/2015
	It is clear that the Mountain Accord Blueprint is catering to the faulty logic of the ski resorts. The resorts have a "build it and they will come" point of view. In fact, there is no data to support that expanding resorts will increase skier-days or revenue. If you query resort skiers, especially tourists who the resorts want to cater to, there is almost no interest in being able to ski at multiple resorts in a day. There is no additional lure for skiers to come to Utah for this reason. None. There are resort skiers and there are BackCountry skiers, and the vast majority of the time there is no mix between the two groups. Expanding into the backcountry by making it more accessible to resort skiers will not bring in more resort skiers. But it will drive away many local and visiting back country skiers who will find many of their prime areas destroyed. I believe the fastest growing segment of the ski industry are backcountry enthusiasts. In addition, while backcountry skiers are supporting mainly local ski shop businesses, most of the tourists coming for resorts are coming with their own equipment bought in another state. For all these reasons, it is certain that vastly expanding the canyon infrastructure for ski resort profit will be a failure and will destroy pristine terrain enjoyed by locals. This will ultimately hurt Utah's reputation as a great ski destination and will hurt the economy with wasteful taxpayer spending, as well as hurting local small businesses which cater to the backcountry community.	SLC	02/26/2015
	It's unknown now, but what trails will be affected? I like the idea of the Millcreek shuttle but I hope it won't be a "required" shuttle as in the National Parks.	SLC	05/01/2015
	Less development of the canyons and Wasatch is what will bring the best and most sustainable long term results. We must plan to keep these great natural resources for generations to come and stop destroying them for unnecessary greed now. I would like to see greater land protections, less development, and no trains running up any canyons.	Slc	04/18/2015
	Looks like a pig with lipstick to me. Just another expansion bid by big money disguised as valuable to the community. This is going to vastly impact the natural beauty of the canyons. I don't mind the tunnel or the land swap ideas. I think it's great to protect the watershed but I don't see how putting light rail in both Cottonwood canyons is going toward that goal. To facilitate light rail is going to require a railroad bed be cut the entire length of the canyon. Not only will this look hideous, it will interrupt and contaminate water flow. Like I said before you can put lipstick on it, but it's still a pig.	slc	02/05/2015
	Making Gardsman Road/Pass open year round would allow easy access from PC to BCC. Pave Gardsman and plow it in the winter. Don't add new chairlifts and limit ski area expansion!!! Promote human powered backcountry travel to allow a connection between the resorts. Allow ski guides to take people from resort to resort and offer a truly unique and low-impact ski experience!!!	SLC	02/11/2015

	Many vague ideas are proposed but details of the environmental impact of a rail system, ski area expansion of Solitude and Alta/Snowbird are vague. I understand this is a type of scoping document but these details are critical to how all of this fits together. Overall it is successful in getting all the players at the table for dialogue.	SLC	04/28/2015
	No expansion of Alta ski area lifts to Grizzly Gulch or Flagstaff.	slc	03/09/2015
	NO TUNNELS / NO TRAINS LAND SWAP SHOULD BE FAIR TO TAXPAYERS NO MORE SKI RESORT EXPANSION PERIOD	SLC	03/13/2015
	Stop emphasizing the value of economic "growth". A "vibrant economy" almost always means a dying habitat. Skip the train notion for Little Cottonwood canyon.	SLC	04/30/2015
	The Blueprint does not appear to adequately balance environmental and natural concerns with development interests. I appreciate the purpose and the mission statement but I am concerned that the process is simply a mechanism to cover an already determined eventual outcome.	Slc	05/01/2015
	The current number of people that access the described areas is near the maximal number that can concurrently use the space At times in the summer, you are heat to toe with the group in front of you. This proposal will make this problem worse. It seems that the proposal is designed to bring more people into the area. With little regard for the long term impact. It seems that a major portion of this proposal is designed to stimulate jobs and the economy of the Wasatch front (building a train, tunnels, the like). There should be better ways to use the economic resources. While the traffic in the BCC and LCC can be horrific, I did not see any suggestion for construction of large parking lots to allow people to use the proposed busses or train. I have taken the bus from tax and in the current state it is too slow, work on other fixes. E.g. charge to drive up, charge to park, this will generate funds to preserve the canyons, restrict flow and drive more people to use busses (especially if there are accessible park and ride lots with dedicated bus service). I think that there will need to be consideration for residents of the canyons etc but these are fine details. Long term impacts may include additional people wanting to live in the canyons as global warming increases..... What impact will there be on winter sports? I presentation in Park City (maybe a year ago) described warming temps such that there will be no winter sports in 50 years? Why set into motion a plan that does not take this massive change into the mix.	SLC	03/16/2015
	The goal of connecting LCC to Park City via tunnels and trains is reckless and counter-productive. Yes, to better transit up the canyons, but these "solutions" really sacrifice the environment for the benefit of the ski industry. Many visitors come to Utah for the wild scenery and the healthy natural environment -- to compromise those in favor of ski resort profit is to end up with an unhealthy environment and an unhealthy economy.	SLC	03/14/2015
	The idea of tunneling through our mountains, adding mountain light rail, and aerial transportation to increase traffic through our mountains makes me sick to my stomach. Our natural mountain areas are one of our most valuable resources BECAUSE they are hard to get to, quiet, untouched, unscarred and unique. This a chance to protect those areas not right into them.	SLC	05/01/2015
	The more protected land the better. I think what you have going now is an excellent start.	SLC	04/30/2015
	The transportation analysis not only needs to focus on Little and Big Cottonwood canyon but all of the transportation feeder systems including 9400 south the 6200 S freeway exit and wasatch Blvd from that point to the mouth of LCC. Many powder days the freeway is backup on the 6200 S exit.	SLC	05/01/2015
	There should not be any development of a rail line and/or tunnel between LCC and BCC without a substantial transfer of land from private ownership to USFS management to offset it. There must be no development of transportation infrastructure or ski lifts in the Catherine's Pass area.	SLC	02/07/2015
	These are my comments regarding the Mountain Accord Plan proposal: In general, the Plan appears to be overly costly and assumes the availability of funding. There is a limited amount of government public projects money available that should have created a more realistic project plan. If one billion is somehow acquired to build the tunnel and cog railway, then other mass transit services in the Salt Lake Valley will be hurt. That has happened in the past. In addition, these projects should compete with other projects with respect to cost effectiveness (cost per passenger) of transit. Note that some cog railways in the U.S. charge \$30+ per passenger and that is on top of the project cost. That cost is unreasonable and an inefficient use of funding. Also a cog railway will probably be electric due to the residents' concern about noise in the canyon. That will require power lines and rail power lines that will destroy the views of canyon visitors. Widening the roadway would provide a better and more cost effective way to get people up and down the canyons. Widening the shoulders for bicyclists would also help safety and be more cost effective than making the bike lanes able to handle big vehicles. Shoulders don't need to have a thick construction and can have deeper ridges to warn drivers if they are going onto the shoulder/bikeway. Bus service needs to be available year round and not be special for skiers. The canyons get visitors all year round. Buses should allow/encourage more bicyclists. Instead of big projects, simple and cheap proposals are a better and more realistic way to plan this area's future. This blueprint could take 50 years and we can do a more effective and realistic blueprint for a lot less money that can be done in less than 5 years.	SLC	05/02/2015
	Keep the public lands wild. There is enough development already. Require reduced energy use of existing development.	SLC	04/30/2015
	Utah Mountain Adventures (UMA) feels the Blueprint could better meet the purpose of Mountain Accord by addressing the physical blocking of access to Rocky Mouth and other smaller canyons situated south of Bells and north of Orson Pratt Trailhead. Legal parking and easements for public access to forest recreation land are needed.	SLC	04/30/2015
	We should be looking at no expansion in the cottonwood canyons only preservation.	SLC	04/30/2015
	What a big topic. Here are some thoughts. Mountain accord thoughts. Background: Who I am: slc resident. Father of 3 young boys. Moved to the area bc of combination of job opportunity, cost of living and recreational quality specifically provided by the Wasatch and Utah as a whole. How we use the Wasatch: Our family skis as much as possible (although not enough)@ a resort in little cottonwood Love to mtn bike in the summer. Crest/big cottonwood/park city Escape the heat in the summer in various ways in the mountains. Thoughts on the Wasatch: 1.It's a finite resource. The range really is small. A single decision like expansion of one lift to one ridge can fundamentally alter the personality of the entire mountain. There isn't the option to "just head one ridge over". 2.Change is coming with more population. I applaud the effort to define the future, otherwise haphazard development can greatly degrade the experience we enjoy today. The primary focus needs to be protecting the positive qualities the Wasatch still has and fixing existing issues that will grow with increased visitation. 3.Drinking water and environmental quality are table stakes. Development restrictions/smart development need to happen. The debate is around how wild do we want this place. 4.Competitive advantage is important. A healthy outdoor recreation economy is a good thing and the Wasatch is an amazing resource that drives the experiences that bring people here to visit and stay. From a skiing point of view, my thoughts view on why visitors chose Utah boils down to: a.Easy access b.Annual snowfall c.Great terrain d.Experience That is the formula. As we ponder the future, policy should support those pillars. No effort needed on terrain. It's here. Snowfall, we need to care about that. It's a larger issue. Access already has challenges that need to be addressed, especially in Little Cottonwood. Experience: this is trickier. Each Canyon provides different experiences in the winter and connecting them poses risk to changing what is great about each one. Simply put, the Wasatch already has all the competitive advantages it needs to sustain competitive advantage in the recreation market. Over development is the biggest threat. 5.In the summertime: Trails and public access up the canyons is critical. Growing trails systems will add to competitive advantage. 6.Wilderness is critical and not just in the sense of the technical designation of Wilderness, but in the sense of avoiding changing the character of the range as a whole by developing roads, lifts, trails, trains, tunnels, etc. that will turn the range into a big ski area and degrade the experiences @ resorts as well as fundamentally change the feel of the backcountry, the balance of which provides competitive advantage. In the summer time, human powered travel on trails should be enhanced. 7.Travel up and down Big but especially little CC canyon is terrible in the winter. Storm cycles and traffic volumes threaten competitive advantage. There's a better way, especially as more users are added. As I think about the Wasatch I want my boys to inherit it is one where 500+ inches of high quality snow still falls, the traffic issues are better managed and the character, experiences and environmental quality of each canyon are preserved.	slc	05/01/2015
	You CANT combine the canyons, the unique aspects of each canyon will be diminished if this goes through. I do not support this, and would hate to have park city linked with snowbird and alta etc. Cut the crap.	slc	03/27/2015
	All I can say is that I am in total agreement with the "The Good, Bad, Ugly ----and Inevitably Ugly printed out in the last SAVE OUR CANYONS latest issue. It is on page 8 & 9 & as I say, I am in total agreement with everything that was listed there. Thank you for letting me put my input in.	SLC Utah	03/31/2015
	I have skied the pertinent Wasatch resort and backcountry recreational areas for the past 35 years and have seen, and to a degree supported, considerable encroachments into former backcountry areas by the ski industry. To name a few: Brighton: Snake Creek, Crest, and Great Western chairlifts. Solitude: Resort rebuild after a period of total shutdown; Summit chairlift. Alta: Point Supreme chairlift. Snowbird: Baby Thunder, Mineral Basin and Baldy chairlifts. Park City/Park West/Canyons: Overall expansion and development too extensive to list. Deer Valley: Creation of an entire new resort. I believe a balance between resort/backcountry development has already been achieved in this rather small (by western USA and European standards) and delicate ecosystem. I oppose any further development. I would like to see the final Mountain Accord agreement deal mainly with transportation issues.	SLC, UT	04/17/2015
	It is all a BAD IDEA!!!	SLC, UT	03/12/2015
	I think this is a very level headed approach to planned development and stewardship of the most important resource that the Wasatch Front has, the Wasatch Range.	SLC, UT and Mancos, CO	04/30/2015
	Transportation is my main concern to stop so many autos and their exhaust in beautiful Little Cottonwood.	snowbird, ut	03/08/2015
	Blueprint seems to be geared solely to a rail system and not considering the alternative of a CNG or newer electric commuter bus shuttle system. In the event of a snow or rock avalanche, buses can be turned around, but a shuttle system would have to be put in place, to rescue stranded commuters on light rail, bringing one back to the bus system as a reliable fall back. Given the proximity to the fault lines, and the likelihood of an event, it would seem prudent that a Bus Rapid Transit system is far more desirable, less expensive to implement, and more flexible in the event of emergency, and easier to integrate with other services for going up and down the canyon. Obviously, another system would fair better for Canyons Interconnection if used along the tops of the canyons or the tunnel system despite the horrendous cost of tunneling - what about \$30 million per mile?	South Jordan	04/30/2015
	I am against change in our beautiful mountains. Especially the idea of building tunnels from one canyon to the other and expanding the ski resorts or anything commercial. I frequent the canyons on a weekly basis and do not want to have to ride a train or bus or some other type of transportation to get to my desired destination. I understand the need to conserve and protect the mountains, but I see this project as someone, or more than one, is trying to gain financially from all of this and I am totally against that. I love the mountains and want to be able to have free access to them any time I want as I've always had before. I've lived here for 49+ years. I grew up in Sandy and know the canyons well. Please don't change what we have and destroy it. Especially when the end goal is to make money. That sickens me.	South Jordan	04/30/2015
	I do not believe there has to be an interconnect between the ski areas, this is not Europe. We have the watershed that is very important to the Wasatch front and second the wildlife has to be protected around and between the ski areas. I think the land transfer idea is great for the protection of the watershed. I also think the idea of creating tunnels underneath the mountains is a bad idea. I think you can control the environment with the use of mass transit buses and tolls for parking vehicles.	south jordan	04/26/2015
	I like most of the solutions proposed by Mountain Accord, however, I am weary about Tunneling between Park City and the Cottonwood Canyons. I would like the see that be reevaluated after earlier aspects of Mountain Accord are implemented.	South Jordan	04/05/2015
	In one phrase - OVERPLANNED. It's moving in the wrong direction. The Cottonwood Canyons need less population not more and you are building in an infrastructure for more. People are a threat to these canyons, not all people, some respect but most don't. A high percentage of the disrespectful you would accommodate. These people have not learned to respect the mountains, nor will they. To connect the ski areas is disastrous, it only encourages the deterioration of the natural habitat. Utah is all about industry, from fossil fuel extraction to ski area expansion. It's near sighted and unsustainable. I applaud your efforts, but it's always the same thing this time in a more cooperative compromising exploitation. The solution is simple: stop ski area expansion, reduce uphill traffic, limit water consumption, enforce a building moratorium! Protect the canyons by prohibiting development and educating the public who use these lands to respect them. You're building in an irreversible complexity - keep it simple - NO MORE DEVELOPMENT!	South Jordan	04/30/2015
	On the map it shows that the land near Tibble Fork Reservoir may become private land. I am against this. This should should still be public access land for hiking and equestrian use. This area should not be privatized.	South Jordan	02/18/2015
	The plan to protect Federal land and purchase private land seems to be very ambitious (i.e. will Talisker and Vail Resorts support this plan?). If not, much of the accord seems to fall apart. Developing alternate plans now may allow for easier discussions in the future with less court involvement.	South Jordan	05/01/2015
	This does little to develop the skiing/snowboarding of the 7 resorts.	South Jordan	02/05/2015
	This proposal is wrong on so many levels. It is all about making money and nothing about saving our canyons and nature. This Grand Plan cannot take place! It seems to me that people doing such things to our beautiful mountains DO NOT DO THIS!!!!	South Jordan	02/08/2015
	It is hard for me to answer that question because the way it is posed. Little Cottonwood Canyon is just that...A LITTLE canyon watershed. If this mountain accord plan is accomplished, that is when the citizens of Salt Lake County will realize they have been tricked into paying billions of dollars to feather the pockets of a few developers who could care less about what Salt Lake County really needs. We do not need to damage one of our precious watersheds and beautiful canyons just so wealthy skiers can access it more conveniently. We need to spend money on our east/west roads to relieve the gridlock and we need to maintain the roads we already have. This canyon is a gem and when it is destroyed, it cannot be brought back. WE need to preserve what we have, not blast away the canyon for the sake of a few.	South Jordan, UT	04/30/2015

	My idea for transit to Park City involves the entire Wasatch Back. I believe commuter rail to Park City through Provo Canyon, Parleys canyon, and a connection to Ogden via Echo canyon would bring vast improvements and developments to the entire Wasatch region. Historic and semi-active rail right of ways already exist in developed and developing areas, such as the Vivian Park to Heber Valley Limited Railway, and Park City's historic "Rail Trail." As I see it, there could potentially be four new ski resorts in the Wasatch, near Jordanelle and Echo Reservoirs. As well as near Morgan. As for a Parley's Canyon rail line, Trax would be well serving for the various feedings in Park City. I would propose building an elevated light rail line above Interstate 80 for much of the route, only deviating to follow the less-steep historically graded Parley's Summit Road once past Lambs Canyon, which becomes Kibby Road. It would meet up with a Frontrunner spur at Kearns Blvd. Further, I would propose a much-less-costly twin tram system between Park City and both Cottonwood Canyons. Trams would be able to be built minimally invasively without contaminating the watershed as well as providing a world class view of the mighty fortress of the Wasatch. The Frontrunner line would begin with a flyover in Provo adjacent to the current Provo City Center Station, and follow the existing historic rail trail, which has been out of use by trains since the 1960's. Were the trains elevated, the popular hiking trail could still be utilized by enthusiasts. By 2050 the region will be home to 10 million people. I propose beginning the upgrades now rather than waiting. The Wasatch Loop, as I call it, will someday potentially ferry olympians (winter or summer) and other sports and thrill seekers throughout the most accessible scenic mountains in North America. Utah really is God's backyard.	South Jordan, Utah	03/08/2015
	I grew up hiking and climbing in the Wasatch. I worked in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons for the US Forest Service for 5 years while getting my Bachelor's degree in Geology at the University of Utah. I went on to do my Master's research in the area between Alta and Brighton. For the past decade I have made several trips a year to visit family in the area and never miss the chance to spend time in the Wasatch. I know those canyons well and appreciate the effort that is being made to preserve the area in light of inevitable growth. I have considered moving back to the area but simply cannot due to the air quality in the valley and the required commute if I were to live in the mountains. I am concerned that the proposed transportation options will affect access to rock climbing, especially in Little Cottonwood Canyon. Little Cottonwood Canyon is a world famous climbing area. Many of the rocks and boulders we enjoy are close to the road and may lie in the path of the proposed light rail. While I wholeheartedly support a light rail system in the canyons, I fear the rocks and boulders I have enjoyed since the 1980's will be destroyed to make room for the rail. I urge you to work closely with the Salt Lake Climber's Alliance to identify boulders and access points that are important to the climbing community. They did a fantastic job of working with the LDS Church to preserve access and rocks during the quarrying operations over a decade ago. At the risk of sounding like a radical, my vision for Little Cottonwood Canyon has always been to have it served almost entirely by light rail with frequent stops and a well maintained trail system to desirable areas. I have no doubt this would cut down on the time it takes most people to get up the canyon and would certainly save countless break pads as they came down. Rental cars or other options could be made available in the mountain towns. Finally, if more development (housing or commercial) is approved I think it is imperative to emphasize sustainable development. Please reduce the impacts to the watershed and ecosystems by requiring developments to have small footprints that require a minimum of travel to obtain required goods and services. Please prohibit Grizzly Gulch and other areas from being developed with sprawling luxury homes or resorts that require constant vehicle traffic to service them.	South Lake Tahoe, CA	02/14/2015
	I am in agreement with the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance's stance on the blueprint as it stands.	South Salt Lake	04/30/2015
	In the area of environmentally sustainable transport it's difficult to see how an EIS/NEPA document would support a train system being built in the canyon. Increased alternative fuel bus service is preferred and more environmentally sustainable, so that a new road and rail track system does not need to be built.	South Salt Lake	05/01/2015
	For the little Cottonwood Canyon/Park City area, I support transportation alternatives A and B; I am opposed to alternatives C and D. I am opposed to C because of its visual and environmental impact. I am opposed to D because I am quite certain improved transportation cannot be accomplished without additional transportation infrastructure as in A and B.	South Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
	IMHO, my concern is to give bikeshike access everywhere it currently exists, and reduce the passenger car traffic with better public transit. I have to question building additional infrastructure to support a rail line (Little and Big Cottonwoods), because I do not know the impact it would have on the canyons. Zion has a great bus system - couldn't we explore something where we could use existing infrastructure?	South Salt Lake, UT	03/05/2015
	I feel this will only inundate our mountains with sound and air pollution. I feel that a train up to Park City would be beneficial, but we should not put a train up Big and Little Cottonwood. Nor should we connect those canyons with the other canyons by train. It would destroy the peace that we have in the mountains. Let's keep our wilderness wilderness.	South Weber	02/05/2015
	The sustainability of the transit system depends on the final design. Why must Park City be served via the Cottonwoods? Park City should have its own train system independent from the other places. Why would people go all the way when they can have the same or better skiing on the way?	St. George, UT	03/09/2015
	The blueprint is too vague to be able to respond confidently to your questions. I applaud the efforts taken so far by all the stakeholders, but the only area of the blueprint that provides enough specificity is Transportation. It appears that the other areas of the plan outline "idealized" concepts that are not much different from those currently being planned for. With regard to the Environmental protections, each of the possible protection categories have pros & cons. It is also unclear to me what type of "enhanced" environmental protections for water quality, habitat restoration, etc. are being proposed by the blueprint that are in addition to those that are already required being done. The entire blueprint seems targeted at the ski industry, especially in the Cottonwood Canyons. I see no significant benefit to Summit County, other than some intermountain trail connections. It does not address needs of commuters and local employers & workers. With climate change, and the results of a recent study conducted by Park City regarding the future of the ski industry, it seems prudent to start planning for a diversified economy which will bring more commuters into and out of Summit County and Park City. I do not see a plan for working with local governments to address these impacts. I also do not see how this plan will assist local governments/businesses to supply the ancillary transportation required to get people from the hubs to their individual destinations. I want more data and information before I will be able to say whether or not I support this plan.	Summit county	02/28/2015
	There should be more focusing on better bus transit options so that the mountains can be accessed and preserved without additional disturbance and development. I believe that the methods with least environmental impact should be the number one priority. The mountain accord as proposed would destroy the individual character of each of the three areas (PC, BCC, LCC). It looks to me like this transportation plan has become heavily influenced by development interests and viewed as a real estate development opportunity.	Summit Park, UT	04/16/2015
	Don't cave in to the nay-sayers! We MUST have a better plan (out side the box of what the rest of this country does) for our transportation. Linking the resorts by rail is a must. Don't let our I-80 become a replica of the Bay Area's I-80 or Denver's I-70, where a Friday or Sunday resort "commute" just isn't tolerated (so many in SF or Denver feel they must drive "up" on Thursday or "return home" so early Sunday it impacts one's ski day). If we don't add rail up I-80 and create a new Hwy 224 corridor transportation mode (maybe dramatically increased bus service can manage the latter) we will replicate what the Bay Area and Denver have, for sure.	Sun Peak area of Park City	03/11/2015
	BRT or Rail should be considered on Parley's Canyon to Park City. Why is only Little Cottonwood being considered for those options? There are no traffic volumes to back up that decision, we shouldn't eliminate options until we have the data to back up that decision. Expanding the footprint of Little Cottonwood would be more impactful than a BRT on I-80, mixed in with traffic. This is why I gave poor remarks on my rating of the plan. We can't only consider Little Cottonwood as the only enhanced transit option, especially when we have no traffic volume data to back up that decision. Please put improved transit connections via I-80 back on the table for discussion. We need another corridor to choose from, as the environmental impacts to Little Cottonwood have the potential to be very high with an exclusive transit option.	Taylorsville	03/17/2015
	Environment - the idea of procuring land and protecting it is sound. This is perhaps the most important part of this plan. Without the land being protected, everything else falls apart and is largely irrelevant. If the land is not there, then the value of the Wasatch becomes zero. Recreation - protecting backcountry access is critical. The SkiLink and One Wasatch ideas are not good for our area. There is no need to connect all of the ski areas. Each one of them is unique and has its own personality. That would be destroyed if they are connected. The backcountry is something that I enjoy and if access is cut off due to development, then something essential to the Wasatch is lost. Economy - the idea of development around transit centers makes sense, and anything we can do to help reduce sprawl is good. One thing that needs to be thought about is how do private companies get on board. Most companies in this country do very little to be flexible with their employees. This flexibility would absolutely be needed if the ideas are to work. Transportation - the idea of parking fees is one that I do not like. While I would love to see more people use transit, I still value the freedom to take my car if I want to. I also don't see any need to connect the Cottonwoods to Park City. There is little use for this as both areas are separate and unique to themselves. All in all, I think the Blueprint is well thought out and comprehensive. However, I think that there are several issues that will make it difficult. First, the cost is going to be extraordinary. This state has little appetite for raising money, especially for ideas like protecting the wonderful environment, especially when we have no traffic volume data to back up that decision. Please put improved transit connections via I-80 back on the table for discussion. Second, there is very little appetite for cooperating with the Federal government in this state. Some of the proposed ideas would require that cooperation. Since the Federal government is in a much better position to be a proper steward of the land, getting that cooperation will be critical. Again, at the moment, the political courage and will is lacking. Finally, I still question the need to connect the Wasatch Front and Back to this degree. While I enjoy both sides, there still seems to me to be very little in common. Just from the perspective of the ski areas, I don't want Brighton, where I ski, to become to tourist focused and developed, like the resorts in Park City or at Snowbird. We will see what Deer Valley has in mind for Solitude, but I am not sure I look forward to what is to come. While I think that there has been a lot of good work done, and there are some good ideas here, I believe that there is still much to do and to think about while we progress on this idea. I do thank everyone for their work and I look forward to being involved in the future. This is my home and the home of my daughter and I want it to continue to be a great place to live! Thank you.	Taylorsville	03/29/2015
	I think the draft Blueprint is an excellent step in achieving the objectives of the Mountain Accord process. Perhaps a draft timeline could be developed that would show which proposed activities could or would be undertaken now, and which would be initiated after the final iteration of the document is approved, along with rough estimated completion times (months, years, etc.)	Taylorsville	05/01/2015
	More advertising to communities and businesses	Taylorsville	03/10/2015
	Much less emphasis on greedy development and much stronger focus on preservation.	Theocracy Utah	03/12/2015
	Quality	Toronto	03/16/2015
	I grew up in Salt Lake, and while I've lived out of state for the last 10 years in both Colorado and British Columbia, I continue to spend most of my vacations coming back to Utah to recreate. I hope to one day move back to SLC, and I consider myself a long-term stakeholder. The only concrete thing this blueprint says is that ski resorts develop the bottom of their mountains and the public pays for better transit options to get there. Everything else is distant abstraction. Further ski resort growth just puts off the problems by another decade, maybe. The Cottonwood Canyons are too small to try to model after big mountain towns like Vail or Steamboat or Whistler. These canyons need to be viewed as the de facto public parks that they are. The ready access to primitive wilderness they provide is one of the few universally appreciated things Salt Lake, and Utah in general, has going for it. Turning them into outdoor malls is a mistake, as it significantly detracts from the quality of life for the entire Wasatch Front. Focusing the tourism base (hotels, restaurants, etc) at the mouth of the canyons, with good transit access, will expose the valley to more tourism dollars than just containing those dollars to a small resort town and a few profiteers. Colorado is full of mountain towns that have the space to be fun and successful. Trying to compete with that is foolishness, given the Wasatch's small footprint. The brand should be an urban/mountain combination, showcasing Salt Lake's great food and arts culture. The brand should be rugged, primitive wilderness, which better suits Utah as a whole. There is an appetite for primitive wilderness in the younger generations; baby boomers won't be skiing much longer by the time this plan is implemented. The tourism model I'm proposing does not maximize tourism dollars for ski resort owners, though I believe it does maximize tourism dollars for Wasatch Front citizens, as well as improve their way of life.	Vancouver, BC	05/01/2015
	Amy Cheney Seymour--less traffic, safe skiing...ONE WASATCH!	Vermontville	04/30/2015
	Visiting Summit County frequently. I know the transportation is a great concern. I'm in favor of a transit system such as light rail. Depending on the development desires of the corridor a gondola system such as what's in place in Telluride may assist access to various Mnt communities that start developing.	Vernal	04/12/2015
	I like the elimination of private property in the watershed and the increase in protected wild lands. I think the swap of some public lands close to the ski areas for all of the other private land is a win for everyone. However, I think what ever development is allowed in the Cottonwood Canyons should be limited to vertical development with no single family homes. I don't like the development spilling into American Fork Canyon. I think American Fork Canyon should be preserved for its water and view shed. The Transportation Plan needs more detail on how it will be carried out over time. Frankly I think that more roads will just lead to more cars and sprawl. I like the idea of light rail transit up Parleys to Kimball Junction, swing it past the Canyons Resort, and over to PCMR and Main Street, then run it out to Quinn's Junction. Long term I think that heavy rail from Provo to Ogden on the Wasatch Back should be considered as well. That would allow many tourists and locals more mobility to other Wasatch Back and Front areas without needing a car. It might be expensive, but I could get behind taxes for a system like that. Finally, I can see running a light rail system from Eastside Salt Lake Valley up Little Cottonwood and over to Park City.	Wanship	02/23/2015
	There needs to be a cap on economic growth in BCC and especially LCC. The transit plan presented in the blue seems to address only visitor volume, which in itself is not enough, instead of making it easier to bring more people into the mountains, more should be done to preserve and prevent overuse at the same time that better ways are developed to transit current visitor volume. Less cars in LCC is well overdue. But this can not be allowed to spiral into the abuse of land and over development by money hungry banks, investors, and greedy people that don't even care about these canyons. Stop growing the ski industry like a publically traded corporation which results in starbucks/Target/Mart style exploitation.	Wanship , UT	05/01/2015
	The Mountain Accord needs to respect the difference between the resorts it is planning on connecting. While Park City already has a lot of traffic, Alta is not subject to that. Alta is a special place and maintaining the differences between the resorts is important. This plan would increase circulation, ruining Alta's special characteristics and also allowing people to come for the day and return to Park City at night, hurting the Alta economy.	Washington, D.C.	05/01/2015

	This work is long over due. I have skied Utah for many years. I consider the Salt Lake City public transportation system to be one of the best in the nation. We try to use it as much as feasible when we are visiting. Extending the light rail to the airport was a great move, now extend it to Park City and run it up the Cottonwood canyons. The protections for the watershed are of paramount importance and the plan seems to well address this issue.	West Bend, WI 53090	04/30/2015
	I think a well designed and run light rail up little cottonwood and continuing into Park city and beyond returning to SLC would take pressure off the environment by reducing auto traffic. As part of adopting light rail the whole One Wasatch concept should be eliminated. Also the concept of any form of gondola transport from area to area should be eliminated as it would be visually as well as physically more disruptive to the Wasatch backcountry.	West Chester, PA	04/08/2015
	would like to see transit connections to Heber or Midway through the Provo Canyon in this proposal.	WEST JORDAN	05/01/2015
	DO NOT MOVE FORWARD WITH THIS, WE SALT LAKE CITY RESIDENTS DO NOT WANT THIS!!! GET IT OFF THE TABLE. WE WANT NO PART OF IT	west jordan	03/27/2015
	Fees like Mill Creek and Mirror Lake. No campfires ever! Other than designated fire rings at pay campgrounds (Spruces, etc.) Strong backcountry LNT and ethics programs across valley. For example: Backcountry etiquette such as be quiet, no disregarding switches, really educate backcountry respect for your fellow man. I've listened to too many life stories I did need to know about while hiking the Wasatch. Keep the dog people out, enforce the leash laws in Mill Creek. Get rid of ORV travel, it's really not needed here. Limit vehicles. X-number per day.	West Jordan	02/05/2015
	Forcing backcountry pedestrian access into mass transit schedule and pricing it out of existence with fees will reduce mountain traffic for environmental protection, but it actually fails recreational use objectives miserably. Pedestrian recreation (hiking) is often difficult to quantify into a strict timeframe, hence automobile usage. I	West Jordan	02/28/2015
	I am pleased with the overall balanced approach to protecting the environment, improving canyon access, and protecting watershed resources. I am concerned with a plan that appears to benefit those with higher incomes more than those with moderate or lower incomes. IE access improvements benefits are much greater for Summit County than Salt Lake County. I am opposed to improving	West Jordan	04/30/2015
	I prefer more wilderness and no more development, even if it means limiting how many people per day can access the canyons.	West Jordan	02/05/2015
	Leave the Wasatch mountains as they are!! Promote the current bus system you have now so not so many people are driving up the canyon. Add more pick up and drop off lines.	west jordan	03/14/2015
	Please continue to solicit and communicate with residents of the greater Salt Lake area. My concerns are centered on congestion coming from the Park City area into the cottonwood canyons with the possible additions of transit links between them. I feel that an outdoor enthusiast would carefully pick which resort destination to visit and commit to that decision. If weather in PC is less than desirable, the cottonwood resorts could quickly become overwhelmed. Additionally, the economic benefits could power out the other factors in the accord, but hopefully they can be weighted appropriately. Environment shall take highest rank, as it is the only sustainable resource in play.	West Jordan	04/29/2015
	Sounds like some folks want to add more lanes to the cottonwood canyons. How about eco friendly busses in stead? and making the fare less than it would cost to drive.	West Jordan	03/15/2015
	Tunnels would seem to negate any complaints about disturbing existing scenic vistas, and will make transportation much safer.	West Jordan	04/30/2015
	I think expanding the canyons areas will have a negative impact to the environment and the community. Leave it how it is. It works, it is beautiful and doesn't need more people in it.	West Jordan	03/15/2015
	N/Aut	West Jordan	03/17/2015
	No tunnels trains!	west Jordan	05/01/2015
	I am very concerned and distrustful of further intrusion into the Wasatch. I am 59 years old. In that I have seen my access to cherished locations restricted, development of the foothills and forests greatly expanded, and the watershed damaged. While the rhetoric of this agreement is geared toward appeasing my concerns, I recognize the difference between rhetoric and reality. I see tremendous economic pressure to develop the Wasatch Range. The rhetoric and motivations for these proposals may not match. So I am saying that I can live with what is proposed. Any deviation would be met with the most activist opposition that I and those I can muster would mount. I do not want the Wasatch Front watershed or public access diminished by those with money or property acquisition designs.	West Jordan, Utah	04/26/2015
	Don't ruin our Mountains!!!! You will ruin where the wildlife live now... There is nothing good about this, except for your corporations to make money off of our mountains. DON'T DO IT!! DON'T DO ANY OF IT!!! DON'T RUIN OUR MOUNTAINS!!!	West Jordan0	03/13/2015
	1. I believe Mountain Accord is amiss in not placing more emphasis on active transportation solutions and making associated communities bike friendly as a stated goal; 2. Should a link between the Cottonwood Canyons to Park City become a reality I am opposed to any aerial connection such as a tram or fancy chair lift; 3. Recreation user conflicts between hikers and bikers on Central Wasatch trails is only going to get worse. I believe Mountain Accord is errant in not laying a groundwork to resolve this problem; 4. Increases in people populations will also increase dog populations, and ergo, there will be greater canine impact in the canyon watershed over time; as with hiker-biker conflicts, I believe Mountain Accord needs to be on record with a strategy to minimize dog presence in the Central Wasatch with alternatives such as using designated utility corridors crisscrossing the urban scape as off-leash dog parks.	West Valley City	02/17/2015
	Compromise is a necessary evil I guess, but to pander to the ski resorts is excessive, especially the Park City side Resorts. They can be treated at destination resorts. Too much compromise, some needed. These are areas that border wilderness, they should be buffer areas if possible.	West Valley City	05/02/2015
	I remember reading an article in City Weekly back in 94-95 about the growth of the Wasatch front. I think at the time they figured 20k-40k people a year would be moving in over a 40 year period. The expectation was that the Wasatch would look like our neighbors on the leeward side of the Rocky Mountains, the Megalopolis. I think those numbers declined but I haven't looked into it for a while. I hope this is more about forward thinking with regard to the expected population growth than anything else but I'm not settled into that thought quite yet. I do think that on given days our local canyons are busy. Parking in certain areas can be pretty hard to find. The transportation issue is a hard one for me now and I don't like the idea of it. How much more parking can be had on Wasatch Blvd. in order to make the proposed system worth it? More dirt being moved to line the upper east bench for black top, concrete and a train? Currently our light rail system doesn't make enough from ticket sales to cover daily operating expenses. From what I understand it needs federal funding to maintain. If fishing brings in more revenue to the state than skiing I don't see the sense.	West Valley City	05/01/2015
	I think that the intent is in the right place. My concern would be that there need to be real improvements to the transportation system to the canyons. For example, it is incredibly difficult as a skier from the west side of the valley to use the UTA Ski Bus. The Ski Bus is much improved on that of decades ago, but has a considerable way to go before it can really become an alternative to driving up and down the canyon. If the service were a bit more flexible and constant, and there were additional lots to ride from, not nestled only on the east side of the valley, I would certainly be much more enthusiastic about using the service rather than driving myself. I think specifically some points on the west side, some of the newer TRAX stations that have very good parking would be excellent spots to extend ski bus service to, especially considering all the new residential properties being built in the south west parts of the valley.	West Valley City	04/30/2015
	The Wasatch Mountains area needs to stay a wilderness area with closely controlled access and development. Once it's gone, it's gone forever. Let's not filled the pockets of developers at the expense of our beautiful mountains and water supply.	West Valley City	04/28/2015
	This blueprint does not provide any details on methods that will be used to fulfill many of the claims it makes. For example, in the environment section, under the "key actions" subsection, the blueprint claims that this construction project will help to preserve land, protect watershed, monitor environmental health, and protect and restore the environment. The blueprint also claims that it will provide transportation alternatives that will result in environmental benefits to the mountains. Is this claim based on the assumption that less people will drive in the canyon due to the proposed idea of charging fees for parking? This blueprint makes bold claims that are not backed up through explanations of the methods by which they will be carried out.	West Valley City	03/13/2015
	The proposal undermines the three main goals of the Accord. The focus appears to be on economic gain rather than protection of the environment. Not only would the proposal lead to environmental damage but the quality of the recreational experience that at present is one of the best in the world would markedly deteriorate. One need only ski the European ski areas or Vail to see how poor the ski experience is with large crowds.	Weston, MA	02/24/2015
	The cost of the railroad proposal dooms it from the beginning. It's a trillion dollar solution to what is mostly a 90, seasonal, transportation problem. People complain about \$100 lift tickets. The fare on that trail system would be double that and still require a huge subsidy. There is nothing sustainable in a plan that depends on a huge federal subsidy that can't be counted on long term.	Woodland	02/09/2015
	The rail system from Park City is in the wrong place so it is useless to commuters. Any rail to PC, which seems too expensive anyway, belongs in Parleys Canyon so there is year round use. The ski resorts should pay for their own parking on Wasatch Blvd, and shuttle their customers. Why should the non skiing taxpayer subsidize those private businesses?	Woodland	04/29/2015
	I am a strong proponent of the light rail or commuter rail systems. Since weather can be factor, and people using the wasatch want to be involved in the results of the weather, local residents could use a gear storage facility at perhaps the rail station. This would have to be a unique storage facility that would allow users of the light rail system, to store their gear and reduce the carry on problem. Most local residents have season passes at generally a specific area or have the favorite areas they like to frequent. This could also be a source of revenue to support the rail system. This would reduce the carry on load on the rail system, and make it easier to use and make the rail system more efficient.	Woodridge IL 60517	04/30/2015
<b>Please provide any additional feedback on the Cottonwood Canyons Scenario.</b>			
	The ski areas are getting a good deal.	Alpine	02/08/2015
	Do not allow the ski areas to expand. the canyons are already too crowded.	Alpine, Ut	04/30/2015
	Anything that prevents the construction of future buildings both commercial and private is good. A private cabin in the Wasatch brings a negative impact per person served far higher than any other legal activity in the canyon. The accord should not make possible the construction any commercial retail or commercial comfort structures. If a person requires a structure for comfort they should stay in the valley.	Alpine, Utah	03/15/2015
	I'm wondering how it is that water is so available now as I've watched for years while the Town of Alta has been in legal issues defending the lack of water? Wonder also about the access ports, locations of entries/exits of tunnels if the transportation heads towards light rail etc. to connect LCC & ECC & over to park city? Noise & light affects, schedules and user availability &/or probably scenarios? seems vague	Alta	03/10/2015
	I feel that the cottonwoods scenario will allow for the Alta ski area to benefit greatly from the ability to swap lands in the old town of alta/ cross tow area and set up a train station/ economic center. is this better for the town of Alta (I'm not sure, it seems to allow for quite a bit more development than has been allowed in the past. The granting of 180 culinary water hookup seems to green light any construction they would need to do. I think if it is done tastefully it could be a boon for the town. I do like the protection of the lands above the town emma ridge line etc.	Alta	03/07/2015
	See my email regarding the proposed tunnels.	Alta	04/03/2015
	The land swaps seems to serve the ski areas' interests most.	Alta	03/16/2015
	The proposed land exchange could have a dramatic effect on the business environment in the Town of Alta. Historical conditions will be changed by allowing one business to gain control of the private land base in the Town. Land currently used under Special Use Permit that have private personal property constructed on it, are being considered as part of the exchange.	Alta	05/01/2015
	There has been too much emphasis placed on business interests and not enough on stewardship and reversing the mistakes of the past. Billions of Dollars on tunnels and railway lines! Money that will never be recoverable over a 100 year timeframe. How does that create a sustainably vibrant economy? More pandering to a ski industry that has already benefited so much from exclusive use of public land. Look at the map! Designate whats left for human powered. Require the ski areas to swap their key parcels of land (Grizzly, Emma, Flagstaff) for the land under their ski lifts, or pull out those lifts! Don't allow the ski areas more land for base area development. Just congestion charge/price LCC road. The market will find solutions (Uber, ride share vans, etc.)	Alta	05/01/2015
	We live in Alta year-round and are very concerned about the notion of a railroad being built up LCC. Where would it go? If on Hwy 210, there will be disruption to automobile access for years and severe avalanche danger all along the route probably requiring sheds to be built over both the rail line and the roadway. Sheds over the roadway will lead to severe black ice problems for drivers. If the railroad is on the south side of the canyon it will have to be carved mostly out of pristine nature and where does it go once it leaves Snowbird? Up the Bypass Road? There isn't enough room for two tracks and all the homeowners will violently object. Tunnel under Peruvian Ridge? Good luck! Across the Creek to the Hellgate Condos and then up Hwy 210? Severe avalanche issues and all homeowners along 210 will fight it. And the cost of building a rail line???? It has to be in the billions. It makes absolutely no sense when a high-speed tram or gondola could move the same number of people just as rapidly with a minimal impact on nature and the existing infrastructure. It is very clear the UTA just wants to build a railroad and is dismissing the tram/gondola solution without even considering it. All the "we are going to protect nature in the canyons" stuff is hypocritical nonsense if the solution to transportation issues is to construct a railroad (which will need 2 tracks!) up through a wilderness area. I'm disgusted.	Alta	02/10/2015
	I think the recreational backcountry and ski area user is well protected. A inter canyon summer trail network would be great!	Alta Utah	04/30/2015
	The locations of landscapes seem logical. However, I am concerned about too much development as a result of land at ski area bases going into private ownership.	Alta, UT	04/30/2015
	I feel strongly that Grizzly Gulch, the majority of which is owned by the Alta Ski Area, should be allowed to be developed for a ski lift and in-bounds skiing terrain.	Alta, Utah	04/29/2015

	Those public parcels proposed to become private currently provide access points to public land. If removed access would be further bottlenecked. Those public parcels are also prime watershed parcels. The private parcels on the north side of little cottonwood canyon are already mostly protected due to their topography. Further protection is needed but not through public ownership. A conservation easement on these parcels would be efficient enough to protect from development and mining. I also don't agree with further expansion of private lands and ski resorts into American Fork canyon. Snowbird has no need to grow into another canyon more that it already has. American Fork canyon currently a high use area, but is still able to maintain a wilderness experience. No need to take that away.	American Fork	04/14/2015
	Who benefits from Mountain Accord? A few ski resorts, the Forest Service in increased users fees. The FS makes \$110 Billion in canyon users fees nationwide. Bikers who will be using the tunnel. Why can't the 20% private land develop hotels, ski resorts, and commercial buildings, but the public lands can for the well connected. Everyone should have equal development rights with access to basic utilities not just public land owners. If SLC has 21,000 acres in the canyons, why is SLC objecting to placing conservation easements on its 21,000 acres? Conservation easements are forced on private land owners by public land owners who won't put conservation easements on 100% of their canyon land. Mountain Accord is a great process. It is doubtful many will change their minds, but collaboration will increase canyon unity.	American Fork, UT	02/22/2015
	It looks like the needs of the people who live in Utah - the second most arid state in the nation - has almost been ignored. Are we seriously supposed to believe that there will be more water to share among more people. Please use common sense.	Berkeley	04/30/2015
	email submitted with comments.	Big Cottonwood Canyon	05/01/2015
	I think you get my points from the last comment field	Bluffdale	03/15/2015
	I'm excited about the prospects here but I am hoping to see some kind of transit or rail line through Little Cottonwood Canyon that would connect the valley to the ski resorts and Park City. I believe it would be a huge boost to Utah's ski industry and overall economy. It would also help clean our air during the critical weeks of winter by taking cars off the roads and out of our canyons.	Bluffdale	02/05/2015
	Exchange of private and public land is a fantastic idea. HOWEVER, rigorous unbiased review of any and all proposed development in future ski resort base areas must be carried out. The undesired outcome of the scenario of a dense, high rise "city" rising at the base of ski resorts is not outside the realm of imagination. I foresee only an intensification of the battle between resorts to attract the out-of-state tourist by offering the newest, most luxurious, most pampering, most.....	Bluffdale, UT	03/31/2015
	I think it's good that land is getting protected but I do not think a rail system should be put in place in the canyon.	Bountiful	05/01/2015
	The taxpayers of the state of Utah would be on the hook for rail and tunnel construction. This hardly seems feasible in a fiscally conservative state. Suppose the taxpayers/legislature reject the cost of the proposed transportation option? Where will the accord be then? It seems like the ski resorts are asking for the moon	Bountiful	04/29/2015
	This is a classic example of a win-win situation; land that could be developed for active use is exchanged for land that should be preserved for passive activities.	Bountiful	04/30/2015
	Would ski lift ticket prices rise as resorts are interconnected? Would ticket prices be lower for Utah taxpayers?	Bountiful	03/21/2015
	I like the idea of trading 200 acres to the ski resorts in order to move 2000 acres from private to public land. I think Grizzly Gulch should be acquired and preserved as public land as a top priority. There should never be an aerial tram or highway connecting Alta, Brighton or Park City. I would prefer for the canyons to remain unconnected and unconnected to Park City, but if that is not possible, a tunnel is the only option. However, it would have to be for mass transit use only in order to prevent increased private development in the canyons. I doubt it would be economically viable, but if so, tunnels work ok in Switzerland. I think the Natural Gas fueled shuttle bus system in Zion National Park works well (private autos prohibited) and I think a similar system might be an adequate (and most economical) option for the Cottonwood Canyons. The shuttle in ZNP runs frequently and stops where you need it to stop.	Bountiful, UT 84010	03/31/2015
	Reviewing the proposed land trade areas, there are very few which appear to be beneficial to the public and most are designed to benefit the resort owners. I don't see any benefit to trade land which can be developed to the ski resorts for land which is undeveloped and currently inaccessible. I would not trade away existing forest land under any circumstances. The parcels to be traded are much more accessible and valuable than the land which the resorts would be giving up.	Bountiful, Utah	03/14/2015
	I am a strong supporter of a rail transit system looping from SLC>LCC>BCC>PC>SLC. This can serve as a REAL transportation solution and reduce the need for car travel in the canyons, while allowing more recreationalists to get to the canyons for their outdoor experience.	Brighton	05/01/2015
	Mountain Accord and other lobbying groups would need to assure the public that large corporate ski resort interests do not muscle their way into promising release of certain private lands in return for ski area expansion and then not delivering. Loss of access to public lands is continually becoming more restricted especially in winter. The blueprint must work toward specific measures and detail precise access points for public land users that are recorded by deed/statute or other means in perpetuity.	Brighton	04/14/2015
	No specific recommendations or plans for preservation of the ridge line and surrounding areas between Guardsman Pass and Mill Creek Canyon. Access must be improved for recreation on both sides of the ridge line without further ski area, residential or commercial development.	Brighton	04/23/2015
	Preserving the Environment, by increasing Development for Economic Gain??? Leave the development alone, improve transportation systems and do not expand the ski areas.	Brighton UT	04/13/2015
	A trailright rail system with limited stops from downtown SLC/SLC airport, up LCC (stopping at Alta and SB), through a tunnel into BCC (stopping at Brighton parking lot) A trailright rail system with limited stops from downtown SLC/SLC airport, up LCC (stopping at Alta and SB), through a tunnel into BCC (stopping at Brighton parking lot) through a tunnel to Park City (stopping in downtown PC) - is the best option for transportation, the environment, preservation, recreation, and all of the interested economies. With a rail system you will discourage driving, and better control mountain Access with limited stops, not only for skiers but for all recreation and mountain enjoyment. People do not like to ride busses and will not use them. Trains are comfortable and reliable and people will use them. Tunnels have minimal environmental impact and preserve natural aesthetics. The European countries which share the Alps also care deeply about their mountains and preserving the environments, rely on the mountains for recreation - and they are completely dependent on well thought-out train systems that very delicately transport millions of people through a very well preserved environment. Recreational demand on these mountains will only increase - so let's do it right and manage the recreational pressure with a rail system.	Brighton Utah	03/17/2015
	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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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! 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. If you could interest the economic interests 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.	Brighton Utah	03/16/2015
	There is no reason to connect Park City to Big and Little Cottonwood. It will just puts more pressure on the cottonwoods, which will degrade water quality for the city. It's a big step to the "urbanization of the mountains" which no one I know wants. Being in BCC for over 20 years a lot of us feel it's just a development play and a push to Urbanize the mountains for the gain of realtors and developers. Your 50k persons a day is perhaps 5 days a year at best and most of those numbers are on the park city side of the ridge line. Let the real impact stay where it already is.	Brighton, UT	02/09/2015
	When it comes to the land trade options, it looks more like a land grab to me! There is too much development in the canyons already, we DO NOT need more development! The enemy to our canyons is development, period! Public lands need to remain public and if and whenever there is private lands that can be purchased and set aside as additional open space, I am adamantly in favor of it!	Brighton, Utah	03/06/2015
	All public land swaps for more private land holding are inappropriate. Alta does not need more accommodations. The Federal Government should have locked up more of the private lands and made swaps years ago. Mining claims that have been allowed to benefit private interests is an example of these kinds of negligent actions on the part of the NFS and Federal Government. The overall cost of all Aerial Trams and above ground Rail Transport are not realistic and not feasible. The existing roadways need to be improved and upgraded, Public Transportation is minimal at best as it is. Public Transportation via busses appears to be a viable option if taken to the level it needs to be to accommodate the mass numbers that should be required to use it for Recreational Access. The Ski Areas should be playing a much bigger part in funding these options. Second and third Home owners should be taxed much more to fund many of these options. Full time Residents of the Canyons should receive tax credits that allow them to experience property taxes that are similar/relative to the other residents in Salt Lake County. Improvement/Redirection/ and Rebuilding of the infrastructure with regard to Guardsman Pass Road needs to be addressed. If Aerial Trams are deemed appropriate to transport Recreationalists from Summit County to the Cottonwoods, then these Trams should not be allowed to drop Recreationalists off on the Ridges. They should only be used to Transport Recreationalists from base facilities to base facilities. The cost of these options should be primarily funded by the ski resorts. No more expansion of Ski Resorts should be allowed. All forms of Mass Transit should be offered for use 12 months of the year. Canyon Residents should be allowed to use their private vehicles. All other Recreationalist should be required to pay a day use fee as now implemented in Mill Creek Canyon. There should be strict enforcement in regard to acknowledging who is a year round resident, and anyone that is not living in their domicile for at least 75 percent of the year should be taxed accordingly. There should be Light Rail in the Salt Lake Valley that ties into and near the mouths of the Cottonwood Canyons. There should be Centralized Transportation Hubs where these Light Rails run, and then these should be tied into eco friendly bus systems that run adequately to get Recreationalist up the Canyons. Multi-level Parking structures need to be built to accommodate the cars that bring people to these Transportation Hubs. Specifically there needs to be more protection of the Cottonwood Canyons that in the upper reaches of the Canyons. The entire Canyon and all drainages need to be protected more strictly. Law enforcement needs to be increased by the Local Authorities as well as the NFS. The Highway systems in the Cottonwood Canyons need to be upgraded to include dedicated bus lanes, safe and adequately sized bike lanes, more Snowsheds in LCC, and a few in BCC. Gas X avalanche mitigation should be installed in all possible areas. All of these Highway System improvements need to be monitored and driven by EPA standards, and the existing creeks and water sources need to be improved to their natural state. Beavers and other wildlife that have been forced out of the Cottonwoods need to be restored. More enforcement needs to be allocated to police for the protection of the watersheds. Ski Areas and their funds from Real Estate and Lift Service dollars need to be monitored more strictly to help create an ongoing funding source that redirects their profits to support any of these improvements and future development. Along with this there needs to be a Recreationalist Tax fund created to help fund these improvements.	Brighton, Utah 84121	05/01/2015
	Over the snow transportation options need to be included through Grizzly Gulch	Centerville	02/05/2015
	I think this is a fantastic compromise. A train up the canyon would allow visitors such as myself to avoid renting a car. Over time would be fantastic if lodging options were developed down canyon near train station (predestination only village). The train option is considerably more desirable than busses, which I'd be much less likely to use. Tunnel to Park City is fantastic idea as we'd likely lodge in Park City and take train to Cottonwoods to ski. In the summer would also use train to access hiking in Cottonwoods. Tunnel option to link to park city considerably more appealing than aerial link. Concentration of resort development at base highly appealing.	Chicago	02/09/2015
	I do not believe a tunnel between Park City and Big Cottonwood Canyon is in the best interest. Not that many people use guardsman pass right now in the summer when the road is open to justify the cost of building a tunnel. Building better roads and closing them in the winter like you do on Mirror Lake Highway or Immigration Canyon is a better and cheaper proposal.	Coalville	04/16/2015
	I am in favor of the protection of public lands. The public/private land trade make sense	Cottonwood heights	04/30/2015
	As I demonstrated above, the rail based, publicly funded scenario is beyond reality. I am fine with the land swaps, except they are too small. The land swaps should account for every acre that the ski resorts and principles (non-housing) own that is outside of their boundaries. The water rights should be thoroughly reviewed before being given to the resorts. The public give backs in trails and wilderness are minimal in comparison to the request for public funding. The resorts need the ability to expand base operations. They should be expanding up, not out. And the buildings should be built to LEED-Platinum and as close to net-zero as possible. Fire places need to be a thing of the past.	Cottonwood Heights	03/02/2015

	As stated above, there should be no physical expansion outside ski resort boundaries. I support Brighton taking control of Hidden Canyon; however, that can be done without new lift construction. Solitude should not be able to realign the Honeycomb lift, doing so will allow skiers from Solitude to access Silver Fork and return via the re-aligned lift. There should be no lift in Grizzly Gulch. While I can support a tunnel between the canyons, I do not support connecting the canyons, or Big Cottonwood Canyon to Park City via any sort of aerial tramway, gondola, or lift. Do not waste tax dollars on pointless tunnels. Just put trains up the cottonwood canyons.	Cottonwood Heights Cottonwood Heights	05/01/2015 05/01/2015
	Everything looks ok to me 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??	Cottonwood Heights	02/12/2015
	Get ONE Wasatch on the table!	Cottonwood Heights	02/12/2015
	Horrible, what a terrible idea. This is stealing public and private land in the bottom of the Canyon for a Train that only benefits wealthy Ski Resort owners. Ski Resort Employees need to be required to ride a Bus. Expanded Bus service is needed.	Cottonwood Heights	03/13/2015
	I am skeptical of input being really considered for non commercial recreational opportunities. In this state business = God. The transportation entities that will have input UDOT and UTA are very flawed organizations. I don't trust they will serve the public needs.	Cottonwood Heights	03/23/2015
	I believe a lot more work needs to be done in terms of the hiking and mountainbiking trail network. We in the SL Valley need to develop a mtb biking plan like the one in PC and even Corner Canyon in Draper. There is a need to incorporate the Bonneville Shoreline trail in a more organized and structured way as well. I also hope that a detailed plan for trail networks up the canyons will be included.	Cottonwood Heights	03/09/2015
	I support this only if Grizzly Gulch is fully transitioned to public ownership (but not with a wilderness designation!). Alternatively Alta could maintain ownership but a long-term right-of-way agreement should be created that covers the entirety of grizzly gulch.	Cottonwood Heights	04/08/2015
	I think it's great to preserve the backcountry--hopefully that happens without any expansion of Alta, Snowbird, Brighton or Solitude. I agree that NO improvement to guardmans should happen. Making that road accessible year round would only make congestion worse in big cottonwood. It's already made it way worse in the summer months because of the recent paving of said road. Why is there an existing ski boundary area line (red line) in Utah county for Snowbird? It looks like it includes many ellens and not just mineral basin. I'm greatly opposed to Snowbird expanding any further -- especially in to Utah county. I'm generally concerned about losing public lands in American Fork canyon and losing any of the already limited motorcycle and 4x4 trails. We need an access motorcycle trail through brighton (pioneer ridge) that would connect quite easily to Snake Creek and in turn American Fork canyon.	Cottonwood Heights	02/24/2015
	I think the effects of linking the ski resorts in the Upper Cottonwoods has potentially far-reaching and unforeseen effects, not to mention the fact that "public interests" are so great in number that it is hard to satisfy them all. As a recreational backcountry skier, a "wilderness experience" on skis is what I'm looking for when I go into the mountains via the ski resort. What I love about the upper Cottonwoods is that I can easily achieve that. Part of what facilitates this type of recreation is that very little commercial space associated with the resorts exists inside Big Cottonwood. It's a very "remote" feeling set of drainages, sandwiched between the hustle and bustle of Park City/Deer Valley and Little Cottonwood. To me, linking the three zones will take away much of that wilderness affect within Big Cottonwood, as it becomes the central hub for transfer between/to Park City and LCC. I would be in favor of a linkage system that does not allow for more than one egress point along its route between LCC and BCC, and between BCC and PC. For example, I do not support a lift going up Grizzly Gulch, in my view, that almost guarantees that the whole Twin Lakes/Wolverine area becomes in bounds at some point. Rather, a tram or tunnel linking Alta to Brighton, and then Brighton to Park City, would do more to maintain a backcountry feel within the upper canyons. In my opinion, this type of transportation also necessitates that folks then hike for the bigger backcountry runs, exposes them (potentially) to more avalanche safety education, asks less of our avalanche control teams (which are already working virtually around the clock), and would funnel more tourists toward the services that the resorts offer, food & beverage, tickets, equipment sales/rentals, etc.	Cottonwood Heights	02/05/2015
	I think the scenario serves the rich people who will benefit from resort expansion.	Cottonwood Heights	03/02/2015
	I would recommend continued limitations on water usage for snow making. There isn't enough water available for this.	Cottonwood Heights	02/27/2015
	It does not benefit the people to take away the Land hundreds of people use every day like the Little Cottonwood Trail. The Land trade swap is a terrible idea.	Cottonwood Heights	04/29/2015
	It is not acceptable to destroy Little Cottonwood Canyon to make more Lanes or a Train. No Land swap is worth the destruction.	Cottonwood Heights	05/01/2015
	Lacks detail. Detail appears to be part of next steps. Almost feels like being a frog on warming water... If you present the hotter topics now you will get feedback. If you dilute the topics and propose them warm, you will likely receive little guidance.	Cottonwood Heights	02/04/2015
	Little Cottonwood Canyon is too precious to build train tracks and bus lanes... please preserve the fragile beauty!	Cottonwood Heights	03/16/2015
	Mountain Accord Dear Board Members, Being fortunate to retire early my family was in the enviable position to pick where we would like to live. Having traveled extensively around the world gave us a myriad of locations from which to choose. In the end we chose Salt Lake City due to its incredible offerings in so many areas. One of the prime areas of interest to us was outdoor recreation. In our ever increasingly complex world outdoor recreation is a quality of life element that is not only important but essential to our existence. Since moving here almost two decades ago we have been extensively involved in our community. From volunteering thousands of hours to our local city of Cottonwood Heights, to working for Salt Lake County Emergency Management, to being on the Board of the Utah Avalanche Center, we have tried to give back to our community that has given so much to us. We applaud the foresight shown in your actions and are happy to see the competence in looking to complain about the past. As they say "A good agreement is where everyone is a little unhappy". We think you have reached that middle ground. Our only request is that you keep the Albion Basin - Summer road and Grizzly Gulch area as a summer and winter recreation area for hikers, backcountry skiers, boarders, and snowshoers without further development or viewscape changes beyond the contiguous Alta area noted in your proposal. (From our reading it appears to be the same perspective as "Save our Canyons" and Peter Metcalf have presented. These are two of our most valued parties in quality of life preservation.) These recreation areas are some of the finest environments for first time users and guests to enjoy the Wasatch in a relatively safe and convenient manner. It is always the spot that we take visitors to see why we live here. Thank you for your foresight and efforts to find a balance that maintains a quality of life unmatched anywhere in the world. With respect, Florence and Roger Kehr and Family	Cottonwood Heights	02/05/2015
	My family utilizes and appreciates both the wilderness in the Cottonwood Canyons and ski resort areas. Rail is a potentially extremely expensive, but intriguing option, particularly if it offered access to Park City and allows bikes, etc. Rail would need to support stops at the bases of cottonwood canyons. Preservation and expansion of "wilderness" areas with dispersed recreation is extremely important. I very much support Grizzly gulch would need to be included as part of this preservation. I am not in favor of "One Wasatch" scenarios.	Cottonwood Heights	04/30/2015
	My personal fear is increased lift access will only later become a vehicle to facilitate future growth whether it be private or public development. The ability to find solitude (not the resort) in the Wasatch range is what makes it all so special. One can now get away from roads, people, lifts and just about anything in a short hike, ride, or BC ski.	Cottonwood Heights	04/26/2015
	No additional development of open space. I do not support the interconnect concept.	Cottonwood Heights	05/01/2015
	No extra lanes and no trains/tunnels. Buses only.	Cottonwood Heights	03/19/2015
	NO TRAINS IN THE COTTONWOOD CANYONS OR ALONG THE FOOTHILLS!!! NO TUNNELS THROUGH THE MOUNTAINS!!! USE HIGH SPEED BUSES FOR ALL SKIERS AND CONTINUE TO ALLOW HIKERS, ROCK CLIMBERS AND BACK COUNTRY SKIERS TO TRAVEL IN THEIR CARS	Cottonwood Heights	03/12/2015
	Not acceptable at all. You may Not destroy the lower Little Cottonwood Canyon to benefit a few back Country Skiers and rick Ski Resort owners.	Cottonwood Heights	04/29/2015
	Only benefits upper Canyon users and owners at the cost of those in the bottom. Not ok.	Cottonwood Heights	04/29/2015
	over 100 units at Alta - don't ruin a good thing. More water for snow making - Where will this come from?	Cottonwood Heights	02/05/2015
	Please see comment above. In addition, I am concerned about expanded water use for snow-making. Where will this water allotment come from given certain population expansion and high likelihood of more warm, dry winters? I would also like to see consideration of a Wasatch National Monument.	Cottonwood Heights	03/16/2015
	restrict lift-served back-country/side-country/etc access. adding a tram to solitude from PC will seriously degrade back-country recreation for all by overloading traditional back-country areas. there is already a road that connects PC to BCC. run a bus for those that need to access BCC or LCC from PC. Keep lift served skiing in the ski resorts!	Cottonwood Heights	05/01/2015
	See previous comments	Cottonwood Heights	03/10/2015
	Since the Cottonwood canyons are a patchwork of public and private land parcels, I can accept the land swaps to consolidate land for resorts and public forest areas. I don't want to see additional expansion of ski resorts in the Cottonwood, and although I can be in favor of improvements to base facilities, I am not in favor of expanding skiable terrain or adding more lifts. I am absolutely not in favor of any encroachment, destruction or "development" into the existing backcountry areas, and Grizzly Gulch must be included as protected backcountry terrain like Superior.	Cottonwood Heights	03/06/2015
	Stay out of Cottonwood Heights. We have voted down many similar ideas, legislative bills, etc. We don't want ANY change to our community. Our legislative people, mayor, councilman, and other parties are on board to fight "this idea"	Cottonwood Heights	03/17/2015
	The Cottonwood Canyons Scenario is more of a well balanced fair approach that does not destroy pristine terrain and suggests viable transportation solutions.	Cottonwood Heights	02/06/2015
	The Cottonwood Canyons task force plan is to destroy Little Cottonwood Canyon for rich Ski Resort owners and back Country Skiers. This is not acceptable!!! The destruction I speak of would be due to extra lanes or a Train. Expanding bus service up the Canyon meets or exceeds 13 of the 14 criteria. More Busses could be implemented quickly and inexpensively. Resort Employees also need to be required to ride a Bus.	Cottonwood Heights	03/16/2015
	The land swaps are reasonable, but a railroad up the canyon makes no environmental or financial sense. And how can we decide about "additional" water for the ski resorts without a real number. The top priority of the process needs to be preservation or improvement of the watershed for the use of the citizens of the area.	Cottonwood Heights	04/30/2015
	The map in the Cottonwood Canyons scenario doesn't accurately represent the proposed land swaps. The map shows two small expansions at Brighton and Solitude, while the land swap includes land in American Fork, Hidden Canyon, and Silver Fork. While the preservation of the land from Superior through Grizzly (hopefully) is progress, the loss of high-traffic backcountry areas in Silver Fork and Hidden Canyon is troublesome. While the idea of Mountain Accord is to preserve the Wasatch until 2040, expanding ski area boundaries seems far more in line with pleasing the ski areas than the people who call the Wasatch home.	Cottonwood Heights	02/12/2015
	The more you add, the worse everything gets. The resorts do not need to expand at all and we do not need more people flooding our backcountry.	Cottonwood Heights	03/16/2015
	The outline is vague and does not offer any specifics about how conflicts will be resolved. The topic should be explored further.	Cottonwood Heights	03/13/2015
	The proposed land swaps and preservation are good for the watershed and for continued dispersed recreation. It will also allow for key development in Ski Area base areas for economic viability.	Cottonwood Heights	03/12/2015
	The trade-offs of increased base area for greater backcountry protections seem fair. One thing that must be controlled is the scale and nature of base developments. Further development of vacation homes that sit vacant the majority of the year is the antithesis of environmental sustainability nor serve the LOCAL public good. Let Parleys be the sacrificial lamb for this type of development. It must be kept out of the Cottonwood Canyons and Millcreek at all costs.	Cottonwood Heights	02/05/2015
	The transfer of the key areas of private land to secured public lands is a huge benefit for the ensuring the beauty and opportunities of the Wasatch for the next generation.	Cottonwood Heights	02/05/2015
	There is absolutely no need for any expansion of recreational winter sports in either Big or Little Cottonwood Canyon, in opinion. Not at resorts, and not in the back country. There is some need for judicious improvements to summer activity centers, and a need for summer trail improvement, particularly in terms of separating some of the hiking and biking trails, for safety reasons. The current blueprint allows far too much "development" when weighed against the very small amount of short term protection it purports to provide. There is absolutely no logical reason to believe that the new federal regulation this plan is claiming/proposing will protect many of these...exchanged...areas will actually become law, especially in the political situation as it is evolving nationally. In 20 years, it will just be "unprotected" and "develop-able."	Cottonwood Heights	03/03/2015
	There were very little conflicts till mining claims were bought. Tuff luck for all or at the time they were bought will determine the rule of the time. Snowbird needs to comply.	Cottonwood Heights	03/12/2015
	This is a slew of bad ideas to make money	Cottonwood Heights	03/27/2015
	This is based on willing sellers of private land.	Cottonwood Heights	04/26/2015
	This is destruction of the peoples land to benefit a very few.	Cottonwood Heights	04/29/2015
	This looks like a good compromise without allowing the ski resorts to completely overrun everything in the canyons.	Cottonwood Heights	03/06/2015
	This proposal cannot be tied in with the train! the land swap has some big tradeoffs in both directions without guaranteeing a train to the ski mountains. Without that bullet point this seems like a fair balance, with the train it is heavily weighted towards over development.	Cottonwood Heights	04/24/2015
	This seems like a win win. Backcountry users get to protect some critical touring terrain (flagstaff, days, cariff, silver) for future generations. Backcountry users loose some good but less critical terrain.	Cottonwood Heights	03/12/2015

	This website has not adequately presented details necessary for a well informed decision.	Cottonwood Heights	03/09/2015
	we do not need rail and tunnels up and across the mountains this only benefits park city residents to resolve their traffic and over building problems	cottonwood heights	03/05/2015
	We don't need more roads. We need viable mass transit. Trains and tunnels would be the best, albeit not the cheapest. The backcountry land would remain intact, and transportation would be solved. And if it eventually connects to the East side of the Range toward Heber, the mountains local population could now chose to live in a way cheaper community and help spread the population growth of the SLC Valley.	Cottonwood Heights	04/29/2015
	While I like the idea of a true public transit system encouraging growth by adding infrastructure in an already crowded canyon is irresponsible. We don't need MORE things and people in the canyon, we simply need a more reliable and sustainable way to get the existing users into the canyon. Don't make us chose between a true transit solution or maintaining the lack of development in the Cottonwood Canyons.	Cottonwood Heights	04/07/2015
	Why do the ski resorts want the land in American Fork Canyon? Do they want to build ski resorts there? How much more water do they want to make more snow?	Cottonwood Heights	04/26/2015
	You may be permanently protecting SOME of the landscape but what about the areas where you propose to run the transit line? Increase watershed protection? Does that mean you will no longer sell the water in Little Cottonwood Creek to Murray City to the point that the creek is a mere trickle by the middle of the summer, causing the huge trees on either side to die?	Cottonwood Heights	03/09/2015
	It is unclear as to how snowmobiling will be effected in this plan. This is a huge form of recreation that needs to be preserved as the environmental impact from this recreation is minimalistic. Also a few staging areas for snowmobiling would be nice such as the guardsmans pass area which gets very congested.	Cottonwood Heights	02/12/2015
	Our responsibility to care for our natural resources, our water, our mountains, and our environment must make a firm commitment to limiting use and restricting further development in these small canyons. The increased population along the Wasatch Front and the need for life sustaining natural resources juxtaposed with the desire for increased recreational use and the resulting economic development of the Cottonwood Canyons has reached a jugglepoint. We must limit use and development if we are going to achieve sustainability of our natural resources.	Cottonwood Heights City	04/21/2015
	When Salt Lake hosted the Olympics, the Cottonwood Canyons were off limits for development because of their importance as a water shed. That importance hasn't changed, nor should development proposals.	Cottonwood Heights City	02/20/2015
	Further resort expansion in the Cottonwood canyons should be limited. Grizzly Gulch should not be further developed.	Cottonwood Heights, UT	04/18/2015
	This cedes an unacceptable amount of popular backcountry skiing terrain to ski resorts.	Cottonwood Heights, UT	03/08/2015
	I can certainly see where the need for compromise comes into play on a plan such as this, but I do worry ski resorts will continue to push for growth.	Cottonwood Heights, Utah	05/01/2015
	Seems to be a very reasonable, thoughtful, balanced plan.	Cottonwood Heights, Utah	03/05/2015
	The only purpose served by the rail scenario agenda is rapid transit to the ski resorts at the expense of entirely limiting the mountain experience outside of the ski resort property. Access to the rest of the canyons is cut off, and the little that will remain will be degraded entirely. Bad scenario. Tell the truth, publish the truth, then put the info out for real public comment and solutions.	Cottonwood Heights, Utah	03/15/2015
	For this to be equitable Grizzly Gulch must be protected and Mary Ellen should remain wilderness. Grizzly - Preserving grizzly gulch should not be a "maybe" and must be part of the land swap to make it an equitable exchange. There are times I am on Patsy Marley and can see more people recreating in Grizzly than on lifts at alta. Keeping grizzly will keep BC skiers coming to LCC and SLC. Mary Ellen: - Mary Ellen should be preserved with the true wilderness that the greater american fork canyon is. This is a 4 season recreation area for many people seeking a more true backcountry experience that cannot be had in the cottonwoods due to the high level of development and traffic. LCC in particular already has significant development and that development should be contained to LCC and not sprawl into American fork. There are also many snowmobilers who are not allowed in LCC/BCC - Additionally, Snowbird is already a massive resort and no visitors talk to see any need for it to be bigger. Most tourists hardly scratch the surface of their terrain. Additionally Snowbird already has a hard time keeping its existing terrain open due to avalanche danger and would likely have a very hard time opening Mary Ellen on top of their current terrain. - I think a plan to relocate the powderbir	Cottonwood Heights	02/10/2015
	It's a nice start. Expanding and obtaining wilderness designation would go even further.	Cottonwood heights	02/05/2015
	I think that as outlined above, a "congestion charging" scheme would improve the traffic load problems. I would always include a ariel connection between the ski areas as this would allow skiers to move easily between the resorts and open up Wasatch to be the premier ski area in the world	Deer Valley part of year. Otherwise London	02/05/2015
	I don't think there is any point for a tunnel linking Park City to the Cottonwood Canyons. I think there should be a train from SLC to Park City. Park City is the only real ski town that Utah has. The Cottonwood Canyon and the ski areas near Ogden all have places to ski, there are not any walkable towns that draw tourists like Aspen, Jackson Hole, Crested Butte, Telluride, or Sun Valley. I think better bus service from SLC to the resorts in the big and little Cottonwood Canyon would better serve the population that skis there. I believe that if you are going to link the ski areas, it should be done using the ONE Wasatch model, not the Mountain Accord model. Backcountry skiers overestimate the effect that the ONE Wasatch connections will have, and building three ski lifts will have a much smaller environmental impact that a train going up either Cottonwood Canyon or a tunnel between Park City and the Cottonwood Canyons. Mountain Accord prioritizes backcountry skiing at the expense of resort skiing. As a ski industry professional, this is a dangerous precedent for Utah tourism. Yes, backcountry skiing is on the rise, but if Utah ever wants to compete with Colorado on skier visits, they need to focus on upgrading the in-bounds skier experience. Very few people travel to backcountry ski, it's dangerous to go into the backcountry on a foreign, unknown snowpack.	Denver	03/03/2015
	As a tax paying snowboarder, I find any expansion of Alta extremely offensive. How dare you try to even further limit accessibility in the Wasatch. This plan is a direct attack on snowboarders and shows the extent that discrimination is accepted in Utah.	Don't worry about it	04/30/2015
	I am not sold on the ski resorts getting more water to make snow.	Draper	02/05/2015
	Leave the private lands out of the mix. It is muddying the waters on this issue and not in the best interests of the public as a whole, but the special interests of the few.	Draper	04/30/2015
	Not 100% convinced that rail up Cottonwood canyon is the best resolution due to construction costs and maintenance costs. The public bus service currently offers a solution, but it offers limited stops for backcountry activities outside of the primary ski resorts. Offering more dispersed stops or a flag-down system might be a solution to reduce the number of cars to small parking areas or having them park in the ski area lots. There is a need for more people to ride public transit up the canyons not convinced rail is the solution but definitely sure that bus only the Zion Model is not the solution. These are public lands - that means we should have access options.	draper	04/12/2015
	Snowbirds plans in American Fork need to be captured in this plan. Will Snowbird be allowed to put a lift / gondola from the Tibble Fork area to Mineral Basin or AF Twins? The alignment there could impact snowmobilers in AF Canyon and also could make White Pine and much of AF Canyon area sidecountry for Snowbird lift skiers. I believe Snowbird "concession" on Superior is not a real meaningful give as they would face massive opposition developing there. Snowbirds plans on expanding from hidden peak to AF Twins or from Tibble to AF Twins or Mineral ought to be documented and boundaries set to protect White Pine for human powered users and AF Canyon for human powered and snowmobilers. Also Snowbirds Cat skiing plans ought to be captured if they were to expand the 416 acres into AF. how far would they take their cats to public lands? I am a passholder at snowbird for past 10+ years and also a snowmobiler and backcountry boarder and feel Snowbird is over-reaching in the AF drainage and they have changed uses and access in upper Mineral Basin and Mary Ellen (closing access) and have disallowed uphill skiing on public lands in their resort. Snowbird is getting too much leeway and boundaries need to be established around their longer term ambitions.	Draper	04/05/2015
	Stewardship of our Watershed Health and Recreation Resources vs Killing the Goose that laid the Golden Egg. Elements of the Wasatch Accord "proposed blueprint" are very good, but some of the options still under consideration represent significant short sighted folly, in my view. Notable positives include the transfer of private land to public in exchange for specific, discreet and thoughtful ski area base camp development makes sense. It provides certainty for the preservation of both watershed health to important holdings, and certainty to the resorts for base camp support facilities that can be developed with best management practices in mind for protection of water quality (rather than ad hoc and less planned dispersed development). However, several options on the transportation table will almost certainly exceed the carrying capacity of a healthy watershed, resulting in degradation of the mountain recreation experience and healthy watershed. While the Wasatch Accord and blueprint study notes the trips to the Wasatch are nearly 2x that of Zion NP and population pressure is expected to increase many times over in the future, all but one of the transit alternatives are based on the premiss that added transportation of more people is better. Quite the contrary. Look at the heralded successful approach of Zion. Leadership and stewardship of the Wasatch would emulate that successful approach of managed access to retain the recreation experience and health of the ecosystem. Notably, Zion does not have the same pristine drinking water supply water quality resource to protect, yet the value of a reliable and high quality water supply in the Wasatch will increase dramatically to supply the growth in the region. The only sustainable transportation options are those which recognize and honor the healthy population carrying capacity of the mountain watershed, both in terms of vehicles coming up the canyon, but also in the safe number of people who can and should be "extracting" recreational resource value from the area. Do we want an experience that boasts 80,000 persons on the mountain a day with respective "footprint" of deleterious impact on the recreation and local environment, or a healthy experience which boasts a quality recreation and quality watershed health? The transportation decision we make will dictate the protection or decimation of our resource, and respective value we receive in return. What is the healthy carrying capacity, and what is the transportation management scheme which assures that? That is the question and strategy we should follow.	draper	02/15/2015
	The proposal relieves economic congestion to the Park City area, in exchange for land protections surrounding the Park City area. It 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, developers will benefit wildly with large property/business owners, while local, Salt Lake Valley people stand little to gain.	Draper	03/06/2015
	Less development on ridge lines please! Less sprawl of development	East millcreek	05/02/2015
	I think the plan provides a great balance, holds rampant development in check, but breaks the grid-lock that has prevented some well thought out plans from moving forward.	East Millcreek Township	02/05/2015
	Not sure I saw a real plan to address the issues. Using gondolas to "control" when and where the tourists are allowed to go would be a big concession in favor of the back country skiers. I think much of the back country terrain should remain as such.	eeefrum	02/05/2015
	Land Swap and more trails for a three lane road and a train?	Granite	03/15/2015
	Again, ridiculous. I worked at Alta when first moving to Utah. Very few people care about hitting multiple locations on their trip. I know that an even fewer number of locals want to go to more than one place in a day. People avoid PC and visit LCC and BCC primarily because they are so secluded.	Granite	02/04/2015
	There must never be tunnels connecting the canyons and Summit County to Salt Lake County. Besides the sheer environmental destructiveness and potential danger from certain minerals in the area, it changes the entire nature of the canyons and the Wasatch Mountains. It drastically alters what we desire to protect. If it comes to a public vote, I would vote no on the entire plan if it includes tunnels through the mountains. If the plan goes through its entire process without a public vote, I would actively work to stop any plan that includes tunnels.	Granite, Utah	04/30/2015
	No ski resort expansion, period. Grizzly Gulch must be left as a wilderness area.	Heber City	04/09/2015
	I am concerned about providing the ski resorts additional water for snow making, especially since water is a precious commodity and one we are running out of. All other proposed plans look good.	Herriman	04/30/2015
	If you can't enjoy it the way it is then don't!	Herriman	02/10/2015
	I think the plans need to recognize that the canyons are used in three distinct ways: 1--Summer. Fewer visitors doing many different things. Parking lots are often full. People are going to many various locations. Traffic is not a major problem (now) but access points are generally insufficient. Note full lots at most hiking trails, notably those in the Albion Basin. 2--Winter, typical day. Current transportation and access seems to be working well. 3--Winter, holiday and weekend. This is the current problem. Too much traffic and environmental impact. However, this really is only a few days a year. Also, the plans do not consider the need for additional restrooms. In the summer, there are very few restroom facilities (none at Brighton resort). This is ironic since dogs are not allowed in the canyon. However, human waste is certainly being left throughout the area, especially in the summer.	Herriman, UT	03/11/2015
	do not want a train in our mountains	Highland	04/16/2015
	The fastest growing area along the Wasatch Front is Utah County, and this is where a third of the Wasatch Front lives today. I would like to see more options for getting to the ski areas from Utah County. For instance, a single ski lift and parking lot near Tibble Fork Reservoir in American Fork Canyon to Mineral Basin/Snowbird may alleviate drive traffic up to LCC/BCC/PC by a third.	Highland	03/12/2015
	There should not be any expansion to the ski resorts. Or any public land given up to the private sector absolutely not. we already have ski resorts and enough development up there, there isn't any reason to add more development.	Highland	04/16/2015
	NO TUNNELS OR TRAMS. We need to be extremely careful with what is left of our mountains.	Holladay	03/26/2015
	Again, I don't think there is enough detail in this plan to make a valid choice above. What are the consequences of the rail system? What does it mean for ski areas to expand and expand snowmaking. How does it impact watershed, wildlife, and the wilderness areas nearby? I love skiing and LCC is what brought me to Utah. But I don't want ski areas to be able to expand at the price of losing the beauty and terrain that makes this area so desirable. With more detail, it would be much easier to make an educated, informed, and wise decision.	Holladay	04/29/2015
	again, it depends how much more the public has to end up spending on these transit systems or ski passes! If there are several purchase options as to having this an added benefit to be or not be used, perfect. But if it's an all or nothing implementation resulting in higher ski pass prices etc. I do not see it beneficial to the public.	Holladay	02/10/2015

	As an avid backcountry user, I simply cannot understand the wisdom in additional development in the tri-canyon area. The remaining wild areas in Millcreek and the Cottonwoods are limited. One massive area for improvement in recreational opportunities seems to be largely overlooked...the potential for improved access to trail systems from the valley and mouths of the canyons (and expanded access from the Shoreline trail). Additionally, it appears that the resorts would trade land that generally could not be developed in return for valuable land and resort expansion. Also, the proposal does not address snowmobile access at Guardsmans Pass. Will snowmobiles have continued access at Guardsmans? For snowmobilers living in the Salt Lake valley, this is one of the few remaining areas open to snowmobiles in the Central Wasatch.	Holladay	02/12/2015
	Consider including recreational usage and canyon access fees to all users (like Millcreek canyon) to reduce the possible tax increase to citizens. Not all residents use/recreate in the Wasatch. Many people spend their time in other Utah areas. Usage fees could help ensure revenue that taxpayers would not assume. Or...revise tax laws to allow recreation taxes to be designated or allocated to specific regions of the state?? Just a thought..... But, bottom line is, I'm a BIG supporter of usage fees to help sustain trail maintenance, garbage service, security, parking etc.... Thank you!	Holladay	04/16/2015
	I am absolutely appalled at the proposal. Not only does it neglect to preserve the natural beauty of the mountain areas, but it BLATENTLY conspires to further the cause of only those who stand to gain big financially. I understand the draw to combine the cottonwoods and the Wasatch back, however, doing so would absolutely defeat the entire reason the area has become so special to begin with. Putting a tram or a tunnel through the mountain from atlas to pcmr would degrade the essence of nature and in doing so, violate the Mountain Accord mission statement. Keeping the canyons separate, keeps traffic down already! Making each canyon more efficient and safe is what should be the focus.... but the \$\$\$ bags are calling all investors and developers.	Holladay	02/17/2015
	I have intentionally waited until the last day to comment on this scenario. I'm still not convinced that the land swaps have the best intentions for preserving the Wasatch. The Wasatch is a unique gem. It has had a significant history of exploitation by its inhabitants. The proposed master development plans by individual ski areas will continue to exploit the canyon. Sure some iconic areas are preserved. That's great, but it isn't enough.	Holladay	05/01/2015
	I think that the resorts would have to dedicate more areas (desirable areas) to wilderness in order for this proposal to move forward. one fear of the backcountry users is that current use areas are in jeopardy. I think formally dedicating superior, emma ridge, grizzly, etc to wilderness is a cornerstone in a deal that make everyone happy. these have been longstanding wilderness areas (in perception only in some cases) and I think that will have to be maintained.	Holladay	02/04/2015
	I think the general concept is sound however there is no mention of climate change and how that may impact the viability of the ski areas. Additionally, there is no mention on construction limits allowed at the base facilities in terms of height or square footage. I'm concerned new base facilities could be visually obtrusive or overwhelming to the current feel of the canyons construction is not limited.	Holladay	03/16/2015
	I would prefer to see the state of Utah take control of the lands slated for federal takeover.	Holladay	02/08/2015
	It is refreshing to see that all parties are giving in a little to reach an agreement. I hope that holds to be true. Rail is essential to avoid long term gridlock in the canyons and Park City.	Holladay	03/12/2015
	It seems more like a reason to expand ski resorts although adding public lands part is good.	Holladay	03/15/2015
	Keep the animal migration corridor between Alta and Brighton free from chairlifts. Make the connection between the resorts by underground train, not through dangerous avalanche terrain. Use snow sheds over the canyon road to solve avalanche and animal migration problems at one stroke.	Holladay	02/10/2015
	Make the trades happen.	Holladay	02/24/2015
	Overall, we don't need this plan. Are you a private organization? Who hired you and gave you permission to promote this plan? How do you intend to finance all these ideas? It certainly isn't how I want my tax dollars spent!!!	Holladay	02/20/2015
	Please see the above response with the following addition. It is really sad that a lot of land in American Fork Canyon will be privatized and sacrificed to gain minor concessions in the Cottonwoods. Utah County residents already have limited outdoor recreation alternatives through the Alpine Loop and the proposed American Fork privatization will suffocate land above Table Fork.	Holladay	04/30/2015
	The 2 page Cottonwood Canyons scenario does not provide enough detail for people to adequately evaluate what is being proposed for these areas as part of the Mountain Accord proposal. After reviewing many other documents on the website, I would suggest that the scenario be modified substantially to reflect all of the other information that if proposed as part of the Mountain Accord. In particular, the plan does not provide any meaningful discussion about proposals to allow or limit future development in the canyons. I would suggest that the scenario be modified to include the following provisions. - No expansion of ski resorts. - Allow additional snowmaking at ski resorts. - Allow additional clustered development as part of the base facilities at existing ski resorts. - Any further development in the canyons should be limited to single family cabins. - Develop a plan and funding needed to purchase private property within the canyons. - The scenario assumes adoption of a fixed rail mass transit system, when that issue has not been decided, and there are other better alternatives. - Create additional Federal protections for areas beyond the existing designated wilderness areas (existing protections are not sufficient).	Holladay	05/01/2015
	The idea of a rail-linked group of resorts is an illusion -- if there isn't going to be any (or very much) skiing, as climate change hits, there are going to be fewer and fewer skiers. And rail or ski lift connections will drive hikers away.	Holladay	04/15/2015
	The idea of building transportation tunnels through the mountains is not in the best interest of wild land conservation. water shed protection nor does it enhance the quality of the outdoor experience. Grizzly gulch, The Emma ridge line to Mt. Superior should be designated wilderness! White pine and Cardiff fork designated as notational forest. I am completely and utterly opposed to ski area expansion (increasing the ski area foot print) enough is enough!!! With the exception of Snowbirds expansion / acquisition of the Mary Ellen gulch parcel, expansion in this area would have far less impact on back country users, water shed etc. than other parcels on the table. The peripheral boundaries of the ski areas are already encroaching on the dispersed recreational opportunities throughout the Wasatch. In addition the cottonwood canyons should remain "dead end canyons" to connect the canyons in anyway would dramatically reduce the quality of the outdoor/ mountain experience and the individuality character and charm that is now present. Lets not turn the beautiful Wasatch into a paved Outdoorsney land, keep the mountains a wild and wonderful place for generations to come and enjoy and not "sell out" in the name of progress!	Holladay	03/11/2015
	The trade for base area resort lands and such things as the entire Superior ridge seems like a no brainer win/win.	Holladay	02/04/2015
	There is too much emphasis placed on the economic vitality of the ski resorts. We do not need to be the largest and best resort destination in the world.	Holladay	04/28/2015
	There should be no more new development in the Wasatch Front Canyons. We need to protect this valuable watershed.	Holladay	03/16/2015
	These are the key points I believe should be considered: A creation of a trails network in upper reached of LCC and BCC. Improved and expanded road cycling opportunities. Permanent protection of Grizzly Gulch with no chairlift. 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).	Holladay	03/14/2015
	I do not see the need for privatization of public land in American Fork Canyon. This land will most likely benefit Snowbird and bring tremendous winter visitation up the fragile American Fork canyon road or maybe up from Heber City. It's just not the 400+ acres they want to privatize and add to the ski resort but all the surrounding NF land that ski lifts, ski trails, power lines, etc. that adds to a huge amount of land taken from its natural state.	Holladay, UT	03/13/2015
	This seems to lean towards the ski resorts in terms of who benefits the most. A careful economic analysis should examine the proposed deal.	Holladay, Utah	03/04/2015
	As a life long resident and with global warming looming in our future, I think the most important aspect of what ever is planned is the protection of these mountains from any development that might, even remotely, disturb this watershed. By development, I mean expanded ski resorts, hiking-biking trails, or even increasing the number of picnic sites. Unfortunately people can love a place to death and with a growing population wanting to enjoy the mountains combined with desertification in our future, even limiting the number of people in the canyons may be necessary in the not to distant future.	Holladay,ut	03/05/2015
	See above	Ivins, UT	03/13/2015
	I see no reason to develop any new connection between the Cottonwood canyons and Park City.	Kamas	03/28/2015
	The upper area is, at best, a link between two very important areas of the Wasatch and, at worst, a potential barrier. Securing that land for the public use is crucial.	Kamas	03/04/2015
	Both Cottonwood Canyons are sufficiently developed. Snowbird's recent development of infrastructure on the top of Hidden Peak and the roadway to Sunday Saddle have demonstrated their inability to integrate well with the environment. Brighton and Solitude surely do not reach visitor capacity on most days of the year.	Kamas, Utah	04/27/2015
	I think too much of the land is being designated for protection. I don't like the idea of fees for using our recreation areas. It makes it less available for public enjoyment.	Keams	04/30/2015
	Preservation of the iconic mountains should not have to come from a deal to give away anything to private for profit business interests.	Kihei Hawaii	02/12/2015
	The addition of rail stops would make the canyons much safer, and help with the current gridlock. The preservation of additional acreage is also beneficial to protect the watershed.	Kimball Junction	04/29/2015
	I believe that public interests are already being adequately served by the existing conditions in the cottonwood canyons. It would seem as though the pressure to expand is not coming from the public but rather a limited group of private entities who are trying to grow their operations.	Lahaina, HI	03/16/2015
	Eliminate existing roads, convert one or more to electric rail only.	Layton	02/06/2015
	I am not a skier, and not familiar enough with Cottonwood canyons to comment. I do support options that are less invasive and less permanent in general.	Layton	03/02/2015
	No rail.	Layton	04/12/2015
	Again, ski resorts appear to be the priority as opposed to other user groups.	Layton, UT	03/30/2015
	There is no binding language anywhere. The "process" is very unclear. What are the steps and binding benchmarks necessary to achieve claimed goals	Lebanon,N.H.	03/07/2015
	What happens if goats are not in public's view met?		
	I am struggling with the thought that the mountain accord is going to secure private land for public use. I am a land owner in the top of Cardiff Fork and I really don't like the thought of having my land secured for public use. It is bizarre to me that the public feels that they are owed my land. I went to the meeting at the Holladay library and was told that Mayor Beckman represented me. I don't feel that is the case at all and he wasn't at the meeting so I didn't feel the love for sure. I believe that the public should stay public and the private needs to be respected and not feel that the Public can "Secure" it.	Lehi	04/06/2015
	This would be fantastic!	Lehi	02/04/2015
	I have several concerns/question about the Cottonwood canyons proposal. 1. Will there be guaranteed access easements and trail heads to access the public lands that might otherwise be "fenced off" by the proposed private lands in LCC? Examples are the central Alta trail head to access Flagstaff/Cardiff. Public access is currently allowed across private land but with this proposal it should be guaranteed. 2. I would like to see a much more detailed map of the proposed snowbird expansion into American Fork Canyon. Currently this portion is low resolution and greyed out. Also would the proposed private land in AF canyon be open to new buildings and development? That is not clear on the proposal.	London	02/04/2015
	NO LANES NO TRAINS UP LITTLE COTTONWOOD CANYON.	Logan	03/02/2015
	We all want to see less development and greater preservation of the natural elements of the cottonwood canyons.	Logan	04/05/2015
	This appears to be a good balance of trading public land bordering resorts, but even if resorts gain access/ use they should have to permit public access for recreation. If people want to hike it rather than pay a lift or access fee. Please to not sacrifice any more public land for private enterprises than absolutely necessary to get a big chunk of private land opened up. Keep the backcountry that is close to SLC Open and free. There are plenty of resorts or terrain that can be further developed within resort boundaries.	Logan Utah	04/30/2015
	You plan on having taxpayer pay 3-6 billion dollars for a transit system that will be too expensive for most to ride. You also plan on putting a train or an extra lane right over the water source so you are all full of crap if you think for one second you are looking out for public water resources. You are also putting major transit systems through where many like to hike, bike, and climb so you are not helping out with recreation. No lanes and no trains up Little Cottonwood Canyon.	Logan Utah	03/10/2015
	Not enough information on how public land to become private would be held in preservation. These areas are a staple of Wasatch back country skiing. Resort skiing has lost its appeal to individuals like me. Long lift lines and groomed trails are not my style. Powder gets tracked out so fast the working class doesn't get any unless it snows on the weekend. I play hookie, or get really lucky because it's still snowing in April. The backcountry offers reprieve from all of the above. What about the economy you say, do you have any idea how much a quality tele ski package runs a guy these days.	Logan, Utah	04/30/2015
	I would defer my judgment to what Alta Ski Area determined meets their needs.	Marietta, GA	03/23/2015
	See above. This proposal is very weighted for someone's economic benefit and destroys a key appeal to this area.	Menlo Park, CA and St. Paul, MN	02/11/2015
	It seems to me that the only issue you are truly interested in is development / expansion of recreation which will generate more dollars and tourism! No where does it hint to improve what is here with out changes-fees - or development. This area the Wasatch has been here long before us - why do we think it needs to be change just to promote "growth" ? "growth" that will take away what we now have which is not what we had say 100 years ago. Just Stop before it is too late. kg	Midval, Utah	03/26/2015

<p>About 50% of the plan seems to be pretty good! But Grizzly Gulch MUST be preserved for the public along with the other proposed areas. Additionally, no ridge line trams for transportation, this is an eye sore for our beautiful mountains and a danger to migrating raptors, etc. I like the idea of rain transit through the canyons to reduce automobile traffic but ONLY as long as it can be done with little impact to the environment and safe for wildlife (any possibility of running that train up the canyon underground, maybe directly under the existing roadway?? This would cost more for sure, but would be safer for people and wildlife, cause less damage in the canyons themselves, and would be a solution without the canyons visually looking any different with the train running under the road that is already there.</p>	Midvale	02/15/2015
<p>It doesn't. You are not listening to the backcountry enthusiast. Keep it pristine and how it is. I don't want to go to our wilderness and see more lifts!! I can't afford lift tickets.</p>	Midvale	02/28/2015
<p>It seems that the resorts get exactly what they want, including expansion and increased transit to their areas via tunnels and aerial trams, but the public is only maintaining a small portion of what we already enjoy. Building aerial trams and digging tunnels is not much of a preservation technique if you ask me. Please leave our backcountry alone. No more expansion of ski resorts and no ski links between park city and the cottonwood canyons. That will only benefit ski resorts profit margins and the tourists paying them.</p>	Midvale	04/30/2015
<p>see comments above</p>	Midvale	02/05/2015
<p>I'm completely against any rail systems in the Cottonwood Canyons. Such systems would destroy any sense of wilderness left up these canyons and be detrimental to wildlife within the canyon.</p>	Midvale	04/30/2015
<p>No more growth - It is out of hand now no more Just Stop.</p>	Midvale Ut	04/09/2015
<p>The transit systems proposed could be implemented in stages to measure the use of mass transit by the public to access skiing and hiking areas. Using incentive and disincentives for bus and auto use especially in the Cottonwoods would be one way to gauge the actual usage of mass transit before building an extremely expensive rail system. Limiting parking and charging for it at the Cottonwood ski resorts while expanding the bus system could be tried. A bus system offers flexibility to cover peak times with more frequent service. Adding a 3rd lane for buses - up in the morning, down in the afternoon, would be cheaper than a train. Add avalanche sheds to the Cottonwoods. One issue for summer &amp; winter is that people like to have their gear in their cars for hiking, picnics and skiing. The ski resorts could be encouraged to provide more locker space for this, maybe with a discount for those who some proof of taking the bus up.</p>	Midway	05/01/2015
<p>This plan isn't terribly clear as far as what's being proposed.</p>	Midway & Park City, UT	02/24/2015
<p>Here I would only reiterate my opposition to a rail system in the Cottonwoods or Millcreek, in favor of Hybrid Electric /CNG Bus Rapid Transit in each. The station stops and resort base area expansions seem reasonable, as is the proposal for increased water for snowmaking. The land swaps seem reasonable as well.</p>	Millcreek	05/01/2015
<p>In return for receiving ownership highly valuable public lands for base facilities, the ski areas should transfer to the public all their remaining private inholdings in the Cottonwood Canyons.</p>	Millcreek	05/01/2015
<p>See above re carpooling and bus.</p>	Millcreek	04/10/2015
<p>The scenario is generally good, but with a few exceptions. I do not believe rail transportation is appropriate for Little Cottonwood Canyon. I feel the expanded bus service in both Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons would be a much better alternative in terms of cost, environmental impact, and flexibility. The proposed ski resort expansion into American Fork Canyon is included in the scenario, even though it is outside the Cottonwood Canyons and is not well documented. This expansion should not be included in the scenario unless better documentation is provided for public review.</p>	Millcreek	04/26/2015
<p>You will always have those who insist that anything different from what we do now is a bad solution. Those individuals are short sighted and self serving.</p>	Millcreek	02/24/2015
<p>High speed rail with avalanche snow sheds and tunnels will create a speedy non-intrusive seamless gateway to our Mountain resources accessible to disabled, local and visiting alpine enthusiast year round. It works in Asia and Europe where there are even more people in their mountains now, because of their high speed rail transportation choices.</p>	Millcreek Township	03/16/2015
<p>I am not clear what "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," entails. I think that in exchange for more land we allow the ski resorts to add large scale mountain transit systems then that cover the peaks and add multiple tunnels then maybe it isn't a great deal.</p>	Millcreek Township	05/01/2015
<p>I'm pleased with the private lands proposed to become public but the ski area boundary expansion gives too much away to the ski-companies.</p>	Millcreek Township	05/01/2015
<p>It appears to have strong environmental protections. But I am concerned how well they will hold. Leaving the back country intact is important. Severely limiting development in the mouth of canyons as well as up them is crucial. Having a good plan is one thing. Following through with it is another. Politics always seems to have a way of encroaching on these things.</p>	Millcreek Township	04/09/2015
<p>The ski areas already have the vast majority of upper canyon terrain, especially North-facing terrain. These areas will see increasing demand as our winters warm. This is evident this season, as more &amp; more skiers are forced to the only areas having sufficient snowpack. Therefore I support trading for private in-holdings in these areas and keeping them open/undeveloped for backcountry use. I oppose ski area expansion into Hidden Canyon and lower Silver Fork. Thank you.</p>	Millcreek Township	03/11/2015
<p>While I appreciate the efforts we have had numerous studies over the years. People have contributed. New studies are continuously proposed and at this point people are confused, "didn't I already give my comments last year?", for example. People are skeptical and confused and begin to believe that that is the intent and, "they're going to do what they want anyway". I have done my best to encourage everyone to provide their input no matter what they think. It hasn't been easy. I have stated my major concerns in the Transportation section below. That appears to be a Lynch pin to all of us if the resorts are holding out on a land swap concerning Grizzly, for example. What happened to environmental concerns? Why are we focusing everything on the Central Wasatch? We should be doing more to disperse population pressure away from the CW to other areas around the valley. I am concerned that the conservation efforts are so minimal as compared to the impacts. I was appalled at the trail conditions and lack of consistent maintenance decades ago. It's getting much worse. New trails have been proposed, but there are issues of drought, location, private ownership, and fire. But, I do like the idea if we have a hard process of maintenance and education spelled out with funding and not the piecemeal effort we currently have. The Forest Service and other agencies have done a fine job in past decades, but budgets have been cut to the point where our public lands are in deep trouble. And I don't see our state helping with this. But, I do realize that the land swap may be our best solution to the piecemeal process that has been going on for years in trying to find some resolution to the stopping the sprawl of development. I favor what Save our Canyons has said concerning the land swap if Grizzly is included in public lands. I do not favor excessive disturbance for the sake of some of the transportation scenarios presented.</p>	Millcreek township	04/30/2015
<p>I would like to see less ski area expansion, but this proposal is a reasonable compromise. I do NOT want to the Wasatch mtns. become lift served side country for those unwilling to "earn their turns". I moved here ten years ago from Colorado so that I could enjoy more backcountry skiing without the crowds, access restrictions, snowmobiles, and ridiculous travel to/from on I-70. I do not want to see even more skiers in the ski areas (or backcountry) as the greatest snow on earth is too short lived now. Powder days are more like powder minutes.</p>	Millcreek, UT	04/30/2015
<p>The Cottonwood Canyons Scenario is appropriate if and only if the identified transit alternatives within the Cottonwood Canyons and connecting them to one another, to Park City, and to the Salt Lake Valley are implemented. Without this key component, the proposed resolutions hamper the long-term ability of stakeholders and the public to find sustainable and working solutions.</p>	Millcreek, UT	03/14/2015
<p>The map doesn't show the 416 acres in American Fork - this would be an expansion for Snowbird? This scenario seems a winning proposal for all parties. I like it.</p>	Millcreek, UT	02/11/2015
<p>Again this is an environmental issue not a question of which money making plan will harm the canyons the least. The watershed must be protected period. If you want to increase the use of buses and penalize individual car use to protect the canyons THEN you could allow some minor base expansion. The rational of stating the increased population growth and increased visitation as a reason to come up with plans to get more people up the canyons is unsustainable. The watershed can only handle a finite amount of use and pollution and the canyon experience can only happen with a finite number of visitors. This is not Disneyland! We cannot continually try to find more ways to get more people up the canyons and make more money!</p>	Murray	02/09/2015
<p>I ski mostly at PCMR. But have been in favor of the joining of resorts to open up more back country. So I support well managed land use and transportation considerations. Parking seems to always be an issue with Ski resorts.</p>	Murray	03/12/2015
<p>I think that the re-designation of land is not in the best interest for all recreation groups. I think that taking land from winter backcountry recreationists in order to build a potential tram to connect the cottonwood canyons to Park City is an extremely poor decision. Grizzly gulch should be protected land - free from development.</p>	Murray	04/05/2015
<p>Rapid Transit Buses are clearly the most economically reasonable and environmentally responsible means to address canyon transit issues as trains and tunnel solutions are cost-prohibitive and extremely destructive to the very things that make our local canyon experiences so desired and unique. Any attempt to connect Wasatch Front and back, BCC and LCC would irreparably ruin the experience these each have to offer.</p>	Murray	05/02/2015
<p>This proposal needs to clarify exclusion of areas between Brighton, Solitude and Park City which would cut off the only animal corridor left to wildlife in this area. Research on the needs of wild life unanimously shows that cutting off access corridors dooms entire species to extinction without any hope of retrieval. Trams proposed at various times would do this, development is threatening it, and if we don't designate wildlife corridors road kill will take care of the rest as I personally saw it do in Laguna Niguel, Cal. over 15 years. All that will remain are skunks, rats and other garbage-eaters similar to that scenario if we don't bargain now to preserve what we have left in our high mountains near SLC where I grew up and now reside again.</p>	Murray	04/25/2015
<p>With climate change effects already taking place, it is very important to ensure we have enough clean water for our communities. In addition to the Cottonwood Canyons Scenario, I would also be in favor of more stringent rationing of water, incentives for xeroscaping &gt; wasting water on grass in the desert, paying the amount that our water actually costs, and eliminating/decreasing unnecessary subsidies.</p>	Murray	04/29/2015
<p>Bikes. (see above comment)</p>	Murray, UT	05/01/2015
<p>I like the thought of more protection of the Cottonwoods by land swaps, but would like to know more about the Resorts' plans for base area development.</p>	Murray, UT	04/30/2015
<p>I like the idea of putting more lands in public sector, especially high elevation and ridge lines, where private holder are willing to sell or trade, also reasonable expansion of ski areas.</p>	Murray, Utah	05/01/2015
<p>Maximum conservation. Maximum conservation. Decrease vehicular traffic, and, if necessary, ration human access. Maximum conservation. If we save too much, we can always change our minds later.</p>	Murray, Utah	04/28/2015
<p>We need to acknowledge the private land owner rights that exist in the Canyons while working towards possibly acquiring priority areas for preservation and future use as funding and programs would allow. Public / Private partnerships and conservation easements may have a place to protect areas at a minimal or reasonable cost to us all.</p>	Murray, Utah 84107	04/30/2015
<p>The public already owns 90% of Alta and 50%+ of Snowbird. The public was supposed to be able to access public land (Pagan / Miller Hill etc) when Snowbird opened Mineral Basin, something the resort has basically reneged on. The public interest is not well served by Corporate interests buying up parcels of land on Superior / East Hellgate etc as a bargaining tactic for developing a theme park in the Upper Cottonwoods. The public interest is not well served by a helicopter operation which intersects with the tranquility of the mountains. The public interest is not well served by turning the prime touring terrain in the upper cottonwoods into slack-country - it is bad enough as it is! The resorts already have the prime terrain - so why do they need more? The Corporate interests of the resorts will never cease in their expansion and will do what they can in their OWN interest. There is nothing to do with the public. If they were state owned utilities, then I might accept it, but these are PRIVATE organizations taking what they can. Hey - I've worked on Wall St for 20 years, and believe me, I know it when I see it! The backcountry environment must be preserved, so that in 50 years time, the Wasatch isn't one big interconnected mess of lifts. What other city in world has such amazing mountain terrain close by? Do I want to stand on the twins (salt lake), turn around and see the damn tram dock? or the Pfeiffer, or Lone Peak, or just about anywhere. The resorts have created their own traffic problem. So let them pay for it.</p>	New York	03/03/2015
<p>No aerial access from PC to Alta or Brighton.</p>	North Salt Lake	04/30/2015
<p>What do you mean by a mountain rail system? What happens to American Fork Canyon? I don't like the sound of it.</p>	Ogden	04/16/2015

	<p>Repeated from above.... "Light rail transit(LRT)in exclusive guideway up Little Cottonwood Canyon to the Park City area, including tunnel connections between Alta, Big Cottonwood Canyon and Park City." The foregoing is an encouraging quote from the study. The most "exclusive guideway" would be a master tunnel with Draper as the portal into the "front" with respective branches to access all ski areas and Park City proper. There is Global precedent for such tunneling. Such precedent has been expressed in its very early conceptualization by Master Geologist Leon Hansen ... deceased. There are many of us who believe that a "Super Tunnel" would remediate if not eliminate most environmental concerns and create a cornucopia of economic activity. The father of the Utah Tunnel concept is Leon Hansen. Leon was a Masters degree level geologist who had a lifelong working relationship with the Greater Park City Mining District of Utah. Leon has held senior positions with several large, international, mining enterprises. There exists a repository of proprietary data that confirms the existence of precious metals resources that equal or exceed what have already been recovered from the mining district prior to its closure. Mining was halted decades ago because the metals resources were impacted and impounded by water in the mines. Leon believed that the water in the mines is a resource even more precious than the remaining gold and silver reserves. If the waters are recovered, the metals can also again be recovered. Synopsis: The Utah Tunnel will be a tunnel like many other long, long tunnels. New York-85; Sweden-51; Japan-33; Moscow-25; Madrid-25; Finland-74; LOETSCHBERG-21; Chunnel-31; Utah Tunnel-21. The Utah Tunnel would also be 21 miles long and most like the LOETSCHBERG tunnel. Loetschberg is the longest land tunnel (21Miles) in the world. The Loetschberg tunnel took eight years to build and cost \$3.5 billion. The Loetschberg tunnel transports skiers to Swiss resorts more quickly. The Utah Tunnel would be a multipurpose/multi use resource. It will Convey...Water...Strategic minerals...Tourist transit to world class ski and recreational resorts...and other economic benefits to all of the citizens of Utah. The Utah Tunnel...it can be done...during economically difficult times. The famous symbols of recovery in the West during the Depression included: Hoover Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, The San Francisco Bay Bridge and the Golden Gate Bridge." The Utah Tunnel will develop the following resources: Water...Multi-Millions of gallons from aquifers under and around the Uinta and Wasatch mountains recovered. Strategic minerals. \$0,000,000,000 (at thousands of dollars an ounce) of water locked, precious metals (gold, silver etc.) resources freed!!! Travel to ski and recreational areas... rapid, uncongested, and safe transit from the airport and other points to resort areas developed. Hydro and Geothermal power...other economic benefits... The tunnel from Draper to Park City will pass under three of Utah's most famous ski resorts. The plan is to connect those resorts with the tunnel thereby ensuring safe and rapid transportation from the Salt Lake International Airport to the resorts. It is our understanding that there is an existing railroad right of way from Draper to the Airport. Submitted respectfully by ... Wayne L. Wickizer Wayne L. Wickizer - Chairman Golden Lamp Regional Center, Inc. First National Bank Building 2nd Floor 480 East 400 South, Suite 201 Salt Lake City, UT 84111 United States. chairman@goldenlamp.org Skype = wwickizer1 Business 801-528-3732 Home 801-326-4960 Cell 435-828-0496 Wayne LinkedIn = http://go.glRg2v9d Website = www.goldenlampregionalcenter.com</p>	Ogden and Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	As indicated earlier, I'm opposed to a train up Little Cottonwood. I feel the negative impacts far outweigh any benefits, and that improved transportation could be provided via buses.	Orem	03/15/2015
	do not want trains, trams or more ski lifts polluting the landscape in our mountains and do not support selling off public land to real estate developers	Orem	04/16/2015
	Growth will happen whether we like it or not, but if we can grow in ways that will have little impact on the land , water, and animals, I will support it.	Orem	03/04/2015
	Would not like to see additional land used for transportation or for profit use. Leave some of these unique precious areas accessible by only backcountry use.	orem	05/01/2015
	I like that trails maintenance and connections. Love the water preservation. Love the expansion of wilderness. Love the added safety. PROTECT GRIZZLY GULCH this should become public land and become protected against any development. I ski primarily at Sundance and Alta. I see absolutely no reason for expansion of either resorts. Even in peak season I get enough skiing in and it's already very expensive. In general I am against any expansion of any of the resorts , but looking at the map of ski area expansion and how much land will become permanently protected I could accept this.	Orem Ut	04/23/2015
	With water resources in the west shrinking, it seems unwise at this time to consider adding 2000 hotel rooms in an area where water reserves are questionable. My family would no longer come to visit the area to ski due to the impracticality of transporting all our gear on a train or bus. This would make for a miserable family experience.	Orlando	04/30/2015
	A mountain rail system doesn't seem to be an environmentally sound alternative if you're trying to conserve forested areas from development and want to maintain scenic beauty and watershed. It just comes across as a push for the Interconnect.	Park City	04/11/2015
	A year-round train which will increase usage of the range is not really environmentally friendly.	Park City	04/08/2015
	Again billion dollar tunnels or trains are not environmentally compatible	park city	03/27/2015
	Again it serves us as humans, but some of it should be protected from humans.	Park City	04/30/2015
	All of the land should be protected and preserved. There should be absolutely NO rail or any type of connection between the canyons.	Park City	02/05/2015
	Allowing the ski resort to expand in exchange for placing the private lands described into public ownership is fair and equitable. Yes, do try and get Grizzly Gulch included in this protection.	Park City	05/02/2015
	Anyone who uses these Canyons regularly knows the problem is 3 months a year. And even during those three months, the problem is 3 days a week out of seven (meaning that Mon, Tues, Wed, and Thurs are empty and without traffic...again, you must use these Canyons as I do to get to and from work to understand this). Simple Math - 3 days/week * 4 weeks a month * 3 months/year = 36 days that these canyons have a transportation problem. So on those days, close the canyon and run a bus system. This is what any responsible private entity would do that dealt with such a relatively small problem in the grand scheme of things. Do we honestly think a private corporation would spend 5 million dollars studying a problem 36 days a year...or better yet, would they spend billions of dollars to solve a problem that is predictable and preventable with a reallocation of UTA busses sitting in their barns already?	Park City	03/11/2015
	As a Park City local who has a season pass in LCC, I would love to see a light rail up LCC. The traffic is absolutely awful and buses do not meet the demand. If modeled after ski resorts in Europe like Chamonix, the train could run while avalanche control is being done. This needs to be done correctly however and if there aren't incentives or its not well planned it won't be used as much.	Park City	04/28/2015
	Because the Wasatch Range is so small compared to the Rockies, I am in favor of protecting as much land as we possibly can. I don't support the gondolas and surface transportation between Canyons. Our snowfall is getting leaner with rising temperatures and I believe that the watershed is a critical aspect. I would rather see the land pristine than crisscrossed with a myriad of transportation links are ski lifts.	Park City	04/30/2015
	Cottonwoods are just being set up as a back door highway to park City	Park City	02/08/2015
	<p>Dear board members, Having read though the Mountain accord I have several concerns with this project. The Board I do not think this board is well balanced. I think too many members are representing the private interests of the incorporated Cities as well as the Ski resorts. Thus I am afraid that the input that is being put forth by the citizens will be ignored and I think that the decision for development and connecting Little Cottonwood canyon with Park City has already been made. This reminds me of some advice my dad used to tell me. Never ask a barber if you need a hair cut. The couple seats that represent the people and groups that want to protect what little land is undeveloped does not represent the overwhelming majority who want no new development. So even if the couple of board members object, the majority of the board who represent commerce, will proceed putting these businesses private interests above the public good. The Land Swap. The Mountain accord plan is not doing enough to protect what little untouched nature is left the Wasatch front. The biggest glaring injustice is the proposed land swap. I am not in agreement with the land swap that is being offered especially by Alta lifts. 100 plus acres in the heart of the town of Alta for land of little value. Giving Alta lifts 110 acres for development is appalling. Alta lifts shareholders have been in court for almost three years with the town of Alta trying to develop land that they were able to purchase below market value because they had originally agreed to keep it as open space. Once this land is made private Alta lifts will come back over time maybe 5 years maybe 25 and fight to have it re zoned for higher density and more development. Alta lifts should be asked to come back to the table with the real reasonable offer. Transportation Little Cottonwood Canyon and Big cottonwood Canyon is too narrow and small a canyon to put in a train system without destroying the fragile natural beauty of these canyons. I am aware that representatives have flown over to Europe to look at their train systems in Grindelwald and Wengen as well as ZERMATT. Having spent approximately two months a year in the Alps for the last 11 plus years in winter ski season as well as in the summer. I know these areas quite well. And these canyons are much wider and larger areas than The Wasatch canyons. These Wasatch canyons roads are much more comparable to the canyon where Saas-Fee ski resort is located. Saas-Fee is in a much narrower dead end canyon which is actually a side canyon on the way up to ZERMATT. Saas-Fee uses a bus system and is also a car free town that has a pay for parking structure for the entire town at the base of the village. Verbier is also one of the largest ski resorts in Switzerland and is at the top of a dead end road and also does not have a train that goes up to the village. I am concerned that the committee that went to visit the train in Grindelwald and Zermatt did not look at the entire transportation system. But were simply dazzled by both the cog trains and the car free villages. One Wasatch. All humans want freedom. This is why we go to the mountains. When people go into nature they find true happiness and joy. When people can get away from any sign of man (development) They realize they do not need material possessions to make them happy. Buildings developments and giant mansions do not bring a sense of nature. Or peace and happiness. They can create feelings of Envy, Jealousy, Anger and resentment. One look at several of the ski resorts shows there has been no restraint to preserve this feeling of nature. These mega resort developments resemble shopping malls where the ski runs have become isles in a giant mall. Where everyone has ski in and ski out condos yet no one ever gets the peaceful joy and awe of being in nature but just inside some fancy development. One Wasatch's vision to create a European style ski experience is mistaken. The Wasatch is not the Alps. The Wasatch is one ridge line with over 50,000 people accessing less than 10 square miles. The Alps is vast. When you look out at the mountain vistas while skiing in the Alps it looks the same as it had 5000 years ago, nothing has changed for over 5000 years! This is what gives people a great sense of freedom and happiness throughout the Alps. This will not be achieved by creating a giant resort development that goes over into Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon from Park city and Deer Valley through bonanza flats. I hope you will take in to account that once developed this precious resource will be gone forever. I appreciate your time and consideration in reading my email. Sincerely Kevin Boyle President KUHL Kevin@kuhl.com</p>	Park City	04/29/2015
	Digging tunnels to bring rail service to park city is a bad idea. If they want to bring rail service to Park City they should come up Parleys to Kimball Junction and use bus service to proceed into town. Rail service up Cottonwood Canyons will not help the economy of Park City and we will lose the reasons we live in Park City.	PARK CITY	04/30/2015
	Environmental impact again is the problem here. Need to add shuttles or an expanded bus system.	Park City	04/27/2015
	Expansion of developed ski areas into Grizzly Gulch should not be allowed.	Park City	03/11/2015
	For profit prosperity at the cost of public tax payer funds is ludicrous.	Park City	05/01/2015
	From looking at the maps of the land swaps, and considering that the proposal calls for construction of a train line at taxpayers' expense, I do not believe that the public interest is served by this scenario.	Park City	02/28/2015
	Have there been individuals interested in selling off their private land?	Park City	02/05/2015
	How is providing more water to the ski areas and making more land available for private development serving the PUBLIC'S interests? Seems more like its serving the ski areas' and developer's interests. I would favor buying the ski area lands outright and placing them in the national forest, using eminent domain if necessary. It really is in the public's interest to have no more development in the central Wasatch. Where is additional water for snowmaking going to come from? If global warming is really here, then maybe the ski areas will just have to live with a shorter season, losing water just like the rest of Utahns.	Park City	03/16/2015
	<p>I am not sure where Mtn Accord is headed. We moved to Park City in 1977 when times were not easy. Since then the City and County has had to defend itself in Court and out against scams, crazy development schemes and crazier state tax. challenges called equalization. One way or another we usually pay a premium to receive the same or inferior product / service. Trip charges are a given for most deliveries and services 30 miles to Park City by companies who think nothing of running 40 miles up to Ogden from SLC no extra charge. I don't know where it is yet but somewhere in the accord will be an opportunity for promoters to try to capitalize on what they feel are easy pickens. As I am sure this response reads like a rant and it should. We have been treated like a red headed step child going back to the first discovery of Silver in our hills. Will any of this Accord improve our lifestyles. Will anything in the accord help fund our schools or provide funding for entry level employees. Is there a provision in the Accord that protects the forests and open lands around our town. Every one I talk to about the Accord process is certain we are going to get the shaft I hope they are wrong, it seems like an honest effort to plan the future for the Wasatch</p>	park city	03/28/2015
	I am opposed to any expansion of any ski area. And where do you propose to get the additional water for snowmaking, given that we are obviously in a drought situation?	Park City	04/30/2015
	I believe the land issues in the canyons need to be resolved and this seems reasonable. Do it now!!	Park City	04/29/2015
	I did not see the 416 acres of American Fork canyon given to the ski resorts on the map. Since this is twice the area of the 210 in Big Cottonwood, should be shown. When one is up on the Bullion divide between Baldy and Sugarloaf, the destruction of the canyon below for the ski resorts is pretty obvious. Also, how will the "public to private" land transfer happen at the base of the ski resorts? The Sun Valley people (Earl Holding's private empire) did a nice job stealing public lands from the people for the Utah Olympics so he could build his second ski resort. How will that fraud be avoided this time?	Park City	03/28/2015

	I do not favor a Cottonwood Canyons/Park city connection via train/tunnel. I believe that if we must connect the Cottonwood Canyons to Park City in order to achieve more federally protected lands, it should be via aerial connection with no egress on the ridge lines. The aerial connection would be available to non skiers and would be a transportation alternative. I favor land swaps for more protection and expanded wilderness and increased protection of our watersheds. I favor BRT for all three Canyons (CCs and Parleys). I think cars need to be disallowed in the Cottonwood Canyons with either bus or rail connection up to the end points (Brighton/Alta) in both. Obviously special permitted vehicles allowed. As for Park City, BRT with a dedicated bus lane and more regulation imposed on vehicle traffic in Park City's Old Town area and ski resorts. Park and ride lots at Kimball Junction and Quinns junction with regular shuttle or aerial connections to Park City. Expeditious bus/transit connection from SLC airport to Park City/and Cottonwood Canyons. As for wilderness designation - as much as possible! Trail connections through the Central Wasatch except in expanded wilderness areas I support. NO road connection via Guardsman Pass	Park City	05/02/2015
	I don't think we need to expand lift served areas anymore. It only serves those who can afford a ticket and a private company that can charge whatever. I am definitely against more water for snowmaking. This is a desert. Why are we doing this?	Park City	03/14/2015
	I have a lot of faith in technology to solve some of these problems in ways that are less impacting. We need 10-20 years at least before these technologies being designed and tested today make revolutionary changes that will allow us to make much smarter decisions on issues like this.	Park City	03/27/2015
	I like to think that the cottonwood canyons are as developed as they should be. These canyons provide the Srt mo g water for the salt lake valley and should be protected. Any further development or ski area expansion is unnecessary and would only benefit those who would profit from it.	Park city	02/06/2015
	I need a lot more information on this.	Park City	02/08/2015
	I really question why specifically the proposal chooses to include a connector from Park City to the Cottonwoods. This is also a lot to stomach and is causing all of the wrong type of attention and criticism and allows the program to be easily misunderstood. My vote would be to actually eliminate this or very clearly start calling this "phase III" or something that identifies it as requires further information. This is the pill that makes it not digestible and to be compared with One Wasatch or other initiatives. For example, see this very well informed article. Things along these lines are all that people are talking about: <a href="http://www.adventure-journal.com/2015/02/will-this-be-americas-largest-ski-area-a-closer-look-at-utahs-mountain-accord/">http://www.adventure-journal.com/2015/02/will-this-be-americas-largest-ski-area-a-closer-look-at-utahs-mountain-accord/</a>	Park City	02/25/2015
	I wonder about the viability of connecting resorts and will the average person take the time to ride lifts and ski/snowboard from pc to snowbird and back. someone may do it once for the novelty but unless there is a dependable way to move back and forth that doesnt involve lifts and sking/snowboarding, i dont see a big benefit.	Park City	02/06/2015
	Improve bus frequency in cottonwood canyons rather than adding a new mode of transportation. Delete all type of trains from plan. They are too noisy, expensive and destroy visual aesthetics.	Park city	04/30/2015
	Improving access to the existing recreation areas via mass transit should be emphasized. Trains and tunnels may not provide the most cost efficient access. Development in the canyons should be limited to renovation of existing improvements. No more condos, hotels, or residential housing should be allowed. Trail systems should be improved to connect resort and to reduce current environmental impacts. We should not have "unique traveler experience" to increase visitation as a goal. We don't need Disneyland in the canyons. Make the canyons a mecca for human powered recreation.	Park City	04/25/2015
	Increased development, more water use, more water use, more water use. Where is this water going to magically come from??? How does that somehow align with responsible environmental (and ultimately human quality of life) protection?	Park City	04/30/2015
	Making Upper cottonwoods public land is a great idea. The extra snow making grants may be a bit of a concern in the long term future - hopefully these grants will be reviewed annually to suit the needs of the public consumption.	Park City	02/04/2015
	need alignment with OneWasatch and per such would like to see more transit by ski lifts (chairs, gondolas, funiculars, etc.) and less pavement/cars - more recreation not more recreational vehicles	park city	04/09/2015
	Need information pursuant to transportation for ingress and egress for the Cottonwoods (train, bus, car, tram, etc.) with specific respect to how those issues impact the Wasatch Back, I-80, State Highway 40, 224 and 248.	Park City	03/17/2015
	No transit should be allowed beyond what is present today over the Wasatch Crest.	Park City	05/01/2015
	Parts of the land exchange are very good, but the impacts of the Snowbird proposed land exchange in Utah County and the Solitude portion on the land exchange are concerning. Also, protection of Grizzly Gulch is essential.	Park City	04/30/2015
	Please protect the backcountry assets such as Grizzly Gulch and others designated by Wasatch Alliance.	Park City	05/02/2015
	preserving wild /un-mechanized areas in central wasatch for human-powered recreation is my number one goal. these areas are a unique resource because of their proximity to a large population base. environmental quality, wild life habitat, water shed also important. limit any lcc and bcc ski area expansion except in cases where land trades make sense. eliminate heli ski operations by buying out concession eliminate snow mobiles in lcc and bcc, especially cardiff fork	Park City	03/15/2015
	Protecting the land and environment are key but can't be at the expense of limiting recreation to the area. This is an amazing place to recreate, this is a good plan to continue ample recreate but with less impact. More trails and connections between each of the canyons is so important. Development of the ski areas to connect to each other involving other ways to connect besides cars is a must.	Park City	02/25/2015
	See my comments above on whether the rail system into LCC is financially realistic within a reasonable timeframe. If not, then the plan comes apart.	Park City	02/18/2015
	ski report expansion into Hidden Canyon and Silver should not be allowed. The ski resorts have already been over expanded.	Park City	03/15/2015
	Station stops on a mountain-rail system are a terrible idea. This would carve up the mountain, disturb the natural land, and change the view. We should use already existing infrastructure like access into the canyon and improve service up the canyon using public transportation and shuttles. Access to Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons should be closed to all motorized vehicles except for residents, campers, and those with disabilities during the winter. The canyons are clogged with unnecessary traffic. Parking structures should be built at the mouth of each canyon with bus service leaving each stop every 10 minutes. Different stops should be set aside for each resort. For example, for those going to Alta, a dedicated Alta bus should leave the mouth of the canyon so that everyone on board doesn't need to spend time going through the Snowbird stops. The same is true for service coming down the mountain. The Alta bus goes directly to the parking garage avoiding unnecessary stops at Snowbird. This will help in queuing the people going to only the destination they need to go. Buses will not be overcrowded with co-mingling passengers for different resorts. For people to get out of their cars and use public transportation, it has to work. Public transportation must be timely and reliable. No one wants to wait 20 mins for a bus to arrive on a powder day. It's just not going to happen. Providing public transportation that works will take thousands of cars off the road and decrease tons of CO2 pollution every year.	Park City	02/05/2015
	The Cottonwood Canyons Scenario serves ski area business interests (how to get more people to the resorts more quickly, more development in LCC, more watershed funneled to private use and more precious water for snowmaking, expanding ski area...) but not public land preservation, respect for wildlife, water management or environmental (long term land preservation/wilderness) interests.	Park City	05/01/2015
	The idea of buying private land and protecting it for public use is good. I would like to see the plan expanded to the Park City ridge/line.	Park City	05/01/2015
	The impacts and the cost would be enormous. Building rail lines up either of both Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons would be an incredibly expensive and destructive process.	Park City	03/15/2015
	The most important part of the Cottonwood Canyons is to maintain the scenic beauty and the supply of water for the Salt Lake Valley. There should be NO connecting Tunnel between the Cottonwoods and the areas East to the Park City Area. This is an extremely poor idea. The Alta basins should be maintained as open space and not additional building should be instituted, other than expanding the ski areas for the resort. The North Faces should be left as they are now! Additionally there is no reason the connect these resorts with the Park City resorts. Light rail up the canyon has been talked about for many years and should have been done but should be done NOW.	Park City	04/30/2015
	The protection of the areas is important, however, I fear the concept of connecting the canyons and increasing traffic.	Park City	04/29/2015
	The scenario lends weight to the troublesome belief that the light rail system is integral to the Blueprint, hence the public focus and concern on the light rail. I would like to see some compelling analysis that explains how further development and increase in skier days for the Wasatch resorts could be achieved in a sustainable manner.	Park City	03/26/2015
	The ski areas give little and support trains up Cottonwood Canyons? Remove the trains from your plan or remove the transportation component. Ban all cars and use buses like Zion National Park.	PARK CITY	02/25/2015
	the suggestion of a connection from Cottonwood Canyons are toward Park City via a tunnel is not reasonable. Way too much disturbance of soil and rock structures. Our "rock" is mostly sandstone, not like the Alps at all. Tunnels might have made sense decades ago in connection Italy to Switzerland, they do not make sense for Utah now. Think of years of construction and the effect it will have on the Salt Lake watershed. Take the tunnel idea of the table all together. It's been sucking all of the air from other options. Light rail could be installed above the soil, without huge earth movement machines disturbing the areas.	park city	03/15/2015
	The wording of this question is leading and sluty	Park City	04/30/2015
	This would be great if the transportation plan was built on an efficient high speed lift system and bus and/or rail. The proposed tunnels are a HUGE negative!!!	Park City	05/01/2015
	Transportation issues in the Cottonwoods can be better addressed with more efficient, environmentally friendly buses and disincentives for auto traffic (alternative D).	Park City	04/26/2015
	Useless and a massive waste of taxpayer money. No one will use it and it destroys the very resource this group claims it wishes to protect.	Park City	02/04/2015
	Water. It is the issue we must all consider first as we look at developing - and repairing damage done by those who didn't know better or were criminally short-sighted.	Park City	04/30/2015
	We have got to reduce vehicular traffic. Period	Park City	04/27/2015
	We need to preserve the natural landscapes of upper LCC and BCC for future generations. Grizzly Gulch must be included in the proposed land swap. This area is an iconic place for human powered recreation as well as a resource of water for the SLC valley. We need to protect current non developed open spaces, and need to address these issues sooner than later. In regards to ski area expansion, any of the ski areas expanding their area on public land should establish an uphill recreational route inside their boundary to compensate for lost access. We need to focus new development in currently developed areas not expanding into open space.	Park City	05/02/2015
	We need to STOP all future development, not facilitate it.	Park City	04/07/2015
	We should not spare more water for snowmaking, or increase the size of ski resorts.	Park City	02/05/2015
	While I can certainly support some ski area land-swapping for additional federal protection, I believe that it's imperative to leave room to connect all of the ski areas so that it is possible to ski between them! One Wasatch should certainly be a part of this plan. After all, what is more environmentally sensitive than being able to ski between the existing resorts? Train? No! A fleet of Busses? No! Use the European model, and simply allow for skiing between all of the resorts. It's not that complicated!	Park City	02/24/2015
	With climate change I doubt we should be focusing so much on ski area expansion. I would like to see more land protected.	Park City	05/02/2015
	year around access needs to be encouraged and affordable for the UT public.	Park City	03/28/2015
	Grizzly Gulch should NOT be developed!	Park City	03/07/2015
	Having more of the wilderness owned by ski companies would inevitably create another Colorado, with big corporations and their high-paid lawyers being able to find loopholes to develop more obtain water rights.	park city	05/01/2015
	Love the plan to acquire old private property rights and extend the existing Wilderness Area (I supported this back in the 70's and 80's) all the way to the Wasatch Back population frontier. Not thrilled with the development of American Fork given Snowbird's track record but frankly it is not heavily used and if it means protecting the core Wasatch by expanding into upper American Fork then that may be needed. Would like to see more explicit discussion about limiting housing/hotel development in the core Wasatch area. Again look at Snowbird/Empire Pass/Montage (also White Pine Canyon in Park City lost to the public) as losing situations for the mountains - big areas consumed for private gain. Much of the transport issue is caused by developing housing/hotels in the higher, hard to reach areas. If the ski areas are to be expanded then limit to only winter time recreation and not building development. There was a good comment in the Mountain Accord about world class viewsheds which is true. The Hudson Valley in New York state helped pioneer this concept so that classic views painted by the American landscape artists 150 years ago still exist today. Having hotels/condo sitting in the middle of a pristine mountain valley is a very bad idea which will punish the citizens for the next 100+ years.	Park City	02/24/2015
	I am in favor of the Cottonwood Canyons proposal	Park City Ut 84098	03/17/2015
	I support the idea of setting aside land and protecting it from future development. I don't support building a multi billion dollar transportation system. it will only make overcrowding worse. "If you build it they will come". it will ruin the character of park city. it will overwhelm the wasatch with too many people.	park city utah	03/16/2015
	5.Do NOT create a new "corridor" between the Wasatch front and Park City via LCC, BCC, and one or more tunnels. 6.Consider opening Guardsman Pass during the winter months, but ONLY with public transportation, emergency traffic, and special permit holders. Note that the majority of the MA transportation group supports some usage of Guardsman pass. 7.Do NOT build railroads into LCC and BCC. Instead, build upon the existing infrastructure and create incentives/disincentives to reduce the use of private cars to move skiers, other recreational traffic, and resort employees to the canyon resorts.	Park City, UT	04/08/2015
	The idea sounds grand but the reality may be untenable. Climate change may alter the viability of ski resorts, and expansion will only increase the monies spent on keeping a skiable snow depth, grooming and avalanche control.	Park City, UT	04/30/2015
	there should be no road and/or tunnel connections to Park City	Park City, UT	04/30/2015

	Too expensive.	Park City, Utah	05/02/2015
	if these lands are protected and made public and the water quality can be protected it is a very good plan. The resorts should be "stewards of the land" and if this prevents future development of million dollar homes that sit empty most of the year in the Cottonwood it would be a public +. Also really like the idea of a light rail system - traffic up and down little and big cottonwood canyons is a legitimate concern and has negative impacts on the environment in the canyons	Philadelphia	02/06/2015
	snowbird should not expand especially not into American Fork Canyon do not allow the 416 race expansion into Utah County or any additional enhancements by Snowbird keep AF canyon clear of resorts	Pleasant Grove	04/30/2015
	Good idea.	Provo	02/06/2015
	The beauty of this land should be preserved. Many people travel here and move here for the natural scenery, as I have done so myself.	Provo	03/15/2015
	Expensive development plans for ski resorts are short-sighted and focus on specific commercial exploitation.	Provo, UT	02/09/2015
	I simply cannot get behind the idea of a tunnel and especially aerial transit aka tram or lift connections between Alta, Brighton, and PCMR. This is a horrible idea, because it would seriously degrade the wilderness experience in the upper Cottonwoods. That area is our public safe-haven from urbanization. We don't want to see it anywhere near Grizzly Gulch, Emma Ridge, Scott's Pass, or Guardsman's Pass. Guardsman's Pass should remain gated in the winter. I know this is a hard line to draw, but it's absolutely essential that we protect these areas from roads or mass transit. For one, the mere presence of the infrastructure would crush the opportunity for a wilderness experience - which is the most important thing the Wasatch has to offer (along with clean water). Secondly, the forms of recreation we desperately need to encourage - for the sake of our reputation, image, and economy - would suffer. What is now a mountain-biking and hiking paradise would be turned into an amusement-park-style sightseeing trip (a la Snowbird tram, currently) and the area that is now a backcountry ski-touring mecca would be reduced to a side- or slack-country area. This leaves the real ski-tourers, bikers, and hikers (and our numbers are growing) with nowhere to go but another, less-urban range to recreate. When it comes to growing the economy and building the "urban-mountain" brand, we really need to limit the amount of infrastructure we build up there. Otherwise, the "mountain" element (read: wild, natural, secluded, adventure) will be totally lost. The people Salt Lake needs to attract (read: young, educated, skilled, well-to-do tourists or working residents) will stay in Boulder.	Provo, UT	02/06/2015
	I would like I see all to proposed private parcels turned into protected public lands.	Richfield	03/10/2015
	The less development of a great natural resource like the Wasatch the better.	Richfield	04/08/2015
	See above.	Riverton	03/14/2015
	Sounds like a good plan.	Riverton	04/30/2015
	Don't appreciate the proposal for increasing dwellings in the two areas.	Salt Lake	04/26/2015
	I am a backcountry skier, hiker, fisherman and general muscle-powered user of the Wasatch. I encourage all planning that comes from this process, with particular attention to the following issues- 1) Water quality preservation is of utmost importance. 2) Transportation by car should be limited, bus service improved, LCC particularly should be examined for possible shuttling, train service, or similar alternatives. 3) No tunnels through the mountains, no gondola, ski lift or mechanized transport should be considered. 4) No further ski resort expansion should be allowed, particularly in Grizzly Gulch, Flagstaff, White Pine, American Fork side of the divide. 5) Overall enviro concerns must take precedence over developers' and resorts' needs. Chris Proctor 1464 East Emerson Ave. Salt Lake City, UT 84105 801.466.1905	Salt Lake	04/17/2015
	I am quite concerned with the proposed land swap. This could really lead to much more development around alta, which I find not desirable. Both adding the water and owning the base area makes this area much more attractive to developers. The land that is obtained for this does not seem to prevent development in that area, although I am not an expert in these topics. I do observe that it has not been developed to date so there is likely a reason. And moving it to being under the control of the public, if that means the Utah legislature, is not necessarily helpful. Thank you, Ed DiBella	Salt Lake	04/19/2015
	I applaud Snowbird for their restraint and favor protecting the areas identified in the plan. Bravo, good work.	Salt Lake	04/30/2015
	I like the agreement with the ski areas to preserve and protect some of the upper lands in their ownership.	Salt Lake	03/25/2015
	I wish Grizzly Gulch in its entirety and Hidden Canyon to be protected from ski area expansion. I also do not support the addition of 108 units to the town of Alta. These will undoubtedly mean more residents (who can afford such luxury) and increase the perception that skiing and ski areas are for those of higher incomes. I do not like the development based ski model and feel it will, in the long term, reduce local desire to access ski resorts. In that same note, I also do not support the linking of the ski resorts together. Though it makes for great marketing it will be degraded to the status of a novelty. We have the greatest snow and best resorts in the nation. Each resort in of itself can sustain a full day of skiing. With an unsure economy and skiing and boarding becoming so expensive I feel it is better to preserve what we have and improve our existing infrastructure rather than expand.	Salt Lake	05/01/2015
	I would prefer to preserve Honeycomb canyon and Grizzly Gulch.	Salt Lake	04/15/2015
	I would support land swaps with resorts in order to permanently protect places like Grizzly Gulch which is the last easily human powered accessible north facing area above 9000 feet left in the Central Wasatch. I know some of it is private land and some of it public. I support property owners rights but if Alta wants to expand there let them give up public Forest Service land on which they currently operate. How about Albion Basin? I would support a lift expansion in Honeycomb Canyon for Solitude providing it does not actually extend the range that inbound skiers are able to go. No opening up Silver Fork to Solitude skiers. In other words the lift will not begin lower than the Honeycomb Return lift thus effectively opening up the East Bowl of Silver Fork and west side of lower Silver Fork to side country access. Look at where the avalanche deaths are increasing and you'll see it's mostly coming from people leaving resorts and getting in trouble.	Salt Lake	04/30/2015
	The only thing being considered is benefit to the ski resorts. Aren't there many more things that should be in there for consideration?	Salt Lake	05/01/2015
	The only way expanded water consumption, real estate development, and construction of a rail line could possibly serve public interests is if the water consumption is offset with greatly expanded conservation efforts, there is free public access to said real estate development, and the rail line replaces vehicular traffic during operational hours. Other than the token land use protections (which are far too minimal) the only aspect of this plan that has any merit is the rail line. I could see a system similar to the Zion National Park shuttle buses benefiting the public by decreasing traffic and ultimately capping the number of users. Roads could re-open to vehicular traffic during times when the trains are non-operational.	Salt Lake	04/30/2015
	The ski areas should not be able to expand. They have enough land to serve their purpose. The "manifest destiny" style expansion that we are seeing with them is not sustainable. The boundaries should be frozen and the resorts should focus on becoming more environmentally-friendly instead of expanding and ruining more wilderness.	Salt Lake	05/01/2015
	no extra lanes and no trains up Little Cottonwood Canyon.	Salt lake city	03/10/2015
	-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. -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. -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. -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).	Salt Lake City	03/01/2015
	-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 with their mere shopping, dining and man-made recreation opportunities (once designed in an indoor ice rink). We need to speak out loudly and often to let the committee 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. -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. 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. -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 have to pay to enter the town of Alta? -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. The plan does not address this issue; it says the Grizzly area is still under negotiation. -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 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 and admirers of Alta have fought for decades to protect. -The plan for the area 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. -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	Salt Lake City	03/11/2015
	.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	1) Not enough land in public ownership, still too much owned/managed exclusively by ski resorts. 2) Too much water allowed for hotel expansion and snow making. We should not waste our precious water to make snow that will only continue to melt faster as the climate warms 3) Encourages expanded ski sprawl, which is bad for the character and environment of the Wasatch. If the goal is to have rapid transit, everyone can stay down in the valley & take trains to the resorts. The mountains are too fragile.	Salt Lake City	03/17/2015
	2. The only way rail makes sense in the Cottonwoods is if driving private cars is limited to land owners in the canyon or there is a hefty \$5 fee (ala Millcreek). 3. The land swaps seem fair to me, but there needs to be zoning restrictions so that a Brighton Hotel (for instance) cannot be 20 floors tall. This way we retain as much of the traditional character of the place as we can. But I do feel that if Grizzly Gulch isn't part of the agreement, then there should be no land swaps at all. 4. I very much oppose any type of transportation linking the ski resorts that would put any kind of transki towers over the ridges between big and little cottonwood canyon. The only place it makes sense to link the canyons is brighton/PC through hidden canyon. UNLESS we are talking about tunnels. 5. I think it important to establish legitimate trailheads for some tenuous situations, such as Heughs canyon, for instance. 6. Mountain Accord should seriously look at stopping motorized access in Mineral Fork. There is motorized access for almost the entire northern and southern Wasatch. While the number of hikers increases, the amount of land set aside for hiking is not getting any bigger. Mineral Fork seems like the best place to do that. 7. Make sure the new parking lot at Wasatch Mountain State Park is not so close to the cabins up there. Cabin owners don't want it, and recreationists also don't want to see cabins the either. There are alternative locations for that (abnormally large) parking lot further down-canyon that make more sense.	Salt lake City	04/30/2015
	A mountain rail system would further negatively impact the riparian ecosystem. The canyon is well served by bus transportation.	Salt Lake City	04/26/2015
	A two page PDF is also incredibly inadequate to provide actionable information for the public! I've heard from the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance that Alta would like to expand into Grizzly Gulch, or up towards Tuscarora, yet this is merely indicated as "under consideration" in the Scenario. This would make a big difference in how well or poorly I view this scenario! Of course it is a good thing that there will be some transfers of land to public ownership, but that does not mean we have to give up land to the ski areas. They can't expand forever, the Wasatch has a finite amount of land, so why not live with their current boundaries? They have already taken a lot of good backcountry ski terrain, just look at all the RIP entries in the "Wasatch Tours" guidebooks.	Salt Lake City	03/17/2015
	again, destruction of the canyon via railroad line construction is a travesty and only benefits the money interests. No way is this a good solution.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015

Again, my concern is the placement of the rail system. If spring/summer/fall recreation areas to climbers and hikers are compromised in order to provide this transportation option to skiers in the winter, I think we are missing the mark. Especially, as summer recreation increases to these areas as climbing becomes more popular, we would be sacrificing 3 seasons worth of economic development in the area in addition to losing valuable natural assets. If the rail were placed in the center of the road (and the road widened slightly), traffic could be limited to local traffic only during winter months which would greatly reduce the environmental damage.	Salt Lake City	02/11/2015
Again, the proposal is geared toward expansion of the ski industry at the expense of wilderness.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
All that happens here is that the ski areas gain land, and less is set aside for public use.	Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
All the proposed Blueprint will accomplish is putting MORE people (= more impact) in the upper Cottonwood Canyons.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
Although I am in favor of better transportation, I do not believe that additional ski runs are necessary. The truth is that the ski industry is dwindling so additional areas are not necessary.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
Although I'm concerned about the transfer of public lands at Alta base to private interests, if such a transfer is necessary in order to transfer the then I can accept that as a compromise. My primary interest is that private lands in the Flagstaff, Grizzly Gulch, Superior, Cardiff etc. areas be transferred to public ownership. The transfer to private ownership of land and benefits listed as #1, 3, 4, & 5 are acceptable in exchange. Although I have some misgivings about the transfer of the public lands at Alta base to private ownership if this transfer is required in order to finalize the deal I can accept it.	salt lake city	04/30/2015
An adequate water supply should be a sine qua non. We cannot exist without water but this also needs to include more conservation. The desire to connect the ski resorts makes no sense to me and uses land that can better be utilized for water and for a backcountry experience. When people ski they almost always stay for the day at one resort, or at most venture out to an adjacent resort. If one wishes to try all the resorts then stay in Salt Lake and choose a different destination each day.	Salt Lake City	02/10/2015
An aerial transport link would diminish the aesthetic and natural qualities of the Wasatch canyons. Other methods must be prioritized.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
An Unpardonable Sin The quality and quantity of the snow, steep beautiful terrain, and easy access make the skiing/hiding experience in the Wasatch Mountains (backcountry and resort) world class. This is a special place. But the quality of the skiing experience in the central Wasatch is in jeopardy. I see the proposals for expansion by the resorts and Ski Utah's "One Wasatch" simply as marketing tools to attract more tourists to our world-class resorts. As a native Utah, Snowbird season pass holder, and frequent backcountry skier, I don't believe these proposals for expansion are in our community's best interest. The Alta and Snowbird ski resorts cannot accommodate more skiers/snowboarders without further compromising the already crowded skiing experience that exists there. Who wants to stand in longer and longer lines while waiting to ride the greatest snow on earth? Not only are the lines insufferably long, with larger and larger crowds the snow gets "skied out" faster and faster. Is this the kind of experience Ski Utah and the ski resorts want for their customers? At the same time, the backcountry cannot afford to be annexed any more by the resorts without compromising the riding experience there. The ski industry in Utah has an insatiable appetite for expansion and development at the moment and the expense of wilderness experience. Both the resorts and the backcountry/wilderness can co-exist harmoniously but it's time for permanent hard lines to be drawn. Tunnels and aerial trams connecting the Cottonwood Canyons and Park City would desecrate what little is left of a wilderness/backcountry experience that exists in the glorious but fragile central Wasatch range. Why connect the resorts? If I want to ski at Alta, I go to Alta. If I want to ski at Deer Valley, I go to Deer Valley. The concept of an interconnect is just a sightseeing gimmick for tourists. No local would dream of wasting quality ski time riding lifts between resorts. Don't ruin what makes this place special and unique just for more money. It's true, transportation challenges in BCC and LCC do need to be addressed. More efficient mass transit makes sense, but let's not reinvent the wheel with complicated expensive projects that permanently deface and deform more of this glorious little mountain range in which we are so fortunate to live.	Salt Lake City	04/16/2015
Any additional access to little cottonwood with damage the canyon. Remove the road and switch to rail only access.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
Any final agreement needs to provide permanent protection of all land outside the ski resort boundaries.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
As a civil engineer with a masters in transportation, I see the idea of rail in the cottonwoods as totally inappropriate! It will be awkward to access with limited benefits. Plus it will be exceedingly expensive and inflict ongoing environmental damage. Interconnect the resorts via gondola/tram make much more sense.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
As a resident of little cottonwood canyon I live with the traffic. I would rather put up with the traffic, as annoying as it is, then to see this canyon destroyed by you. It is a waste of time and money to put a train in. If it costs \$18 for a rowing trip on a bus how much is a train going to cost? It's more cost effective for a person to drive their own personal vehicle up to the resorts not to mention more convenient.	Salt Lake City	02/12/2015
As an active backcountry skier as well as a 20 year long Alta and Snowbird passholder I like the compromise proposed. However, Alta needs to give up Grizzly Gulch and work a land exchange with the forest service for Rocky Point to Brighton. This exchange would keep backcountry skiers happy for easy access and allow Alta a true "ski" connection with Brighton versus the proposed tram connection with Solitude. Yes, backcountry will be lost at Rocky Point, but in order to ski this area now, one has to cross through Alta or Brighton to access it anyway.	Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
As an avid backcountry skier, this proposal meets the consensus view that the ski areas should not greatly expand their boundaries. This compromise allows greater development at ski areas in roads (not chair lifts). Much support for this.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
As an avid cyclist, I would like to encourage the maintenance of safe roadways for cyclists.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
As growth continues along the Wasatch front, more and more interest will be focused upon the usage of this unique area. I feel that allotting planned growth, and working towards preserving this area in a sustainable manner can go hand in hand, and as of now the Mountain Accord has provided what I believe is the most responsible plan proposed to date.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
As long as the new private land N of Alta allows for ski-touring access, I think it could be ok.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
As the Blueprint stands, it is too vague regarding many topics. Although designed at a high-level, without details how can one support this proposed plan. For example, Grizzly Gulch's status and land exchange appears to be in flux, and should be clearly indicated before the Blueprint moves forward.	Salt Lake City	03/06/2015
At the rate we are going, if we do not protect some of the required lands now they will be either gone or destroyed by the time our children will have the opportunity to use them.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
Being able to take over private lands and place in public/protected designation is great. Letting Solitude expand into Silver Fork however is not ideal.	Salt Lake City	02/24/2015
Believe the Scenario limits future growth and area access as being exclusionary based on general statements in the draft. Exclusionary based on anticipated users. Is public land and should be open and accessible to all. Better buses and headways could solve the problems not a rail.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
By and large, the Cottonwood Canyons Scenario is provides a reasonable summary of future plans, but details are remarkably scarce. As mentioned above, the scenario should explicitly declare that protection of the natural environment and an intact ecosystem is the number one priority in any future scenario, all other purposes being secondary thereto.	Salt Lake City	04/02/2015
Charge entry fees to use canyon and put towards better transportation. I'm all for the land swap as snowbird will give up all the terrain from Superior to Grizzly gulch for back country.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
Concerned that Public Lands Under Consideration To Become Private would greatly change the iconic looks of the ski resorts. How would zoning and commercial/private building be controlled at bases of Alta, Snowbird, Brighton and Solitude? Especially at Alta and preserving the historic draw that it retains.	salt lake city	04/26/2015
Connecting the 4 cottonwood canyon resorts should be priority number one. Connecting Brighton to Alta and Solitude to Alta (we want to avoid choke points of course) would be the best thing one could do for the area for skiing. I think the plan to have a rail system up little cottonwood canyon that could run without worry of avalanche and snow conditions is absolutely great.	Salt Lake City	02/10/2015
Currently there are too many conflicting parts for an educated individual to believe that all of these areas will be able to come to an agreement that satisfies all of the issues listed above and mentioned in the Cottonwood Canyons Scenario. There is conflict between goals of each of the four main areas the Mountain Accord has presented. I believe people are looking at the area in which they are a stakeholder (recreation, environment, transportation, or economy) and failing to examine how all goals could be achieved, because they simply cannot.	Salt Lake City	03/13/2015
Does not take into account changing trends in land use (growth of backcountry vs resorts)	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
Don't encroach on the current beauty of the Little Cottonwood Trail. The stream area and the current trail are unique. Please make public, exactly where the light rail is intended to run. The detail of the location of the rail when it comes to maintaining the stream area of the lower portion of Little Cottonwood Canyon. Also, what will happen to the Little Cottonwood Trail? If the trail is intended to be changed, please make this information available for comment.	Salt Lake City	04/26/2015
Encroach as little as possible. Allow parking by the roadside.	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
Even though the proposed train connection would be less obtrusive, it is going to be outrageously expensive. As we seemed to be conned into this by the major ski resorts. I believe it would be important for them to have more skin in the game. Meaning, they should be responsible for a good portion of the cost as they and the state would be the prime beneficiaries. I do not want to be responsible for paying for this through higher property taxes. Jack up the hotel taxes, restaurant taxes, ski lift passes, but please don't put the burden onto property owners. As we are aware, the system group members who supposedly had some say in this, have not been thrilled with the outcome, I hope the burden of paying for this will not be hoisted upon all residents of Utah as well. This whole process started off with good intentions, with the systems groups narrowing down the details for the executive committee. But completely fell off track by the ski resort land owners and the state pursuing greater tourism trumping the process and making the ultimate decision.	Salt Lake City	03/01/2015
Expansion and interconnection of ski resorts is not in any long term public interest. It is only in the interest of the rich few who will stand to benefit financially from it.	Salt Lake City	02/10/2015
Feel there needs to be an environmental impact listing or grading noted on each of the various Transit Mode Descriptions so the public can see which transit mode has the least long term impact.	Salt Lake City	02/25/2015
For this deal to be acceptable, Grizzly Gulch must be preserved. I would like to know more about the ski area interests in American Fork and how this will impact American Fork Canyon.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
good to preserve watershed, but unclear why anything has to go private. I advocate for PUBLIC lands expansion, not private	Salt Lake City	04/23/2015
Good, but don't want additional culinary water for 208 units to be used for developing Albion Basin. Existing resort lodges, etc can be improved or expanded after further review.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
Great compromise to preserve undeveloped area, avoid stringing lifts and gondolas everywhere, and concentrating development (including new transit infrastructure) in already developed areas. I'm not in favor of increasing protection status on USFS if it restricts recreational use such as mountain biking. I agree with the concept of limiting development in currently undeveloped areas, but we don't limit recreational modes to do this. As an expert in water quality, I don't see any connection between uses such as mountain biking and watershed protection.	Salt Lake City	03/15/2015
Grizzly Gulch is a deal breaker unless it is protected. "Under consideration" may as well be built out with lifts and restaurants. Protect it.	salt lake city	05/01/2015
Grizzly gulch must go public to make this deal worth it.	Salt Lake City	02/07/2015
Grizzly Gulch needs to be protected. Ski resorts need to be confined to their existing boundaries. No Interconnect or anything like it--this idea has been floated for forty years, and every time it gets rejected, the ski industry, like a persistent toddler comes back and asks again. I am cynical that this entire process is just another attempt to do so. If it is a serious attempt to develop a plan for the future, it needs to provide a final NO for connecting the ski resorts in the Front and the Back, whether by lift, gondola, tunnel, or road.	salt lake city	04/28/2015
Grizzly Gulch should absolutely be included in the category of preserved land. Not only is Grizzly Gulch an incredible area for easily accessible backcountry terrain, it is also a pristine area to hike in the summer and already very accessible from Alta and Solitude, there is no reason they need to continue expanding boundaries into Grizzly Gulch. Another red flag in the Cottonwood Canyons scenario is the proposal to give resorts more water for snow making. Doesn't this seem just backwards and laughable that we are expanding resorts at a time when they are also increasing the amount of snow making they need to do each year? Dogs aren't even allowed in the Cottonwood Canyons to protect our water sheds, and yet we are letting those water sheds get developed and siphoning off water to resorts to make more snow?	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
High capacity transit to the mouth of canyons and to Park City is a good idea but in the canyon is a really poor idea. For automotive disincentives - try disallowing access to anything but a shuttle in the canyon.	SALT LAKE CITY	02/04/2015
Higher density development at the base of ski areas in exchange for protection of the higher areas is a good trade-off and should be considered.	Salt Lake City	04/08/2015
How do we have enough water for snow making? If there isn't enough snow, then certain lifts should be closed. We need to deal with the reality of our water situation.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
How much water exactly for snowmaking and the Alta area? Salt Lake City is throwing up apartments like crazy. Is it prepared to meet this additional demand on water while at the same time granting additional water usage from their water source? Once again is the Accord accounting for global warming and it's affect on Utah's winters and that affect on Salt Lake City's water supply. As a resident I hope Salt Lake City is aggressively protecting its interests in regards to the health of its water supply.	Salt Lake City	03/26/2015
I agree with all of the proposed actions to protect the watershed, preserve backcountry terrain and everything else Mountain Accord and Save our Canyons is doing! Thank you!!!	salt lake city	04/15/2015
I agree with preventing resort expansion and keeping them in check. I like much of the proposal in that aspect. Acquiring whatever private land that is possible is not a bad idea. Again the transportation aspect really misses the mark.	Salt Lake City	03/06/2015

	I am a bit concerned about conceding Hidden Canyon and the expansion into Silver Fork. Many of the private lands being turned over are already untenable for further development and their use as a bargaining chip is, in my opinion, overstated.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I am against any ski resort expansion. Ski resort expansion takes away from non motorized outdoor recreationalist. Areas that would provide a wilderness experience.	Salt Lake City	03/11/2015
	I am both a resort skier and a BC skier. But the most important aspect of the planning to me needs to be preservation of the backcountry ski terrain. I am very much in favor of the land transfers to preserve Grizzly Gulch and Flagstaff Peak for BC ski usage. I believe the interconnect between Alta and Brighton should be in the Catherine's Pass area, not via Twin Lakes Pass or anywhere else in Grizzly Gulch.	Salt Lake City	04/14/2015
	I am concerned about the "linking" of all these areas if it includes what will become high traffic areas requiring more leveling/flattening of the countryside to accommodate traffic. I am concerned proposed "tunnels" may disrupt the landscape considerably. It is important to preserve the land from development, so I support the exchange of private to public, and feel the minimal expansion of the ski resorts as proposed is acceptable.	Salt Lake City	04/26/2015
	I am concerned about the impacts of tunneling on water supply and quality in Cottonwood Canyons watershed. I urge Mountain Accord to study this issue carefully and if the decision is to proceed with tunneling, to ensure maximum possible environmental protection of the watershed in the design, construction and maintenance of the tunnels.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I am for the plan as long as ski resort expansion is kept in check.	Salt Lake City	04/14/2015
	I am happy to see some areas of these mountains being protected, such as Mount Superior. I think that it's a good compromise of land preservation to try to limit development at the bases of the ski resorts. I enjoy skiing and value it's importance for the local economy, but I want to see more done to prevent the resorts, like Snowbird, from expanding their territory into pristine wilderness areas. I think this aspect should be stressed a bit more. I don't want to see giant buildings constructed in the upper mountainous areas.	Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
	I am not happy about further development and expansion of ski resorts, especially development that is unrelated to mountains, such as waterslides and roller coasters. This is not Laqoon! Our climate is becoming drier and warmer. With less snow, resorts may need to shrink.	Salt Lake City	04/08/2015
	I am not in favor of ski resort expansion, at their bases or especially into the back-country.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I am opposed to any further ski area expansion, categorically. The ski industries own numbers show a steady decline in ski area users, so how is a land grab for more public land justified? Likewise, direct and indirect revenues associated with skier/snowboarder attendance is a minuscule fraction of Utah state revenue, so there is little to no financial benefit to the general public to hand over yet more public lands. Every previous expansion has permanently eliminated access and use of backcountry terrain on public lands. Meanwhile, backcountry winter recreation has been experiencing a dramatic and steady increase, and the Wasatch Range is recognized worldwide for its unique combination of great snow and convenient backcountry access - that is, until the resorts take that legacy away. The top of the cottonwood canyons are already very congested, and options for backcountry access in the winter is already extremely limited. Even small expansions like Grizzly Gulch or lower Silver fork would completely block public access to significant terrain.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I am opposed to any ski resort expansion - especially Brighton's efforts to expand toward 10,420'. However, the land swaps could make this worthwhile, so long as no additional expansion is allowed with additional public-private land swaps being part of the deal.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I am opposed to the proposed transfers of forest service land to private ownership. At least some of the areas are the only public parking areas that allow public access to forest service land. If these are turned over to private ownership they will eventually be used for development and what parking remains will likely be limited to guests at the resorts or become very expensive parking, as is occurring in Park City now that Vail has taken over the ski area. I am also very concerned about the impact on Salt Lake's water supply. Water used for snow making comes back to us as run off in the summer. Water used to support development becomes sewage. Given the current drought and the likelihood of climate change from global warming I don't think we can afford any additional development in Big Cottonwood Canyon or Little Cottonwood Canyon.	Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
	I appreciate seeing minimal ski area expansion as I feel that there are plenty of opportunities for downhill ski recreation in the canyons. What I would like to see considered is better connectivity of summer trails (hiking, mt. biking) between the Park City side and the Cottonwoods/Milcreek/Parley's side. Currently there are only a handful of connectors at Guardsman and Scotts Pass and at the Canyons. It'd be nice to for example continue the Wasatch Crest north towards Lambs Canyon and Parley's summit.	Salt Lake City	04/22/2015
	I appreciate the Blueprint's desire to meet everybody's needs here. I understand that it's a difficult task. That said, I cannot support what is effectively the selling of public infrastructure to the ski resorts. Having those upper elevation lands in the public domain is a great idea, and I'm all for it. But I'm not in support of doing so if that means that the four ski areas get to dictate public policy in a way that effectively delivers more tourists to their doorstep every day.	Salt Lake City	04/14/2015
	I believe it's a good deal for the ski resorts and gives them what they need to grow, while still being limited.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I believe that a train compromise is a backwards and invasive strategy for fixing the public transit issues we face.	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015
	I believe that any plan that does not include Grizzly Gulch should not be considered. In return I believe that a tunnel to connect alta with other resorts is perfectly reasonable and preferred. Protecting the area from Grizzly to Mt Superior is preferable over any other option. If possible the expansion of the twin peaks wilderness areas west of this area should just be expanded. As well as expansion of the lone peak wilderness area to include the white pine area. If pavement and maintenance of the guardsmans pass is a potential it should be considered also.	Salt Lake City	04/22/2015
	I can support modest expansion of base-area management for the ski resorts in L. Cottonwood Canyon, but any expansion of ski permit boundaries needs to be kept to a minimum.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	I cannot support any more land being taken from backcountry users and given to resorts, who value money over the preservation of the environment. There's been enough land degradation and commercialization by the resorts, no need to more of that when statistics show skier visits by resorts have been declining, whereas backcountry skiing has been experiencing double-digit growth year-over-year. Giving more land to ski resorts essentially takes away resources from a thriving sport (backcountry riding) and gives them to a declining sport (resort riding).	Salt Lake City	02/15/2015
	I can't imagine how terrible the mountain experience would become with a train. Maybe it's the least bad option (it's hard to know what the ski resorts would plan to do with their land parcels otherwise, and housing developments would also be bad), but holy cow. People love it here and move here for the "skiing", not the ski "resorts". In fact, resorts and their invasive luxuries (like a train) are a huge turn-off and will drive people (myself included) out of the state. I love Utah. Don't change it.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	I did not see any mention of increased regulation or removal of the heli-ski operation. Additional water for 100+ home in LCC but how about the existing "dry cabins" that already exist? Will they get water?	Salt Lake City	03/17/2015
	I dislike the American Fork/Snowbird privatization. Also, I think Grizzly Gulch should definitely be public.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	I do not feel land swaps for more base area development are a good idea UNLESS the land being protected is buildable and the swap will PREVENT development. Unbuildable land should not be swapped in order to allow more building to occur. Water resources in the canyons are limited and I believe that base area development needs to be limited to protect the watershed.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I do not support the scenario, as it does not establish permanent wilderness designation for the Grizzly Gulch area.	Salt Lake City	02/25/2015
	I do support preservation of these lands. I do not feel that building transit would preserve the land. This would be harmful for the wildlife and ecosystems. I also have concerns about how it would affect our water supply. I would support more buses being added on the current roads. I would also support a toll fee to increase use of public transportation.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	I don't like the idea of public lands moving into private ownership. It always seems like the "public" gets taken advantage of. I'm not in favor of more development! We don't need MORE people coming to Utah to ski, as our winter air is bad enough already! The protected growth for Utah is already alarming without always trying to increase "economic development" for every business sector in the state. The quality of life along the Wasatch Front is already declining because of mass of people living here. I, for one, am looking at moving because it's too crowded already.	Salt Lake City	03/15/2015
	I don't like the idea of trains going up the canyon as it would ruin the peace and serenity of the landscape. I find myself going up Grizzly Gulch atleast 10-15 times a winter and it would be a shame to lose Grizzly Gulch, Catharines Pass, Wolverine Cirque.	Salt Lake City	02/19/2015
	I don't think it is wise to try to accommodate the tourist that may be here for a week or two. this at the sacrifice of people that live here all year around. We can't eat money. More than anything else in this world, we need more serenity...then possibly we come up with new "out of the box" heads. I do thank you for the work you have done.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I don't think the recommendations incorporate enough protections about how extended drought will impact the Canyons. How will all aspects of the Canyon survive the lack of water that may be a realistic scenario. What additional restrictions on growth and usage of water need to be imposed in case the conditions of recent years are actually the norm and not the exception? I feel the current recommendations are catering to the expansionist needs/thinking of the commercial interests in the canyon to the disadvantage of conservation and sustainability.	Salt Lake City	04/13/2015
	I don't understand how a train system up any of our canyons is going to help the economy. It may help the economy of the owners of the ski resorts, but as for me an electrical engineer I won't see one dime. I do see a negative impact on back country access for skiing as well as a negative impact on climbing. Not to mention the environmental scars left behind due to the amount of construction this will take. This seems the precursor for the resorts in getting their wish for a linked up ski system. This system will greatly impact back country ski access as well as chew up more environment in the construction. In times where climate changes are slowing down revenue for resorts maybe these same resorts should be looking for more innovative ways of generating income through out the year. As opposed spending billions of dollars of someone elses money so they can get an extra 1000 people on their slopes during a powder day.	Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
	I enjoy riding my bike up the cottonwood canyon roads, and placing a mountain rail system will make riding more dangerous and less enjoyable as our wilderness will now be packed with human made trains and noise pollution from them. Expanding the alta resort also takes away from recreation for our snowboarders and back-country splitboarders, so it does not serve the best interest of the public as you will be limiting access to many recreaters...	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I favor optimizing bus service to all the ski resorts. I am opposed to a light rail system going up Little Cottonwood Canyon and I am strongly opposed to a tunnel system between Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons. I would favor a long gondola up Little Cottonwood Canyon. This would be a terrific tourist experience and would decrease auto traffic in the Canyon. A Gondola might work in Big Cottonwood Canyon also, although I recognize that it would have to be even longer. The easiest way to connect the Park City areas with Big Cottonwood Canyon would be to improve Guardsman Pass and keep it open in the winter.	Salt Lake City	03/11/2015
	I find the land swap very equitable and beneficial for all parties involved. I think that the land parcels proposed for public acquisition make sense for both backcountry recreation and for the preservation of our watershed and mountain environment. I think that the parcels offered in return are in places where they will be of most use and benefit to the towns and resorts.	Salt Lake City	03/18/2015
	I have had this land trade scenario explained to me by both Carl Fischer and Buck Swaney and it still does not make sense to me. Why does Solitude want that land so bad? Do we really need Snowbird to expand way into American Fork Canyon? Are we really doing the right move by allowing Alta and Snowbird to expand at the base of their resorts? I love how the wording "marketable transit" was used in this document, who are you really marketing? Locals are not going to use all of this new land being developed? Locals are the ones buying season tickets and are coming back year after year? Will someone really need to be able to access all of this ski area in one day? Probably not. One cannot ski all of the "connected" ski areas in one day. That is one way for the resorts to market itself and make more money. Though I know that we can't just not trade something, I really hope that the least amount of impact is made with this land trade. I would hate to look out Hidden Peak or Sugarloaf and see nothing but ski lifts going through this area, no matter how much I love to ski.	Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
	I have no problem with the proposed ski area expansions to Hidden Canyon and lower Silver Fork though I feel strongly that Grizzly Gulch should be off the table as an expansion for Alta as it would remove a great, safe backcountry ski area (and would make the Twin Lakes pass area almost inaccessible for backcountry skiers also). I also support the proposal for the increased base area footprints and snowmaking. I support the construction of avalanche sheds where needed in the canyons.	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015
	I like snow, but I prefer to have water for drinking.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	I like that parts of Mt. Superior and Flagstaff Mountain, White Pine and Days Fork would all be permanently protected from future roller coasters, condo developments or ski areas expansion...but I just can't tolerate and further expansion of existing ski resorts. If we don't have colder winters it would be a waste of investors' money anyway. Has greed blinded them? Any wild space is irreplaceable and invaluable. Why risk losing even another square meter to development?	Salt Lake City	04/23/2015
	I like the idea of controlling access to LCC. I do recreate often at odd hours. For example, like many others, I often ski at 6 AM. I also mountain bike at similar times. If there is only train or bus access, it would be great if it could be extended to serve those of us with similar time frames. Or, cars could be allowed on off hours.	Salt Lake City	03/07/2015
	I like the idea of swapping land strategically to mutual benefit of the public and the ski resort land owners. However, I don't feel like I know enough about the provisions of the proposed land tracts to be swapped to give a full endorsement.	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
	I like the proposal to convert some ski area and private holdings back to the public (Grizzly Gulch, Superior, etc). What is not addressed is a complete end to ski area expansion once a resolution is reached. In the past, ski areas have been insatiable in their quest for expansion. Will this finally be the end to further ski area expansion? Can this be stated in the plan? What has also not been discussed is that there is quite a bit of private land available in the Big and Little...these holdings are wild cards and could radically change the amount of development that we could see in the canyons. How does the Accord account for these private holdings? Although the Accord is not proposing a system of gondolas and trams connecting the canyons, I would like to state my opposition to this idea.	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015
	I like the regional trail network. I like swapping land in Grizzly and the southside of the canyon with the resorts, except for expansion by Alta toward Mt. Tuscarora.	Salt Lake City	04/28/2015

I like this. I am a ski resort user and a back country user (mostly for summer biking and backpacking). I didn't realize that much of the land I use is actually private property. I support allowing more concentrated development at the resorts in exchange for the more land to become public and protected (assuming we can still hike and hike on those public lands).	Salt Lake City	02/09/2015
I love the idea of acquiring more public land in the Cottonwood Canyons from private landowners, but only if it is then reserved for conservation, not development.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
I must admit I don't agree with the idea of a tram going from park city to solitude. I fear that that will cause that area to lose asseptic appeal to the back country area. As an avid back country skier and mountain biker I don't like the idea of there being a tram in this area and/or a tunnel going through the mountain. Construction in this area would be detrimental to the land and ecosystem, let alone the terrain in this area. I think the tunnel with a transit system is a better idea and more efficient system then a tram would be, if I had to pick one. I think a transit in little cottonwood canyon is a good idea, but I also do fear how that could affect the appeal of hiking and climbing in the canyon during the summer but something must be done to stop all the driving and traffic in the canyon.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
I oppose any development or expansion into Grizzly Gulch and oppose the large expansion to the town of Alta base facilities.	Salt Lake City	03/02/2015
I oppose linking the canyons.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
I say undecided, because it depends. The Cottonwood Canyons Scenario states that Grizzly Gulch is only under consideration. That alone makes me fearful of Alta planning to expand into it. If Grizzly Gulch is not protected, and more ski lifts go in there, we the locals and backcountry enthusiasts have lost. I don't have much of a problem with the proposed Snowbird/Brighton/Solitude expansions. Other than the possibility of Grizzly Gulch not being protected, I also dislike the fact that the resorts would get more water for snowmaking. Obviously they "need" it because of the past few really bad years for snow. Those bad snowpacks have also hurt Salt Lake and the surrounding areas. This isn't an issue confined to the Wasatch Range. Snowpacks have been shrinking all over the place, and a lot of places are now in a state of continued drought. Using more of our water to create snow is only going to hurt that.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
I see this as a trade (bribe) for railroads/tunnels/ski resort development. The resorts are doing fine financially. They don't need to grow any more. They already sit in a priceless location with the greatest snow on earth. They already take a huge toll on the "veiwshed", watershed, and mountain ecosystem. They displace many, many other activities. Their footprint is large enough already and includes huge chunks of public USFS land that they have co-opted and altered for their own purposes. I do see the advantage of wresting some of their private lands away from them to protect them from development. But this development can be blocked in other ways. Perhaps these resort lands outside of the resort boundaries can be swapped for the very ample public USFS lands they "borrow" within their existing boundaries. That makes more sense to me.	Salt Lake City	02/10/2015
I ski Alta and have had issues getting up or down from there only on few occasions. The idea of a dedicated bus lane is not as bad as the proposed train and tunnels. However, if bus and cars are allowed at the same time, the purpose of the bus would be defeated. There is a bus now and everyone still drives. Let's face it, winter recreation goes with driving; it is often perceived as far less tedious and troublesome due to clothing and gear. Add larger families or families with children, and the bus is completely out. Lastly, the issue of parking remains. Where would we park in order to get up the canyons? The train idea is just laughable, not just because of money but also natural resources, preservation and even convenience (liking to the trax line in Sandy?!!)	Salt Lake City	03/26/2015
I support enabling the ski resorts to utilize more water for snowmaking. I do not support a mountain-rail system as I feel the return on investment would be quite low. The bus system that is currently in place could be improved by having direct and more frequent routes to major trailheads and resorts. It needs be efficient and less expensive than driving a car. 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. I am supportive of Brighton's formal adoption of Hidden Canyon, provided any chairlift reaches back towards the Great Western chairlift. I am supportive of increased connectivity between Brighton and Solitude in the SolBright area.	Salt Lake City	03/10/2015
I think a rail system, a tram, and tunnels are overkill. a rail system is concerning for the cost, the funds necessary to build, the fire hazard from the track and or the fuel needed, tunnels seem excessive as skiing at one resort per day seems to be more than enough. the same is true for moving people from one resort to another with a tram. I don't think the demand would warrant it, and it changes the back country experience irreparably. bikers, back country skiers, hikers don't need it. the ability to move many people are all limited with any of these mechanisms. natural gas buses would seem more plausible, as there can be many of them at once, and they arrive at different times.	salt lake city	04/27/2015
I think that land anywhere near the wilderness areas should be acquired and serve as buffers from any development and increasingly intensive human intrusion. Development at Alta's base should be on a most limited footprint, use few resources, and try to be nearly invisible against the natural backdrop. I think that connecting Alta to Brighton and Park City would be a big mistake, and destructive to the character of Alta and Brighton.	Salt Lake City	04/27/2015
I think the land swaps are generally a good thing, as long as the expanded development has a hard and strong boundary to prevent further development in the future. The lines need to be drawn and NOT be malleable for future development.	Salt Lake City	02/04/2015
I think the land swaps make a lot of sense and I support them fully.	Salt Lake City	04/27/2015
I think the transit options, like trains and trams, to connect Big & Little Cottonwood Canyons and BCC and Park City cannot be built with negatively impacting the natural ecosystem to a high degree. Use of these trains or trams to connect these canyons will continue to harm the ecosystem over time and diminish any gains in any other parts of the environment. Other than these intrusive, unnecessary trains, the plan is to solid.	salt lake city	05/01/2015
I think there's a serious disconnect between the propoganda of the initiative "clean water" "preserve environment" meant to shield the reality that the actions proposed are 100% counter to the main alleged tenants of the plan.	Salt Lake City	04/14/2015
I think you'll know better how well it serves the public interests once you get the survey results back. As far as how it does serving my interests, I would say that through some things in serves them well and from others not as well but no detail are being asked here.	Salt Lake City	02/18/2015
I urge you to put environmental protection first and avoid further construction at all costs. Resorts have already built up enough, it's time for back-country to get its fair share in wilderness designation. We shouldn't have to exchange land-for-land to protect some then let resorts destroy some. There must be some alternative to this plan, like advocating mass transit rather than imposing more construction. It would be in ski resorts' best interest to advocate mass transit up the canyon in order to obtain better air quality in the long run, so skiers and employees alike can enjoy the benefits of clean air/mass transit.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
I vehemently oppose winter access being extended through the Cottonwood Canyons to Park City (see previous statement).	Salt Lake City	02/06/2015
I very much applaud the proposals to move those private lands to Public ownership. I strongly oppose the proposals of developing the Flagstaff/Emma ridge areas for a lift. A rails system up the canyon would be great. I still would like to know how that would be financed.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
I want to be able to ski with chairlift access between all Cottonwood Canyon ski resorts. My out of town guests would PAY into the local economy if that were an option. I would pay money into the local economy if that were an option. Money that could otherwise go to alternate solutions for protecting the Wasatch. You are fighting the inevitable and driving money out of Utah if you resist this plan.	salt lake city	04/29/2015
I would like to know how much the different groups are represented in the Cottonwood Canyons Scenario. I would like to see a equal representation of all groups.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
I would support land swaps with resorts in order to permanently protect places like Grizzly Gulch which is the last easily human powered accessible north facing area above 9000 feet left in the Central Wasatch. I know some of it is private land and some of it public. I support property owners rights but if Alta wants to expand there let them give up public Forest Service land on which they currently operate. How about Albion Basin? I would support a lift expansion in Honeycomb Canyon for Solitude providing it does not actually extend the range that inbound skiers are able to go. No opening up Silver Fork to Solitude skiers. In other words the lift will not begin lower than the Honeycomb Return lift thus effectively opening up the East Bowl of Silver Fork and west side of lower Silver Fork to side country access. Look at where the avalanche deaths are increasing and you'll see it's mostly coming from people leaving resorts and getting in trouble.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
I'd be lying if I said I was happy about the proposed development on the "to become" private lands as a result of the land exchanges—but I guess it's worth it to get the current private lands that are not developed protected as protected "backcountry". Additionally, I do want to see Grizzly Gulch procured as public land and to remain undeveloped, as well as I hope the Brighton Lakes area—(i.e. Lake Mary, Lake Martha, Lake Catherine, Lake Catherine, Twin Lakes—as well as the Wolverine Cirque) all remain as high-quality backcountry. Please no new lifts or aerial tramways into these areas.	Salt Lake City	02/15/2015
If employees were REQUIRED to carpool or take the bus as part of their employment contract, a huge part of the traffic congestion could be eliminated.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
I'm a frequent canyons recreator (estimate 3-5 visits per week) and believe that the mountain accord should be developed to optimize backcountry/non-ski area use and watershed protection. I understand that the ski areas want room for additional development, but I believe it should be done within their existing footprints and in areas that have poor access from the SL side and correspondingly little pressure from non-resort visitors. I have lived along the Wasatch Front for about 2 decades and have watched the crowds increase a great deal in the canyons during this time. While the ski resorts draw tourists and their dollars to the state, I believe that the backcountry (winter skiing and summer hiking/biking) areas draw more permanent visitors that can contribute a great deal to other aspects of the local economy. Having access to relatively wild areas is a major component to a good quality of life. People have and will continue to move here just to have this. Compared to the relatively unimpacted areas next to them, ski areas are pretty noticeably less wild and less aesthetic. This is true in the summer and the winter. The Emma Ridgeline and Grizzly Gulch areas have such easy hiking and skiing access that they should be spared from ski resort development. If Snowbird and Alta need to expand, they should be allowed to do so to the south and East into the Mineral/Dry Fork areas that few Wasatch Front users ever visit. Brighton could expand toward Park City, and Solitude could expand out toward Brighton a little bit I suppose. As for transportation, it seems like a no-brainer to optimize the canyons bus system during the ski season, and eventually during the summer months. Sure, we will have to construct some large parking structures near the canyon mouths, but you would have to do this with a train also. It seems like you could run a lot more buses for the \$2 billion it would cost to build a train up LCC. By the way, the train idea seems crazy. Wouldn't it require taking out portions of the cherished Quarry Trail, relatively pristine areas near LCC creek, and maybe some designated wilderness. And other than the "cool" factor, I can't see how it would be better than taking the bus.	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015
I'm a season pass holder and resort skier every year, but I am of the opinion that there are a lot of large ski resorts in our little mountain range already and they do not need to expand ski terrain. Snowbird and Alta are already so large that even on a busy day, once you get past traffic and parking to get to the resort, I feel they have a lot of capacity still. And that's just two of our 7 resorts! Increasing population will increase resort skier numbers - but it will also increase backcountry users. The balance we have right now is decent, and we should restrain resort growth into places like Grizzly Gulch. When possible, let's increase the amount of alpine terrain under protection. To that end, I am fine with increasing base area development via the proposed land swaps. Where there is already development, expanding it won't be as noticeable as adding new chairlifts, etc. Just make sure to preserve wildlife corridors near the streams and to allow crossing the canyons.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
I'm concerned with opening our watershed to more people. We are experiencing a decline in our water supply from the global changes in our environment and we should be very careful with our precious water resource.	Salt lake city	04/26/2015
I'm not certain there is a true balance between conservation, economy, tourism, etc. but that may be the reality of development/progress. The efforts made to include additional conservation/lands is commendable, but there should be more, and additional protection for existing lands proposed. Grizzly Gulch should be included in the lands set aside for conservation.	Salt Lake City	03/09/2015
I'm not sure there are a lot of facts presented to comment here. The Grizzly area is "under consideration". The area under Superior is probably undevelopable due to avalanche hazard so that may not mean too much. The area under Flagstaff has been talked about by Alta so that could be worth something if it was turned over to public. Otherwise, the remaining private enclaves may not be developable anyhow. Having said all that, I see the plan as "neutral" because I see it as improvements and economic development that wont overtake backcountry usage areas.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
I'm sorry I don't have time to look at this in detail right now.	SALT LAKE CITY	05/01/2015
I'm unsure of how much this serves public interests, but I'm sure it serves many private interests.	Salt Lake City	03/01/2015
Improved bus service, definitely. Trains and tunnels? Definitely not. All the rail solutions seem primarily driven by the perceived need to emulate the Alps. We are not not should we try to be. On the up side, protecting various lands by putting them into development, whilst permitting more resort development in certain key areas is a wise compromise. Resorts need to accommodate their expected traffic by improving/expanding their base infrastructure. New lifts in new areas are really not needed, however.	Salt Lake City	04/16/2015
Individual ski areas have different management styles and should be managed individually. The 258 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 will impact the landscape and character of Alta. The Scenario does not acknowledge Alta's planned lift into the Grizzly Gulch.	Salt Lake City	02/06/2015
Is this agreement dependent on the new transit system connecting the canyons to each other and Park City?	Salt Lake City	02/12/2015
Is this agreement dependent on the new transit system connecting the canyons to each other and Park City?	Salt Lake City	02/12/2015

It appears members of the Mountain Accord, including Salt Lake City are willing to trade future water contracts to a very select few, those who down hill ski or can afford multimillion-dollar condos at the base of a resort. Before the Mountain Accord selects who gets to develop in the canyon a thoroughly open and transparent public process must occur. Looking at the map of areas the Mountain Accord is touting as "protecting," one is private land at White Pine Reservoir. Since this land is surrounded by public land without any access and currently stores water for Sandy City and South Despain Extension it is protected land and water. The Mountain Accord is being disingenuous touting this as a "win-win" solution. This trade accomplishes nothing towards protecting water for our future, in fact it seems simply a nod to the ski industry and Forest Service. How well should a swap like this go over to those who are already leery of the Forest Service's water motives? The Forest Service is in several of our congressional delegates crosshairs since their recent attempt to revise their ground water directive drew criticism throughout the west. This trade will be heavily scrutinized by all of the stakeholders and is nowhere near being a sure thing. By trading land, which is already being protected, even if "de facto," the Mountain Accord is not getting a fair trade. The Mountain Accord is premature in advertising this proposal as a compromise between the ski areas and others in protecting our watersheds when the area around Grizzly Gulch is simply "under consideration." Before these proposals can move forward, we must understand completely what is being offered. The Mountain Accord's so called "blueprint" seems more like a draft, certainly not ready to be taken through the federal National Environmental Policy Act Environmental Impact Statement process. Swapping out our heritage for promises of wilderness or federally protected land is premature. Our congressional delegation would block ANY attempts to designate more land in the Wasatch as wilderness or impose further federal protections. The Utah State Legislature is actively fighting to wrestle control of federal lands, I am to believe the Mountain Accord has found the magic path to make all of these land swaps happen? This proposal needs much more fleshing out before it can be called a "blueprint."	Salt Lake City	04/28/2015
it continues the destruction of American Fork and pollutes more water	Salt Lake City	04/28/2015
It doesn't. It is about tourism and not our water supply.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
It identifies, rather than solves, the critical issue of Grizzly Gulch. It gives away the Meadow Chutes. These are the two most critical ski-resort / back-country issues. Both are unambiguous win/lose issues. They are both well used now, and the resorts would like to take them away from their current (local) use to be sold to (out-of-state) downhill skiers. How is this any kind of compromise? So kudos for at least listing them, but demerits for leaving them unsolved and then presenting this as a "blueprint". On the other hand, increasing ski-resort base facilities could help make the resorts more viable without hurting other users. I'm ok with that.	Salt Lake City	04/20/2015
It is hard to imagine that trading essentially unused private land for currently public land that would go on to be developed would provide a benefit to the environment.	Salt Lake City	03/02/2015
It is not in the public's best interest to invest a bunch of money in a "marketable" rail system when we already have the seed of marketable public transit ready to flourish in busses and shuttles. A rail system would go up and down the canyon with no more frequency than a bus could achieve from the canyon head. Why not increase frequency of bus runs, invest in cleaner-fueled vehicles, and give the shuttle system a canyon-tailored makeover with space for mountain bikes, ski/snowboarding equipment, and rider's camping gear. Utah would be the novel site of sustainable recreation if it was possible for people to camp without driving through! A complete new little Free, low-to-no emission canyon fleet would surpass marketable expectations for canyon transit. It'd save the money and physical energy/material needed to develop a rail, and challenge UTA to bolster their own services by creating transit competition. Please also consider the noise a rail system would bring in the canyon. Diverting personal automobile traffic onto a rail system serves our air quality and energy-reducing needs for the long run, but Little Cottonwood Canyon is one of the last spaces for quietude and escape from city noise. Light-rails are great and they best serve populations using it to make it to work, schools, homes, grocery stores, appointments etc. There is great potential in building light-rails on Foothill through Wasatch Blvd to link them to Bus Rapid Transit to both serve the high traffic going through LCC while decreasing unpleasant noise.	Salt Lake City	02/23/2015
IT is pro-development. That is not the real public interest.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
It mainly just helps ski resorts	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
It opens the door for more development in the canyons-which I am opposed to.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
It pulls water resources out when Utah is considering requiring water rationing - there is no extra water to spare, and it certainly doesn't belong to a bunch of expensive developments in the Cottonwood canyons.	Salt Lake City	04/26/2015
It seems critical to move toward a light rail solution for Little Cottonwood Canyon. It seems too ambitious to bite off a connection with Park City from the beginning. Why not try rail in LCC and see how it goes then determine if the connection to PC makes sense.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
It will keep these areas how they should always have been.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
It's a great idea to delineate the private/public and expansion/conservation areas.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
Its great that there is talk and recognition of saving certain areas of the Wasatch but it's frustrating that the resorts are holding it hostage. Unfortunately, it's naive to think we could preserve that private land and not have to give something up. No more lifts though!!	Salt Lake City	03/30/2015
Keep in mind that U.S. ski resorts are basically chasing the same skier base (not new skiers) to get them to come to their resort. Resorts always have to offer more and better facilities. The Wasatch is small and must be protected for the drinking water and the recreation for all that should be available. It isn't all about the elite that keep ski resorts going.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
Land swaps are potentially ok provided the details are fully spelled out before the swaps are approved. IE environmental impact, water use, high density housing such as condo's or new hotels.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
Land: Scenario F says ski areas are willing to make exchanges of private parcels to public... is their an MOU or formalized agreement? Where does the LDS land in LCC fit into the transition of private to public land? How can the public access land on the south side of the Wasatch Resort? Trails: I'm very supportive of enhancing the connectivity of trails with paired trailhead facilities.	Salt Lake City	03/17/2015
LEAVE IT ALONE !!! NOTHING NEEDS CHANGING	Salt Lake City	03/15/2015
Leave the Wasatch the way it is.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
Limit Ski Resorts to present boundaries. Most important use is as a watershed. Ski Resorts do not need to expand - Just the opposite - reduce their size, Backcountry skiing is OK. Do not expand Ski Resorts boundaries. NO NEW LIFTS ARE WANTED OR NEEDED.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
MA is too heavily favored towards ski resort development and expansion. At some point there is a limit to the number of people you can put in the canyon regardless of transportation systems. You cant keep expanding use forever. Use an optimized rapid transit system, improved road, limited parking, disincentives for driving/parking in the canyon, and the natural box end character of the canyon to have a natural maximum capacity. Most quality recreation businesses have a capacity limit before the experience is diminished. Disneyland, Ski resorts, go-cart parks, golf courses and many more. LCC and BCC should have its limits too. If there are 2m more people in UT...there needs to be capacity limits or the experience is destroyed.	Salt Lake City	03/02/2015
Mass transit to upper canyons would be in everyone's best interest but there is NO justification for connecting the upper canyons by tunnel or any other methods	SALT LAKE CITY	02/05/2015
More development in the Cottonwood Canyons would destroy the current feel of them. They are unique as they are. Updates are one thing but if the Cottonwoods start looking like Park City areas, I believe many people would be upset. The Cottonwoods need to keep the current balance.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
More private land should be made public and conserved with the most protective conservation designation possible.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
More protection needed. Watershed poorly protected under these plans.	Salt Lake City	04/19/2015
My one main concern for developing these canyons further is water usage. How much water can the watershed provide? I also think Salt Lake City should put in mandatory watering restrictions each summer regardless of how much rain we get. It's crazy to me that this doesn't already take place in a city in the desert!	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
my primary concerns are watershed protection and protection of the wilderness and wildlife values of the central wasatch, including alternative transportation and limiting further expansion of the ski resorts. Development in the central wasatch should be limited and constantly monitored to protect the beauty and values of these incomparable mountains.	salt lake city	02/16/2015
my primary concerns are watershed protection and protection of the wilderness and wildlife values of the central wasatch, including alternative transportation and limiting further expansion of the ski resorts. Development in the central wasatch should be limited and constantly monitored to protect the beauty and values of these incomparable mountains.	salt lake city	02/16/2015
Need to preserve public access, for recreational uses, across any newly privatized lands. The scenario is vague on where additional water and water rights come from to meet proposed future development.	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
No expansion of Brighton into Hidden Valley.	Salt Lake City	02/06/2015
No more development in the Wasatch! The plan seems to address lots of important big picture problems related to the threat of future development. Does it address the increasing damage caused by mountain bikers or the growing conflicts among mountain bikers and other trail users?	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
No more development. Closure of the canyons to private traffic on weekends and high volume days. Only commercial permitted vehicles on those days and public transit. No ski area expansion. NO TUNNELS OR TRAMS CONNECTING PARK CITY TO COTTONWOODS. Prioritize clean watershed.	Salt Lake City	02/24/2015
No mountain transit is needed, and will not benefit the Cottonwood Canyons. I like the idea of secure more public lands.	salt lake city	02/28/2015
No one comes away completely happy	salt lake city	03/08/2015
NO SKI RESORT EXPANSION!!! NO NEW DEVELOPMENT!!!	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
on the surface this approach looks favorable. I've heard thru multiple sources the only way this scenario is approved by the Resorts is that a train has to be build up the canyons. In my opinion a train up the Cottonwoods would be a Disaster to the canyon and environment. Those canyons are too small. If the Resorts want to have further development let them build the infrastructure and their parking needs to the development. Don't make the public pay for a train so they can build more SF. A train will never pencil up the Cottonwoods.	Salt lake city	03/11/2015
Our mountains are close, we have rich wildlife, and other diverse resources. Protecting the canyons is important. Comparing our Wasatch Mountains to the "Alps" and "connecting" the canyons and trails is just a bit grandiose.	Salt Lake City	03/11/2015
Overemphasis on transit, under emphasis on traffic impacts, especially through traffic.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
Permanently scarring our landscape for transportation between places that is already available by road in the summer, and used recreationally by backcountry users year-round is an absurd idea and not in line with "responsible stewardship of our resources".	Salt Lake City	03/18/2015
Please address how the disputed areas will be handled instead of leaving them open for discussion - i.e. Grizzly Gulch. Please provide more content on where you want to put lifts and how many access roads will be needed to maintain the lifts. Also provide details as to where those roads would be placed. This report is vague at best, barely mentioning aerial transport. While progress has been made with this accord, it lacks depth and detail that is needed to garner support. Additionally - would a train be added while keeping the existing road open or would the road be shut down? That needs to be addressed. A train isn't a bad idea if the road itself is shut down, or access to the canyons is limited by shuttle. But to have both the road packed with cars and a train cruising up and down the canyon- that seems to be a very poorly planned idea. Additionally, please convince us that all of this is necessary for an industry that is steadily declining and more people are exiting the sport of skiing than entering into it. Also, is all of this necessary with the snow we have been receiving in recent years? We haven't exactly been having stellar winters. I do not see any of this addressed in the study. I do not support this plan in its current state.	Salt Lake City	02/16/2015
Please do not expand the base facilities at the Cottonwood Canyon resorts. The goal should be to keep the development simple, with basic services and lodging. The magic of the Cottonwoods is that they are not overly developed like Park City, Jackson, Lake Tahoe, Colorado, etc.	Salt Lake City	02/09/2015
Please don't develop American Fork Canyon for skiing!!! It is one of my favorite places because it ISN'T as developed as the other canyons.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
Please see prior comments. Yes to better transportation efforts. No to Ski Link or Interconnect or any similar ideas and schemes.	Salt Lake City	02/06/2015
Proposed resort expansion and projects like One Wasatch would either eliminate or endanger low-risk backcountry terrain critical for those new to backcountry travel and those traveling on higher risk days. The backcountry access we have makes the Wasatch front a special area and encourages responsible, sustainable use of our wilderness areas. Encroachment of these areas by ski area expansion and increased backcountry resort access may benefit the few pockets of ski area owners, but creates a new land-use burden and reduces the quality of wilderness recreation for those of us living and recreating here on the Wasatch front. Please protect these lands that are such an important place for us.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
Providing a "marketable transit option" is contrary to the entire idea of dispersed recreation. The appeal of a backcountry experience is the seclusion and scenic journey to the destination. Having lift rails and mechanical operations would not only detract from the natural beauty and landscape that people seek out in dispersed recreation areas, but will more than likely deter many tourists from coming and enjoying the land. The Cottonwood Canyons Scenario also fails to responsibly consider the needs and uses for the water that it proposes to acquire. Our winter this year was dismal, and while the ski resorts undoubtedly had financial hits, the water should NOT be allocated to make more snow. One needs only to look to California to realize the extremely real threat that a drought holds for the citizens of the Wasatch. Our watersheds need to be expanded and protected to provide a clean and sustainable source of drinking water, especially if the population is predicted to grow substantially over the next decades.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
Public interest has come second, and the stake holders have created the proposal first. So it is hard to see how one could agree that public interest is very important here. My hope is that intelligent citizens will read this and see the flaw in that logic (I could be wrong as their might have been a public input I am not aware of).	salt lake city	02/06/2015

Purchasing private lands in the upper Cottonwood Canyons is an excellent idea if these lands are truly being set aside to preserve these areas from future development. Our water resources are a big concern for the Salt Lake Valley. More development will impose too much of a strain on our precious water resources.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
Read above.....Totally AGAINST THIS.....	Salt Lake City	02/04/2015
Same basic position as Wasatch Backcountry Alliance (WBA), Writter Wildlands Alliance (WWA) and Save Our Canyons (SOC).	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
Same issues as above.	Salt Lake City	03/25/2015
see above	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
See above comments. A regional trail network is unnecessary. There is more than adequate access within the canyons on existing trails. The assumption that to make things better we need to "build" and "expand" is invalid. Like it or not, we have reached the stage where "control" and "limit" are necessary to preserve what is already there without further degradation of water resources, air quality, wildlife habitat, etc.	Salt Lake City	04/13/2015
See above for LCC	Salt Lake City	03/26/2015
See above rant about tunnels and trams. Instead, do a train up both the Cottonwood canyons. It works in the parks. Make parking a pain (see Whistler, again). If there is real rapid transit between PC and SLC, then people would be much better served getting up and down our Cottonwoods using that system. If the goal is to maintain the areas, then don't run trams or tunnels to them PLEASE. Trading lands around seems OK, if it keeps back country access open and unobstructed ( see tunnel and tram rant) . Everybody skis "Hidden" anyhow, might as well do avalanche control there.	Salt Lake City	04/26/2015
See my comments above	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
See my comments above	Salt Lake City	03/04/2015
See my comments in the previous section for a good summary. I am in support of shuttle buses in the cottonwoods but a rail and tunnels are a terrible and invasive idea that ruin the essence of the wasatch range. I support trail network expansion but keep the mountains pure and free of tunnels and a rail system. It will ruin a lot of land and disrupt the ecosystem as well as the whole backcountry experience. The gondola is too invasive as well, the backcountry is intended to be a challenge to enjoy its beauty.	Salt lake city	05/02/2015
See my earlier comments in Part 1 regarding transportation in the Cottonwood Canyons.	Salt Lake City	04/27/2015
Setting aside lands for wilderness is fine, but it doesn't make sense to swap for having the rail system up the canyon. I am opposed to having the train go up the canyon or having tunnel through the mountain. I support the engineer Todd Leeds comments about that not being a good idea for the mountains.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
Ski area expansion is too limited in the trade off.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
Ski areas keep on expanding and expanding and expanding. I would theoretically support allowing a little more expansion now in order to prevent future expansion, but I don't really trust the ski industry, particularly now that the aggressive Vail Corporation has taken over the Canyons/Park City. It seems inevitable that ill-conceived plans like "One Wasatch" and "Skilink" will keep popping up. I've read the Park City report on predicted effects of climate change on the ski industry so it also seems inevitable that the lower elevation resorts will keep trying to grab higher elevation terrain. I think the ski areas are already too big. They have already expanded into places that should have remained as backcountry. Since they have already absorbed too much of the Wasatch Mountains it really rankles to be asked to give them even more, but the tradeoff might possibly be worth it if it really eliminates the problem of private inholdings. Wilderness: Wilderness designation seems essential as a boundary to ski resort expansion and to protect the watershed. I support the Wasatch Wilderness and Watershed Protection Act that was introduced by former Congressman Jim Matheson.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
Ski resorts are concerned with profit. They may mask their intentions of wanting to make more money as wanting to protect the environment but we do not need to give them the 258 acres for future development.	Salt Lake City	04/01/2015
So many stakeholders and moving parts, it's hard to know if the CCS is for the benefit of all the public or just the owners of the ski resorts. It is always the details in which the deal is good or bad. Hard to know which private owners of the land want it to remain pristine and untouched and which want to develop or mine it (LDS church and the Granite mine). I am eager to register my opinion that both lower canyons are not being used at all in the interest of the benefit of the environment, the unique draw of the canyons as a pristine and natural wonder, or our general public wellness. It has been allowed to be pillaged and torn up by private land grabbers who never should have been given ownership of the land. It should have never been sold to the quarry, Terry Diehl, the LDS Granite mine, nor the current developers of the puked out gigantron-homes of the lower Little Cottonwood. These private interests have fast turned our lower Cottonwood Canyons into an eyesore.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
Thanks for our consideration of my opinion. Amy	Salt Lake City	02/11/2015
Specifically call out that One Wasatch will not be allowed. The current plan allows for reasonable resort expansion, no additional expansion should be permitted. This is especially true for the grizzly gulch area.	Salt Lake City	02/11/2015
Stop expanding on our public lands. We need more pristine and non commercial lands!!	Salt Lake City	03/26/2015
Thank you for working to try to find compromise to backcountry access.	Salt Lake City	03/15/2015
The areas outlined in this scenario desperately need preservation and public designation. The compromise with the ski resorts seems just.	Salt Lake City	03/05/2015
The assumption of a rail solution is premature and lacking factual support, and distracts from this process. I'm happy that UTA money and staff have supported this process to this point, but that unfortunate fact now threatens to derail and bias any outcomes or decisions.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
The backcountry public land should contain all Superior, Flagstaff, and Grizzly gulch, AND Silver fork. The proposed rail system seems pie-in-the-sky. The ski industry would benefit immensely from rail, but at a HUGE public cost. Its hard to imagine this being realistic, but I'm open to it. What's the buy in from the public and the ski industry? Busses seem much more realistic. Mandatory carpooling would be minimal expense as well. I'd be happy to support any and all reasonable priced projects through user fees.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
The Blueprint fails to consider watershed impacts of proposed transportation and interconnect construction. It does not answer the question of why the resorts can demand an interconnect. The presumption is that taxpayers would pay for transportation "improvements" The trade of private lands for expansion of ski resort expansions seems positive.	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015
The Blueprint serves the interest of developer.	Salt Lake City	03/22/2015
The canyons should not be locked together and if a transportation link is required, try it with Big Cottonwood first and attempt to leave Little Cottonwood unique and unlinked unless that proves to be a mistake in the future.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
The CCS contains some good ideas, particularly those aimed at concentrating development at the base of the lifts, sort of like Snowbird is already doing (and for which it should be commended). High rise development, similar to the Cliff Lodge and similar hotels in Europe, is a good plan. However, it sort of stops there. Making the backcountry more and more accessible to side country explorers does no one any good, and only creates the opportunity for more out-of-borders to get hurt or killed. Seriously. There are some obvious places where connections could be made, like over Catherine's pass, where development is already quite extensive. But the temptation to "interconnect" and "one wasatch" the place should be avoided. If there is some apsement for the resorts, with expanded boundaries, these boundaries should be made HARD (like creating wilderness areas) so that we don't have to revisit these same requests for more land again, say in 10 years. Or every 10 years until all the land is available to lift-skiers.	Salt Lake City	04/07/2015
The Cottonwood Canyons are already heavily impacted. Bringing more people and more intense use is not in the best interest of preserving what is left of the natural environment. Construction of a light rail system in Little Cottonwood, a text book example of glaciation, would negatively affect the nature of the canyon.	Salt Lake City	03/14/2015
The Cottonwood canyons scenario addresses the key issues of the canyon.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
The cottonwood canyons scenario doesn't take into account users that are not purchasing lift tickets from the ski areas. The transportation outline covers how to get people into the mountains, but not how they will benefit the economy. Maintained bike and hiking trails should be a priority. It would be financially feasible to connect Park City to Alta via bike trails prior to mechanized connections. There are currently not a lot of options for a visitor to help stimulate the economy in upper Little Cottonwood Canyons in the summer.	Salt Lake City	03/20/2015
The Cottonwood Canyons Scenario is a win-win for everyone. It is a "no-brainer" land swap that protects sensitive lands while allowing the resorts flexibility for operations and expansion. If this land swap is the only part of the Mountain Accord that gets implemented, I will still consider the Mountain Accord highly successful!	Salt Lake City	03/09/2015
The Cottonwood Canyons Scenario is concerning in its proposed benefits to the ski areas. The benefit to ski areas of additional water for snowmaking is of great concern. It is necessary to conserve water, particularly at the headwaters, for the health of the stream and associated riparian area. Negative impacts of snowmaking include loss of approximately 30% of water to evaporation in addition to the general environmental disruption of snowmaking including sound, impacts of snow density on flora and soil, chemical composition of water used ( <a href="http://bit.ly/1DsGS3l">http://bit.ly/1DsGS3l</a> ). Additionally, it seems unreasonable to expand base area development to the extent noted, as this proposed expansion contradicts watershed and environmental protection efforts. The Cottonwood Canyons scenario is lacking significant detail related to environmental protection and seems more focused on economy and recreation than it does environment.	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015
The cottonwood Canyons scenario must explicitly prohibit a lift going up Grizzly Gulch. That area is a key access point to some of the most used and valued back country terrain in the Wasatch. Building a lift there would benefit few, while taking a precious resource away from so many people. I'm also adamantly opposed to Brighton expanding into Hidden Canyon.	Salt Lake City	04/22/2015
The developed ski areas gain far too much and give up far too little. That is not an equal trade off.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
The entire equation will be completely changed depending on whether a rail line is built alongside the road in Little Cottonwood Canyon or whether it is built separated from the existing highway. I would fully support BRT/Mountain Light Rail in Little Cottonwood Canyon if the rail lines hugs the road as tightly as possible (and uses the existing passing lanes where available. If the rail line is built farther away from the road, then I would be vehemently opposed. Little Cottonwood Canyon is too narrow and too sensitive for more of the mountain slopes to be sacrificed for transportation corridors. Only the existing transportation corridor should be used, with cuts into the mountain sides used only when absolutely necessary.	Salt Lake City	02/04/2015
The exchange of lands is obviously a compromise, perhaps inevitable. Grizzly Gulch should absolutely be included into the preserved areas.	Salt Lake City	04/03/2015
The idea of land trades and consolidations seem very appropriate. The future, and future use, of the canyons is highly dependent upon very uncertain future events. That should give strong preference to going beyond trades, to add public acquisitions of critical areas and to limit development on both public and private lands where that is important for preserving future options important to meeting uncertain futures (the plan presumably will explore what these uncertainties are). Fair compensation probably would be expensive, so the costs and financing also need exploration.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
The ideas behind getting more water to certain units and areas when under public ownership sounds like one of the best ideas that could come from purchasing the land at the top of the canyons. My main concern is with the vegetative impacts, and soil impacts created while creating a mountain rail system. The system, in and of itself sounds amazing and I would love to use it. I know that there are already rails going up Little Cottonwood Canyon - but how can you really mitigate that sort of impact? That is a huge undertaking to put that sort of system in place. The same goes for the tunnel: how in the world do you mitigate that and ensure that it's within the proper parameters of an EIS, and in accordance with proper NEPA standards? In addition to that, having a connection of water at the top of the canyon is fine, I'm sure you could figure that out without too much dismay - I'll have more comments for transportation below.	Salt Lake City	03/09/2015
The land swap is a good idea, however, the implementation of a mountain rail system is completely against my beliefs on how a canyon should look. Your visiting tourist family would still rent their suburban whether there's a rail system or not. There must be different alternatives instead of development.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
The lands must be preserved and the ski area expansion halted! (see above). No more development. 108 units at Alta!!! - nol Why do they need that resort expansion? Its already easily accessible side-country. Is it so they can bomb it or eventually put lifts there?	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
The Mountain Accord outcome I would like to see would focus on conservation of the land, Protecting our watershed and changes that would amount to a net reduction of development in the Central Wasatch. Land swaps that would concentrate development at the base of resorts in trade for minimizing private land in the backcountry seem to make sense both economically and environmentally. A Shuttle system involving buses or vans would be able to meet the varied recreational needs in the canyons. Trains are not conducive to multiple trailhead stops and are not as flexible as buses or vans for changing needs both over time and season. Plus the environmental cost of building rail in the canyon seems overwhelming for such as small area. I don't support further connectivity for the resorts. There is no good way for this to be accomplished and the benefit would have nothing to do with those of us who live here. It is all for marketing a declining industry. I would also favor fees such as we have in Millcreek Canyon. It makes sense that those that use the canyons for recreation should help in the maintenance of those facilities that we enjoy. Money collected should be earmarked for improvement and maintenance of those canyons.	Salt Lake City	04/27/2015
The mountains are too crowded already don't build light rail up the canyons.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
The property in american fork canyon seems an odd exchange. Where is it? Why is it being deeded? How does it benefit the resorts?	SALT LAKE CITY	04/15/2015
The proposal is good in it's attempt and initial plans for cooperation between all interested parties. I'm happy that we've all come together to work out these issues. I'm still a little disappointed in the lack if innovative concepts proposed, although I understand that there are a lot of different people to appease. I am very concerned about the loss of backcountry access in Grizzly Gulch. It's the cornerstone of wasatch backcountry skiing, and this area needs to be kept as non-lift serviced.	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015

	The proposal is not balanced. The resorts are getting base area expansion, a tax-payer funded train and tunnel system, water for expansion, water for snow-making, AND SKI AREA EXPANSION. In exchange, the north side of the canyon from Superior to the Emma Ridges (NOT GRIZZLY GULCH), will gain protection. I would support this recommendation if the ridgeline from Superior to Catherines Pass was protected in perpetuity, AND NO SKI AREA EXPANSION.	Salt Lake City	03/02/2015
	The proposal serves the ski industry not the public.	Salt Lake City	02/12/2015
	The proposal to move forward with either a tunnel connecting the Cottonwood Canyons to Park City or a gondola both seem a little absurd and undermine the notion of environmental protection. It seems like a purely economical move in terms of consolidating resorts and limiting backcountry access (Vail Resorts expanding from two resorts in Park City into a third in BCC). A much easier way to increase tourism revenue in Utah would be to change the liquor laws as opposed to drilling a hole through a mountain or building a gondola.	salt lake city	04/30/2015
	The proposed Snowbird extension seems excessive. This resort has already become one of the most intrusive "eye sores" of the Wasatch front. We've already allowed them to dynamite off the top of a mountain to build a tram, and now an embarrassing conference center. It is time to put a more definitive restriction on their destructive and extensive expansion projects.	Salt Lake City	02/12/2015
	The public's interest is opposed to the ski resorts' interests. No more ski area expansion or base area development. No land swaps. Protect as much land as possible with wilderness designation.	SALT LAKE CITY	02/12/2015
	The scenario, as stated above, only brings upon an unsustainable amount of people to the area. The Cottonwood is a relatively small area, that even today, is becoming crowded and in turn decreasing the state of wilderness within the canyons. Once again, economic prosperity is becoming the single tiered idea of this proposal not seeing the effects that this has on the environmental health and the social equity.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	The ski resorts do not need to expand another acre! They already attract tourist from all over the world. At this point it is diminishing wilderness experiences from local residents who use the back country which is always growing.	Salt Lake City	03/13/2015
	The tradeoffs of allowing 108 new water shares for Alta, exchange of lands in American Fork to Snowbird, some expansion of ski area boundaries into Hidden Canyon and Honeycomb Canyon seems reasonable if the parcels are acquired for public ownership in Grizzly Gulch, Flagstaff Mountain and White Pine is made off limits to ski area expansion. It all has to come together or none of it will work.	salt lake city	02/23/2015
	The Upper Cottonwood Canyons must have environmental protections in place. Though economic growth is important to the State of Utah, too much exploitation will undoubtedly impact water, animals, and other natural resources. There has to be a fine balance between these goals and it's impossible to determine this from the blueprints.	Salt Lake City	03/04/2015
	There has long been a need for Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons to be connected to Park City and to each other, and without having to go back down the canyon. This has long been expressed by the people in the valley that use these canyons and would bring a great benefit to the towns economically. This is an example of "public development options" as proposed by the public. A study for the best way to accomplish this should be completed quickly.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	There is no need for a tunnel or lift connecting little and big cottonwood canyons. There is no need for a tunnel or lift connecting park city to big cottonwood canyon. This will ruin the pristine backcountry that hundreds of people already enjoy on a daily basis.	SALT LAKE CITY	02/10/2015
	There is no need, nor is it desirable to the WF community, to expand the acreage of developable ski base areas. The ski areas can work with what they have, although some small swaps should be considered to better align transit service (better located, but fewer, transit stop facilities) Swapping or exchanging land is desirable provided past private land purchases solely for purposes of speculation are not rewarded (on steep, riparian, or other designations known-to-the-buyer to make land undevelopable). Exchanges should be considered for land of equal value, not equal characteristics, and generally should be for land outside the central Wasatch. The cost of rail, land needs, and pressure on year round development that rail it will bring, seem undesirable compared to other transit options. Bus service should have been considered in more detail and rethought in the blueprint. The schedule, frequency, and routing of current buses almost seems designed to discourage ridership. Transit need an advantage. The LCC buses should stop once at Alta and Snowbird each, with stops and related facilities constructed to minimize travel time. The bus should stop at Creekside (on the highway) ,the top of Chickadee or at Snowbird Center. If at Chickadee, there should be a structure with lockers as well as a fast cabriolet style lift that facilitates up and down hill foot passengers. If it stops at snowbird center, it should have its own dedicated paved route through snowbird as entering at entry 1 and exiting on the bypass road, underpassing the chickadee ski run. This would facilitate shorter travel times and provide an advantage during peak traffic that would incentivize transit usage. A dedicated transit lane through snowbird could be treated as an HOV and also opened to carpools of 4 or more. The cost of a 1-15 rebuild for the Olympics was around 2 billion and serves much of the broader populace and economy. To spend that amount of money to benefit a small subset of the population and the ski related businesses doesn't seem prudent. The problem in LCC is peak day/hour travel and safety of the road. It's not adding more skiers to this equation. Congestion based pricing (toll triggering transponders) could be a good option as could incentives that aim to make more use of the existing unused capacity (empty seats) that go up and down the canyon. At a minimum, resort parking should fill with carpools at the nearest side of the lot and cars with empty seats parking at the rear. Causal carpool strategies, including apps, should be explored (consider the power of an alternative, tech-enabled model and the impact that similar approaches have made for Uber/Lyft style ridesharing). Data and analytics should be employed to inform drivers on expected travel and delay times, especially for peak up and downhill traffic and parking availability. Consider the relative costs of a LCC train compared to the acquisition of a large parcel and the road work such as the gravel pit to the north of the mouth of Big Cottonwood canyon. Is there really a demand for skiers to ski on both the Park City and Cottonwood canyons in the same day? If yes, let's explore the demand by offering or piloting over-the-snow surface shuttles between the areas. Is this really a big deal? Resident and tourist skiers alike want half day tickets at reasonable prices and good food offerings at ski resorts. Let's tackle these perceived needs first before we invest billions in trains and tunnels.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	There is no reason to deface The Cottonwood canyons with a light rail or anything else. "Take nothing but photographs. Leave nothing but footprints." We already can't achieve that so lets try and do our best.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	there needs to be a guarantee no more homes/land will be developed in the cottonwood canyons. Nothing more than is already developed.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	There needs to be no further development to connect the Canyons/Park City Mountain Resort ski areas or the Deer Valley/Solitude ski area. No development or opening of roads or trails should be built across land where it does not exist today. No public lands should become private.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	There should be as little expansion of resorts and structures as possible. There should be no more ski lifts. Back country skiing is becoming very popular as is cross country and snow shoeing. Summer use is huge and campgrounds are full. Bikes are also more popular. Skiing is not the only asset or use. We don't need an amusement park or a connection to Park City. There is no way you can ski all the resorts in one day anyway.	Salt Lake city	04/30/2015
	These scenarios do seem like they would lessen traffic and parking. It also is nice to hear that the One Wasatch proposal does not align with all the needs of the Mountain Accord. However, just like my comments above, I want to make sure that dispersed use is just as easy and that the great climbing areas are preserved. I don't want transpiration to only align with the resorts. I'm too poor to go to resorts, and I certainly don't want to start paying a fee to go climb everyday.	Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
	This blueprint seems to be self serving to the tourist industry. Locals, like my self, would rather preserve the quality of our watershed and access to the mountain environments than to make them better suited for tourists to enjoy.	salt lake city	04/05/2015
	This figure is unclear. What does the light yellow color represent?	Salt Lake City	02/04/2015
	This is a "gift" to the Alta Ski Lifts who would be receiving valuable developable acreage, for non developable acreage. It is not a fair exchange and doesn't necessarily benefit the Town of Alta, which is not coincidentally the Alta Ski Lift Company.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	This is a good step, but more emphasis needs to be placed on protecting undeveloped land. I know the FCOZ imposes very strict regulations in the canyons and all of this should apply to ski resort development as well.	Salt Lake City	03/05/2015
	This is no accord at all. The proposed developments would spell the death of backcountry skiing in the Wasatch and would usher in a new era of big-money development and environmental degradation. The current transportation system in the Cottonwood Canyons limits traffic to the resorts - a desirable outcome so as to limit the human impact on the environment and to ensure the canyons are not transformed into a theme-park-style zoo of people and commercial interests. As a long-time backcountry skier and hiker in the Wasatch, I'm saddened and worried about these plans, and I hope the interests of a few wealthy developers will no be able to squander taxpayer dollars on their profit-driven projects.	Salt Lake City	02/28/2015
	This land swap idea looks good on paper, but it's not clear to me how this is advantageous to the canyon. Why is one area better than another. Are these private areas at any real risk of being further developed and made into a scar any bigger than a train would be?	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
	This makes the rich more wealthy, while those in Utah are stuck footing the bill.	SALT LAKE CITY	02/05/2015
	This portion is actually quite constructive. But Grizzly Gulch needs to be protected from development also.	Salt Lake City	04/28/2015
	This proposal is manageable if wilderness is expanded on the SL Co drainages. Retain Guardsmans as snowmo friendly + all Summit Co drainages currently open.	SALT LAKE CITY	02/15/2015
	This scenario is a sellout of precious, limited mountain terrain under the guise of preservation. Developers will grow fat and rich while wildlife and outdoor experience disappear into the nether reaches. Shameless.	salt lake city	04/30/2015
	This seems like a good trade - more land is preserved for public access than is given to private business (ski areas).	Salt Lake City	04/27/2015
	This will increase profits to the few. I don't approve of this.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	To me the deal breakers in the Cottonwood Canyons scenario are failure to definitively include Grizzly Gulch as protected and preserved for public benefit, and the expansion of Solitude into the bottom of Silver Fork Canyon. Grizzly Gulch serves as safe access to the Silver Fork and the Twin Lakes areas. Another advantage is that it is a good place to tour early season due to its high elevation and consistent snowfall. The topography of the terrain benefits not just backcountry skiers, but also allows access for those with snow shoes and cross country skis. Every other part of the "headwaters of the canyons" is currently occupied by ski lifts, to me it is essential that Grizzly Gulch be protected. Without Grizzly being preserved I don't see how a backcountry skier could access the Twin Lakes Pass or eastern half of Silver Fork terrain if Alta is running lifts up there. I personally believe Alta has aggregated holdings in Grizzly Gulch not because the skiing is great (it's primarily a southern aspect), but as a bargaining chip they can cynically deploy to leverage the USFS to allow them to swap for land where they can undertake real estate development due to the fact they don't own the existing lodging. I can't understand the purpose of the proposed ski area expansion in Silver Fork Canyon. This area is at risk from substantial avalanches descending from the Meadows and Flannigan's. This seems like the first step in allowing Solitude to put lifts up the Meadows, or into the East Bowl and Flannigan's areas which is world class backcountry terrain. I am also concerned about the land swap for Solitude near the BCC road. I have no problem with land being used in support of public transportation options. However Solitude built their village on their old upper parking lot, I would not want the land swap to take place so Solitude can expand its parking area for passenger cars. They made their decision to build on their parking and have reaped the benefits of the village - they should be made to live with their decision.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	too vague what does it mean to preserve lands for public benefit? wilderness? bicycles? motorcycles and ATVs? helicopter and snowcat skiing? maximum extraction of mineral resources?	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015
	Train is horrible idea. Make a toll road and maybe people won't drive up by themselves.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Tunnel construction and roadway development will have a huge negative impact on any wilderness preservation/experience.	Salt Lake City	02/06/2015
	Tunnel construction will reduce wilderness area in the Wasatch. Construction of a light rail that extends up the canyons but does not connect would better fit the goals of Mountain Accord.	Salt Lake City	02/06/2015
	Ultimately it comes down to how ones preferred use of these resources sustain forward into the future. The development model is based on development, so it's difficult to take seriously any commitment by resorts to stop growing their boundaries, if they are allowed just a little bit more. While I'd like to see more land preserved and more restrictions on resort growth and development, I'm guessing the current proposal is as good as its going to get. I really don't think there is a solution that will please everyone. I believe that ultimately the choice is between commerce for the present vs. future survival (e.g. safe, abundant water supply, healthy forests and air quality). At some point personal recreation and economic growth both go out the window. Fortunately, choosing a wilderness based path squares with future health and security aims.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	Using pristine water sources for snowmaking is a waste. We need this water for our survival in the West. This is NOT optional. More transit stops would require more water and more potential for our water sources to become polluted or wasted due to carelessness.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	UT	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	Very bold transportation goals and ideas. Costs seem out of reach to me. Trail connections between canyons, to link the canyons should also be shown. Many avid thru hikers could be interested in the Wasatch with better trail connections from Logan to Mant. Alta's interest in a commercial core does not seem to be recognized.	Salt Lake City	03/31/2015
	Water quality and watershed preservation should be the primary goal.	Salt Lake City	03/05/2015
	We have roads to the Cottonwoods. What on earth makes you think this proposal would ease traffic congestion??? It won't!	Salt Lake City	03/25/2015
	We must keep vehicular emissions under control in our sensitive canyon areas to ensure the health of our delicate wildlife and their environments	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	We need to limit the impact of people. If it is difficult to get in it will limit itself.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	We need to prioritize the scenic vistas in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. Specifically, we need to protect the views from development that would grossly impact people's experience. What's going to stop Snowbird from building a roller coaster across the highway? If the ski areas are allowed to expand, how is the watershed going to be protected in those areas?	Salt Lake City	02/25/2015
	We'll see how the water thing goes... I'd certainly say that using more water for snow-making would not be a priority for me!	Salt Lake City	04/13/2015
	What are you thinking?	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015

	<p>When the Mountain Accord process was initially proposed I was enthusiastic and optimistic. I fell in love with the Cottonwood Canyons in the early eighties and the affair remains strong. Yet over the last three decades I have seen the impact of a dramatic increase in users despite the efforts of the Forest Service, Town of Alta, Friends of Alta and many others to mitigate said impact. Clearly something needs to be done. My comments address the following: Overview - the unique nature of the three primary core Wasatch areas of Park City, Big Cottonwood Canyon, Little Cottonwood Canyon Transportation in the Canyons Transfer of Private Lands to Public Entities Transfer of Public Lands to Private Entities Water Issues Cost Overview - The three main areas (PC, BCC, LCC) of the core Wasatch each have unique characteristics that offer both locals and visitors distinct and special experiences. We are not Europe nor should we try to be. We are Utah; let's celebrate and preserve the special characteristics of each of the three areas. The mountain accord as proposed would destroy the individual character of each of the three areas; the combination of ready access via rail line and increased developable space in the base areas would create a much more homogenous experience across the zones. Additionally it appears to me that what began as a transportation plan has been hijacked by development interests as a real estate development plan. I am in favor of a sensible transportation plan. I am opposed to a plan that opens the door for significant additional development in the Cottonwood Canyons and has the additional unfortunate consequence of diluting the unique experience offered by each zone. Transportation in the Canyon - A rail interconnect is a bad idea. As described above it will result in a much more homogenous experience across the three areas. It also would take a long time to come to fruition and would be extremely expensive. Fortunately there are better solutions. Note again that a rail interconnect is extremely expensive. The cost is measured in billions of dollars and it will likely take decades to plan, approve and build. The problem exists now and needs to be resolved. Adding a dedicated bus lane in LCC would cost millions not billions and could be completed in years, not decades. (Note: A billion is one thousand times greater than a million. This dramatically lower price tag should appeal to our congressional delegation that claims to be fiscally conservative). Transfer of Private Lands to Public Entities - The idea of preserving lands from future development is appealing. It would be a relief to be assured that the Grizzly Gulch Area and the Emma through Flagstaff Ridge in LCC would be safe from development pressures in perpetuity. Unfortunately transferring private lands to public entities would not create this assurance. Large parts of the existing ski terrain in the Cottonwood Canyons is on permitted public land. The political pressure to develop these areas would not cease as a result of the mountain accord and future Utah congressional delegations will likely find themselves pressured by the existing resorts and other developers to open up these public lands to additional development. The only way to assure these lands remain safe from development pressures is to have title in the properties pass to a not for profit entity like the Utah Land Trust. Otherwise the transfer will be a development delaying tactic and nothing more. Transfer of Public Lands to Private Entities - Alta has retained its unique character over the past several decades through the dedicated efforts of the Alta town office, Friends of Alta, and the broad community of people who have come to love Alta for its relatively wild and undeveloped nature. Yet much is changing. We have seen Vail resorts take control of the Canyons ski area and take ownership of Park City Ski Area. We have seen Deer Valley acquire Solitude. Vail, along with other ski area operators, has figured out the formula to dramatically enhance shareholder returns by creating comprehensive base areas with a full range of services including lodging, dining, shopping and entertainment. The land swap as envisioned which would pass title of much of the land in the Alta base area to the Alta Ski Lift company would be an economic bonanza for the shareholders of the Alta Ski Lift company. It would also make the Alta lift company far more valuable to an acquirer like Vail Resorts who need developable land in the base area to build it out according to their model. This would come at the expense of the broad public who owns the area, through governmental entities, right now. I have no idea what the Alta Ski Lift company plans to do and count many of the individuals managing the resort as friends. However I do not think it is appropriate to provide an economic bonanza to a private entity at taxpayers expense. Additionally such a transfer would allow development space at the Alta base for development and acceleration of the homogenization of the three core Wasatch areas which I oppose. Water Issues - I am not sure what the political process was that resulted in</p>	Salt Lake City 03/07/2015
	<p>While I love trains and tunnels in urban areas, I oppose trains and tunnels as part of this scenario. I prefer a mix of B, C, and D alternatives, with preference for BRT with termination at the top of the canyons.</p>	Salt Lake City 04/15/2015
	<p>While I support base area concessions to the resorts in return for added protections to other lands north of Little Cottonwood Canyon Road, I do not support expanded ski area boundaries. I do not support Snowbird's proposed land exchange with USFS that would convert public land into private land. I do not support Snowbird's planned expansion into Utah County and I do not support public lands in American Fork Canyon being exchanged for additional protections around Flagstaff, Superior, etc. I do not support resort expansion by Solitude or Brighton either.</p>	Salt Lake City 05/01/2015
	<p>While traffic up canyon is and can be a nightmare on good snow days, the infrastructure would be severely underutilized during summer months. adding up to 108 units (given the current cost of units in LCC) would be a detriment to the overall experience of recreation users in LCC.</p>	Salt Lake City 03/02/2015
	<p>Why should we have to make concessions to ski resorts in order to protect public lands from the grasp. When is it enough for them. The ski industry is witnessing slowing growth and many (locals) are being priced out. As conditions get drier, the ski areas will witness shorter seasons and fewer ski days making growth of their facilities an economic failure for them and an environmental sacrifice for the citizens of Utah. The BLM should not make any concessions of public lands to developers. Specifically, a permanent rail system would give the canyons a mechanized, amusement park feeling.</p>	Salt Lake City 04/27/2015
	<p>Why wait to fix the problem of cars in the canyon? There should be no cars and we should not have to wait and pay through the nose for the most extreme solution. What's wrong with immediately employing a "bus-only" system? Electric or natural gas buses are &lt;\$500k a pop and they could be used in a year. Routes that start at nodes throughout the valley, such as the University of Utah, the CBD or other high population centers could save on personal auto use (pollution...) A transit hub at the base of the canyons is expensive (\$30-50 million) and creates a traffic nightmare Your map and labeling, are confusing. The "private lands to be considered to become public" are awfully small. Does this mean that they go into the SLC Watershed Parcel category? Or does this mean they go into the USFS Ownership category? It is unclear. "Allowing" these lands to become under public ownership and protection, what does that mean? The only "metric" in the Environment section of the blueprint is the claim that the Mountain Accord will "more than double the amount of federal land with elevated protection." What is elevated protection? Wilderness? That has to be congressionally established, correct? Is that guaranteed to happen? How can you guarantee that? The ski resorts, UTA, and developers get everything they want, with no legislative delay. The environment is left with lands that are "considered" to be protected, so a consideration based on the partnership of those who generally oppose the environment? These people are really going to partner to get these lands at wilderness status? That is a very significant promise, especially because of the number of times they have rescinded their partnership in the past. That is not a compromise for the environment. That is a loss. We don't need additional water for snow-making, we need additional understanding of global warming. We can't make/keep the snow because it is too hot. Ski resorts should not be expanded while they are becoming irrelevant. We live in a desert. Certainly we can come up with better uses of our water than actually spraying it out into space. The public lands to become private portion of the map is completely unexplained by the Cottonwood Canyons Scenario. Who do they go to? Private land for conservation? Or private land owned by ski resorts?</p>	Salt Lake City 05/02/2015
	<p>Backcountry skiers are against it, environmentalists are against it and anyone who loves our canyons is against it. We are the public and we are against it.</p>	Salt Lake City 02/24/2015
	<p>See my above comment.</p>	Salt Lake City 05/01/2015
	<p>The land swap proposals look to go a long way towards protecting upper LCC from ski area expansion with one major exception. Grizzly Gulch seems to be hidden under the table. There is no definitive plan for Grizzly. This is a valuable backcountry area despite its history of mechanized use and mining. If Alta is permitted to put a chair lift in Grizzly, the entirety of upper LCC would become side country terrain. The amount of true backcountry terrain continues to become more and more crowded. Removing LCC would compound the crowding and decrease the recreation user experience in the best case and lead to increased avalanche fatalities in the worst case. I strongly support the proposed land swaps that would protect Superior to Flagstaff, however, I also feel strongly that protection of Grizzly needs to be included in the Accord.</p>	Salt Lake City 02/15/2015
	<p>Turning certain areas right next to the resorts into more resort riding is just not a good idea. People already have enough terrain to ride and a lot of this terrain is already easy access from a resort. I just don't think it would be right to do something like this to our backcountry when we can't reverse what is done.</p>	Salt Lake City 02/04/2015
	<p>The Cottonwoods Canyons Scenario should permanently prohibit expansion of ski areas, since there are large enough already. Having skied at the areas between five to ten times a year for over a decade, observations indicate that the areas are rarely crowded. Furthermore, statistics show that skier days are declining at ski resorts. Therefore, there is no need for more land to be used by ski areas. Development of any sort on the north side of Little Cottonwood Canyon should be banned permanently.</p>	Salt Lake City (East Millcreek Township) 05/01/2015
	<p>More details need to be provided - but Preservation of the entire Ridgeline from Stairs Gulch up to Wolverine Ridge - including Grizzly Gulch - to prevent any further ski lift building or off road vehicle travel and development is absolutely necessary to protect and preserve that ridgeline and all the back county access to non-motorized travel and should be instituted immediately. That should only be one of many ridgelines and canyons and valleys that need the same protected area designation. Some further ski lift building could be allowed in places adjacent and adjoining current ski lift boundaries could a good idea to provide more ski access - but only to abutting areas of the already existing Ski Resorts and their boundaries for operation on Forest Service and State Land.</p>	Salt Lake City (native) 05/02/2015
	<p>I don't think this helps the public interest as it just encourages more development which in turn puts more demand on the already limited natural resource of water.</p>	Salt Lake City / Alta 03/12/2015
	<p>I ski over 50 times a year up Little Cottonwood with a few more up Big Cottonwood. I enjoy both canyons in the winter. I live in the Avenues area of Salt Lake City. I usually drive alone. If I knew I would wait no more than 15 - 20 minutes everyday, 8 am to 5 pm I would get out of my car and get on the bus to ride the last six miles to Alta or Snow. UTA were to do this along with building a probable need multi-story parking garage many solitary drivers would ride the bus as well. Dedicated buses and parking garages would be the least damaging solution and would preserve the Wasatch from Disneylandizing. I can not imagine the travesty and irreparable harm light rail, tunnels, trams and gondolas will do to the Wasatch experience to those who love these mountains so very, very much for what they offer. Bus transportation has got worse and worse over the last 25 years. UTA states ridership decreases have decreased the service. Decreased service has decrease interest in service.</p>	Salt Lake City use mostly Little Cottonwood Canyon 05/01/2015
	<p>With the exception of the proposed Snowbird expansion into Mary Ellen Gulch/AF canyon (this area is empty... except for noise pollution, please don't eat another ridgeline with a ski lift), this looks like an exception compromise, it seems to hold potential private land use to valleys and off of ridge lines.</p>	Salt Lake City, 84105 02/12/2015
	<p>The land agreement for slight ski area expansion for considerable public land increase is reasonable.</p>	Salt Lake City, Emigration Canyon 02/09/2015
	<p>I am very pleased to see the ski areas on board with this project. Through the debate over the Ski-Link proposal, it became very clear to me that linking ski areas with aerial lifts would use public lands to serve a very limited number of private individual, and wouldn't actually be practical for transportation. This proposal fits with Ski UTAH's "Ski City, USA" marketing campaign where you can stay downtown and go to any of the central wasatch resorts.</p>	Salt Lake City, UT 02/23/2015
	<p>I answered "Undecided/I don't know" because I feel that the "Cottonwood Canyons Scenario" document does not explain much about the proposed changes in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. Public interests do include resort goers, but it also includes backcountry users, and all of those who depend on the watershed in those two Canyons. I feel that the proposal gives much to the resorts, while potentially disrupting valuable watershed and decreasing the wilderness feel and backcountry availability to other users.</p>	Salt Lake City, UT 03/17/2015
	<p>I generally support the proposed development swaps which would allow ski areas to expand near their bases while preserving and protecting Superior, Emma ridge, Flagstaff, and White Pine. It is essential that Grizzly Gulch also be preserved and protected. It's important to recognize that the status quo already advantages the ski resorts with much of the high elevation, north facing terrain that provides the best skiing. In a year like this, when snow below 8,000 feet is sparse, I've become frustratingly aware that most of the prime terrain is already occupied by ski resorts, forcing backcountry users to crowd into a few small areas. I have no issue with ski areas developing their bases, within reason, provide appropriate environmental considerations are taken, and protecting additional land for backcountry ski terrain is important to preserve the recreational value of the Wasatch. I say Grizzly Gulch must be included because this trailhead is an important access point by which backcountry skiers can safely access much of the rest of the terrain in upper Little Cottonwood. Grizzly also offers access to the most diverse terrain of any backcountry area in the Wasatch, from steep chutes in Wolverine bowl to mellow slopes perfect for beginner backcountry skiers to a safe summer road that is often used by snowshoers. Every time I went to Grizzly Gulch this winter I noticed that it was crowded with backcountry skiers, cross country skiers, kids, families, snowshoers, etc. I think the unique nature of the terrain here (safe, approachable, beautiful, fun) is why it would be such a loss to the recreation community were it to be developed.</p>	Salt Lake City, UT 04/26/2015
	<p>Rail transportation is a mistake in my opinion. I also very much doubt that private property owners (e.g., along Guardsman) are going to be willing to make swaps. My business owns property in the area, and while not a private land under consideration to become public, I can say with absolute confidence that my partners would not be amenable to such. While I understand that this presents an ideal plan according to some, the practical realities may dictate otherwise.</p>	Salt Lake City, UT 02/24/2015
	<p>Would this proposal exclude the possibility of the proposed Grizzly Gulch ski lift and thus ONEWasatch? It is not clear..... I think the land swap is a good idea to trade for transit stops and possible, centralized development as necessary.</p>	Salt Lake City, UT 02/04/2015
	<p>Yes, the land swap is needed, but may be unnecessary if there is no snow to ski on, or if it's not cold enough to use that extra water to make snow. This alternative ignores the elephant in the room of climate change. Also, with an increasing population along the Wasatch front/back, less and less of whom engage in snow sports (or will be able to in the future), the ski area permit boundaries expansions are not warranted-- it is taking publicly owned assets that will be needed by future generations and giving them to private entities for a use that will not be viable in the future (unless we take real steps to dramatically-- DRAMATICALLY-- reduce CO2 emissions). This is a give-away, plain and simple. And as I've mentioned before, a mountain rail system is OK, but it is not the first priority. A Valley rail system is.</p>	Salt Lake City, UT 04/24/2015
	<p>Do not expand the ski areas.</p>	Salt Lake City, UT 84121 04/30/2015
	<p>I'm slightly concerned about the ski area expansions. The backcountry is heavily used already. I like the creation of additional public lands. Overall it seems to be a good trade off.</p>	Salt Lake City, UT 84109 04/03/2015

	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 yet another round of development. Enough please!	Salt Lake City, Utah	02/25/2015
	There should be no exchange of Federal lands to become private property. Who needs private lands in the canyons. It's disgusting enough as it is. For example, the street signs that have become a part of Big Cottonwood Canyon. It's a process of slowly, creeping development. For what? It seems to be just for the sake of development. The European looking ski area of Solitude is an eyesore for the canyon. What is the reason behind that? This is the Western United States, not some fairy tale fantasy come true of recreating European looking structure. These canyons do not need any more excessive ideas, but then again, this is the U.S., land of excessiveness - for it's own sake.	Salt Lake City, Utah	05/01/2015
	I like the idea of a public-private partnership that would preserve this beautiful area for us now and for future generations. Keeping development confined to the base of the resorts makes sense and allows improvements to make these ski areas more competitive and attractive to tourists and locals alike. It seems that the first benefit listed - "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", would be a real draw for these areas and I believe would only make our already great reputation as a world class ski destination even more pronounced. Not only that, but the other season activities that these canyons offer would also benefit.	Salt Lake County (Canyon Rim Area)	04/28/2015
	How many people can fit in upper LC, BC before quality of experience is affected? I live in salt lake county. I don't ski in summit county. Why should summit county have direct tunnel access to LC especially. BC only may be a place to start. I like public ownership of grizzly gulch to keep back country access. It is also a popular summer destination.	Salt Lake city/Taylorville	05/01/2015
	It would be a travesty to put a train up Little Cottonwood Canyon. Building a train would do irreparable damage to the environment and beauty of the canyon. The canyon does not belong to the ski resorts, the ski tourists or the local skiers. It belongs to the everyday Utah. If something must be done to upgrade the ski experience and deal with existing issues, a gondola system connecting the resorts should be carefully studied as a preferable alternative. It would do far less damage to the environment and not block access to Little Cottonwood or other canyons for any Utahn. As a state, we simply cannot afford to spend billions to build a train up the canyon. Some people say that this money will come from the federal government. If the federal government gives money for this project, they will consider that their obligation to help Utah is met. If we can get billions, that money should be used to upgrade, repair or expand the transportation and road system throughout the Salt Lake valley, particularly on the west side. If we had any "extra" money, it should certainly go towards education or other top priorities that would benefit many more of our citizens. Putting a train up Little Cottonwood Canyon is a terrible idea, designed to benefit just a few of the wealthiest among us at the expense of other pressing needs. Ravaging this spectacular canyon to benefit this small segment of our population is not only indefensible but inexcusable.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	No extra lanes or trains up Little Cottonwood Canyon. Only more busses, and a more flexible bus schedule, like Zion's.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	The Cottonwood Canyons are a sensitive area. Coming up with a maximum sustainable capacity for these 2 canyons seems like an idea whose time has come. How many people can these canyons absorb and still remain healthy? Get a number that all parties can agree on and work from that. A rail system up the Cottonwood Canyons and connecting the Cottonwoods to Park City is not an environmentally sound idea. Connecting the 2 Cottonwoods via tunnels to improve recreational access is fine. A land swap with the ski resorts that results in better land protection and fewer law suits makes a lot of sense. I also think it is fine to develop the town of Alta and allow more water for snow-making, as long as the residents have significant input in those decisions. Better bus systems, yearly use passes and disincentives to drive (like parking fees) are all good ideas and much cheaper and more environmentally friendly than a train.	Sandy	03/10/2015
	Plans to increase the numbers of out of State tourists in the big and little cottonwood canyons is a mistake. Objective should be preserve the fragile economic system for long term use by current and future Utah residents. Mountain Accord is acting like these canyons are Disneyland. And the organization refuses to listen to citizens input.	sandy	02/28/2015
	"Preserve" the mountains! Give me a break! They want to develop them for their own benefit.	Sandy	02/20/2015
	1) Grizzly Gulch needs mandatory protection! This is a deal breaker! Consideration must be made to the access Grizzly provides to Wolverine Cirque and the same Emma ridge line that is to be protected. NO new chairlift up Tuscarora or Grizzly! One can envision Alta gaining access and under the guise of commuter station expansion creating a lift link to Solitude or Brighton. Every time an expansion proposal is shunned they have a new lifeline proposal. ENOUGH!!! NOOO to Snowbird - why is the resort, the private business for profit always the taker. Why when protection comes up they finagle to grab another acre - why are they to say "well were willing to cede some acres for all of the rest - they've got what they've got - we are willing to help via approving RESORT FUNDED solutions to abate some of the transportation mess they've created but no more expansion. NONE!!!!!! 2) Absolute crystal clear designation of the proposed ski resort expansion for said commuter stations. This must be absolutely clear with penalty for violation. 3) NO more water for snow making. This should be clear from water protection studies. The resultant shoulder season depletion of water from secondary creeks to major canyon creeks from snow making endeavors threaten not only volume of water but living species within the water ecosystem. 4) for community pride - well we'll be darn proud to show the outside visitor these land grabbin money grubbin environment killers did not take these public lands-- howse about showing that off?	Sandy	05/02/2015
	A rail system will trash the canyons. Use a shuttle bus system during the busiest times of the year. Lots of stops, no private vehicles unless you have a permit (own property, etc.) like in Zion NP or in Aspen, etc. Rail is overkill for this pristine, fragile, smallish area.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	Again ~ we can drive our cars, ride our motorcycles, pedal our bikes, run with our legs, and ride the Park n Ride up Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons. And, you want to add a TRAIN, too? Are you serious?	Sandy	04/14/2015
	Again your plan is all dependent on a train system for transportation. This is wrong, obscenely expensive and completely naive in regards to how significant this will damage the entire lower canyon.	Sandy	03/13/2015
	Again, there is no mention of separated bike paths in the canyons. We absolutely need this, for the reasons I detailed above. Emigration Canyon is another good example. The bike path could double as a cross-country skiing and "fatbike" trail in the winter, and provide a means for skiers to enjoy "one more big run" down to the bottom of the canyon, easing congestion as the ski resorts evacuate in the evening.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	Again, vague, cycling not addressed at all! Cycling needs to be addressed	Sandy	04/30/2015
	Again, with the proposed land swap in Grizzly Gulch, the Cottonwood Canyons Scenario is admirable, without this land swap, it falls far short of protecting dispersed recreation and the environment.	Sandy	02/28/2015
	Alta expansion should not happen.	Sandy	04/30/2015
	Alta should not give up Grizzly gulch until an alternate form of transportation to BCC is agreed upon.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	Any rail system or Bus Rapid Transit system would destroy the beauty and serenity of Little Cottonwood Canyon. Big Cottonwood Canyon is an erosion canyon and follows the many curves of an ancient river bed whereas Little Cottonwood Canyon was caused by a glacier and as such is wide open and straight. In addition, I cannot conceive of anyway the 1-4 billion dollars for needed for such a system could possibly be justified, nor can I believe your proposed destruction of Little Cottonwood Canyon could survive the general public's awareness of your proposals. Don Halverson	Sandy	02/24/2015
	As stated above, the Cottonwood Canyons Scenario does not serve the public interest other than to reduce the amount of taxes paid by citizens. The Cottonwood Canyon Scenario largely benefits the resorts and development companies that would gain from having an increased flow of traffic into the Wasatch Mountains. The Scenario that would best serve the public interest would be to preserve the wilderness of the Wasatch Mountains.	Sandy	05/02/2015
	At this point it is hard to say how well the Canyons will be preserved because there is a lack of detail in the scenario. As a resort and backcountry skier for 45 years, I moved to Utah to be near Little Cottonwood Canyon. In my opinion, there is no need for ski area expansion in the Cottonwoods, and no justification for linkages between the canyons and the Wasatch back. There may be some marketing benefit, but the time it would take to go from one place to another will mean there will be little traffic...you could literally spend half or more of your day traversing from one resort to another and back again without any real benefit. As backcountry skiing becomes more and more popular, it would be a grave mistake to allow the resorts to grow into the limited backcountry terrain which is available. You could kill the next golden goose and once it's dead it can't be gotten back. I strongly urge you to leave the canyons as they are now.	Sandy	04/29/2015
	Best solution ios to stop trying to attract tourist. Next best is the tunnel from Brighton to Alta with Little Cotton Wood canyon closed in the winter. Worst solutions are the increased TRAFFIC, TRAIN AND WIDENING ROAD up Little Cottonwood Canyon	Sandy	04/13/2015
	blueprint to general	Sandy	02/04/2015
	Bringing more visitors into the canyons is not going to provide a better or even maintain the quality of the recreational experience. LCC is already being choked to death at the expense of Snowbird's profit. A train or additional bus lanes through out the canyon would completely change the character of the canyon from a beautiful pristine environment to a commercial center. Is this being done so Snowbird can add the additional 2000 units that the County already approved?	Sandy	04/20/2015
	Buses would be more flexible, cheaper and less environmentally damaging. Putting up a train line with the sideline footprint will have a tremendously damage environmental impact.	Sandy	02/23/2015
	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 haven. 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.	Sandy	03/11/2015
	Having a tax line run up Little Cottonwood canyon is the worst idea. In no way will this solve the problems with traffic in Little Cottonwood Canyon. It will destroy what makes the canyon beautiful and there is no room for a road and a tax line. I feel like the decision to develop Little Cottonwood Canyon is 100% economical. No one will ride Trax. The bad traffic days will not go away because they are caused by canyon closures and avalanches. Do not destroy what makes Utah great our natural resources because of the idea of adding revenue to the State.	Sandy	02/26/2015
	Here is what I like: 1. Private for public land swaps I especially like putting these privately owned areas into public lands: Mt. Superior, Flagstaff, Emma Ridge, White Pine, Guardsman Pass, Cardiff/Days Fork, and Hidden Canyon areas. Even though the total average of private land proposed to become public is much greater than the public land that the ski areas could receive as privately owned, I think that is a very fair swap given the greater value to the ski resorts of the base land areas they would receive. I am an avid and frequent back-country skier and hiker, especially in upper Little Cottonwood Canyon including White Pine. So, I am happy to see the land in those areas preserved and removed from ski area development. Here is what I do not like: 1. The fact that Grizzly Gulch is "under consideration". I think it is one of the heaviest use areas of LCC, and I think it should definitely be preserved. Also, compared to all the areas listed above, Grizzly Gulch is the area that is most accessible to beginner and intermediate skiers, boarders, and snowshoers including children. Most of the other areas are primarily for expert or advanced users (both in skill as well as physical strength and stamina). Grizzly Gulch and its adjacent areas can also be enjoyed in a much shorter outing than the above areas. It permits visits as short as 2-3 hour whereas the others mostly require a one half to full day commitment. If all the areas above ARE preserved but Grizzly Gulch is NOT preserved, then I would oppose the entire Cottonwood Canyons Scenario. 2. Station stops on a mountain-rail system Here is what I am neutral about: 1. Additional water for snowmaking.	Sandy	05/02/2015
	Horrible solutions have been suggested. Great damage will be done to the canyons to accomplish what MA has in mind. Try some small steps before spending so much money on a bondoggle.	Sandy	02/25/2015
	How did a rail line proposal for the canyons become the Blueprint choice? It was not the recommended choice of the citizen Transportation Systems group. Such a massive infrastructure would disturb the canyon. The 2002 Olympics stated that the Canyons were too sensitive to be able to sustain structures and the influx of visitors. So what has changed?	sandy	05/01/2015
	How is building a multi-billion dollar train that blazes up the canyon saving environment, recreation or water resources? It's not...it's making transportation dept. money. Be honest.	sandy	03/03/2015
	I am in favor of a light rail or dedicated bus transit system up Little Cottonwood Canyon. I ride the bus as often as I can but I do not like to be crowded in with standing room only and will opt to drive my car when faced with this situation day after day. (I work and ski at Alta and have gone up the canyon more than 80 times so far this season). The current bus schedule is far from adequate. Four buses will pick up at the bottom of LCC within five minutes of each other then there are big gaps but quite often it is standing room only.	Sandy	03/05/2015
	I am very much in favor of the expanded trail system described in the Proposal. However, there is not enough information to know if it meets our needs. It is essential given the popularity and growth of mountain biking, that mountain bikes be allowed on the new trail system. Mountain bikes do not degrade a properly designed trail tread any more than hiking traffic, both far less than equestrian traffic. In fact, the rolling action of mountain bike tires consolidates the trail tread which make it less susceptible to erosion. The Proposal does not clarify mountain bike use.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	I believe having a blueprint for future development is extremely important and proposed land swaps make sense. It will preserve sections that are currently hodge podge and provide recreation areas some room to expand near their already existing land areas.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	I oppose ski area expansion, so I am positive about creating lasting limits on expansion, not thrilled on the concessions. I think boundaries in all counties should be drawn including snowbird expansion to the south.	Sandy	04/20/2015
	I ski each of the areas looking to be protected, however if swapping means boring mountain tunnels for rail systems, I am concerned about this. My opinion, the resorts already have what they need and they shouldn't be permitted to expand. The iconic locations are super vital to back country users and should remain protected.	Sandy	05/01/2015

I support Mt. Accord's blueprint proposal for increased environmental protection of Wasatch lands and enhanced recreation trail networks. However, I am opposed to the following elements of the transportation blueprint: a) proposed resort expansion into current prime back-country ski areas, b) the proposal for a train or rapid transit bus lane in Little Cottonwood Canyon (LCC), and c) the proposed connection of the LCC, Big Cottonwood Canyon (BCC) and Park City. --a- Alta's proposal to expand into Grizzly Gulch with a new chair lift and Solitude's proposal to expand into Silver Fork with a chair lift re-alignment would be a great loss to the back-country ski community! Grizzly Gulch in particular is my main back-country terrain that I ski 2-3 times a month for most of the winter. Based on my experience, it seems like the majority of back-country skiers are Utahans, while the majority of resort skiers are out-of-staters. By giving up more back-country terrain to the ski resorts we are catering to out-of-staters and at the same time restricting our own ability to enjoy the Wasatch wilderness. I am proud to support Wasatch Backcountry Alliance, and I hope they will succeed at opposing these proposals. --b0-I am opposed to the train or bus rapid transit BRT lane proposal "proposed transportation plan" (PTP) in LCC for the following 9 reasons: b1) the urbanization feel that it would bring to the canyon, b2) the potential loss of bouldering and other rock-climbing opportunities, b3) the increased risk they would add to driving the canyon, b4) the impact on the environment, b5) the potential lack of utility for dispersed users at late hours, b6) the increased risk for pedestrian-traffic fatalities due to increased foot traffic from a fixed stop schedule, b7) the potential loss of parking opportunities, b8) the cost of financing this PTP, b9-b10) the disconnect between this PTP and Mt. Accord's own "ideal system" research on transportation and growth. --b1-If a train or bus were added to LCC alongside the existing roadway it would make the canyon feel more urban/developed. I use this canyon regularly, 3-5 times a month throughout the year, to escape the city and enjoy our amazing Wasatch wilderness through rock-climbing, bouldering, ice-climbing, hiking, biking, back-country skiing, alpine skiing, cross-country skiing and running. If a train were added, it would be a diesel cog locomotive due to the grade of LCC which averages about 8%, as electric trains cannot travel this steep of a grade. I am concerned about seeing, hearing, and smelling a train in the canyon when I am trying to escape the city and enjoy the wilderness. This would greatly detract from my recreational experiences. --b2-Along these lines, how would developing a train alongside LCC road affect the bouldering and rock-climbing access and experience? In particular, some boulders are within 20 feet of the road, so I wonder how a train or BRT could fit and preserve the existing bouldering experience. I would hope that bouldering and climbing opportunities would not be lost. I also hope that it would not endanger climbers or cause increased stress due to proximity of train tracks or the bus lane. --b3-I am concerned about the dangers that a train or BRT system would bring to the car traffic through the canyon. Driving personal vehicles would become more dangerous because we would now be sandwiched between the opposing lane and a train or BRT lane. This is especially dangerous in the winter time where cars slide off the road. An increase in traffic fatalities seems likely as cars slide into a train or bus track. --b4-The canyon is part of a protected watershed and a fragile ecosystem. I am concerned about the environmental impact of building a train or widening the road for the BRT lane. --b5-As a dispersed user, I would need several stops throughout the canyon in order for the PTP to accommodate my usage. Gritmill, Gate Butress, Coalpit Butress, Lisa Falls, Maybird Slide Area, Tanner Gulch and White Pine. In order for the PTP to be useful for me in the summer time, I would also need services that run until 10pm at night. Otherwise, I will likely continue to drive the canyon. --b6-Given that some freedom is lost from a fixed stop schedule, it will also be important to have a safe trail system since foot-traffic alongside the road will increase in response to fewer access points. This trail system will need to run the length of the canyon, otherwise pedestrian-traffic fatalities could increase. --b7-I hope that existing parking opportunities will not be lost or reduced as a result of the PTP. --b8-The cost of financing a train is estimated at a billion dollars - a steep price tag to be financed by Utah tax payers relative to the fraction of Utahans who use LCC on a regular basis. Also, what are the costs of clearing land slides and avalanches from train tracks? --b9-Finally, I am concerned about the disconnect between the research from MA's transportation and growth research, which show traffic volumes in LCC to be constant over the past 11 years, and the proposal to put in a train or	Sandy	04/30/2015
I think a fee station is reasonable. I like the added protections to expand the wilderness area. I think a bike lane/running lane could be a good idea. I think we need more organized parking, as roadside parking is limited. I think some sections of big cottonwood canyon road are dangerous, especially right after the power station as you drive up the canyon.	sandy	04/01/2015
I think having light rail up LCC would be excellent, as long as there are stops along the way for trailheads other than just the major resorts. also tunneling to BCC/PC is an interesting proposal, but I'm unclear as to the environmental impacts of this. I'm very happy with the plan to protect watersheds.	sandy	03/22/2015
I think that a train Little CC is sounds like overkill. I live at the bottom of the canyon and the road is only very busy on big snow days. Other than that it is not bad at all. Increasing the bus schedule would be more than enough. It would be very sad to see a not needed train destroy the mountaintop trails that so many people use.	Sandy	02/17/2015
I would like to know what the resorts plan to do with the lands transferred to them. I would bet that Snowbird will add the 2000 units that	sandy	04/20/2015
I would like to see a tram system with multiple stops for recreation, construction of riblets would have the least effect on wildlife and the water shed.	Sandy	04/30/2015
I would love to see the environmental proposed actions for our canyons, but find the proposals benefiting the ski resorts to be repugnant. Further expansion into developed areas into Silver and American Forks Station stops are reasonable, but not specifically a "mountain-rail system". Development with water rights at the base of Alta of up to 108 condos units under no circumstances benefits the canyon. And then there is the continuing negotiations of Grizzly Gulch. Will this be on the development list or in exchange for even more development? In years to come, our watershed will become more important and must not be compromised by further development. The recreational proposals are simply unclear. How many new trails and connections to resorts? What specifically does it mean to "direct future growth...to areas with infrastructure that can accommodate and manage growth"? It sounds like the formula for future expansion and development of the resorts. A user fee that is reasonable and funds habitat restoration could be very beneficial, but to "reinvest in...infrastructure", again, leaves me questioning the vision. The economic proposals simply sound counter-productive to the environmental proposals. How does connecting the Wasatch Back with the Cottonwood Canyons do anything but bring more people and development into the Canyons?	SANDY	04/29/2015
I'm a little concerned about expansion of the honeycomb ski area, but I'm a big fan of putting the entire South Face of Little Cottonwood Canyon in public hands.	Sandy	03/16/2015
It appears that the key in this area is as stated above. Conflicts are apparently between development in the canyons and a narrow group of environmental groups who wish to limit development. The environmental groups are being given concessions by the ski resorts, but the price for these concessions is a rail corridor up Little Cottonwood Canyon. This will result in both roadway traffic and rail line traffic, by design increase the number of people in the canyon and the environmental impact. I am not convinced.	Sandy	03/06/2015
It doesn't serve the locals, just the tourists that are visiting.	Sandy	03/15/2015
It is allowing private ownership in the lower elevations to expand more and more, thus driving up the human impact on the land and the need for even more transportation and over use of the mountains.	Sandy	03/11/2015
It seems to serve the ski resorts very well but not the vast majority of Utahns, tax payers or nature lovers.	Sandy	05/01/2015
it's hard to comment on the exchange of usfs lands for private lands as the information is minimal. I am in favor of the exchange from the standpoint of moving the forest service out of the commercial zone and preserving the land on the north side of the canyon. But there are many details that need to be ironed out concerning the visibility of existing lodges and access to parking for everyone I've grown up at the base of Little Cottonwood Canyon. The canyon is now being loved to death, people park their cars anywhere, and riparian areas along roadways are being destroyed. It is now time to take a bavarian alps approach and utilize mass transit in order to preserve the environment and lessen the impact by users. I don't think overbuilding such a system is a possibility, especially with our population growth.	Sandy	04/06/2015
Land swaps in exchange for train stops is a terrible trade!! I'm all for setting aside land for public use, but this is a BAD deal. Any train up LCC would be an environmental and visual disaster and would not even come close to any potential "benefit" derived from securing additional public lands at the top of the canyon.	Sandy	03/02/2015
Last night's meeting was a joke, none of the questions we asked were answered, no open discussion was accomplished. This seem to be a technique to ram thru a bunch of mountain development plans with no input by neighbors.	Sandy	02/12/2015
Leave little cottonwood canyon alone.	sandy	03/09/2015
Leave the canyons alone! Trax is not the answer, it will ruin Sandy and will ruin the beautiful canyons with ugly trains which have a track record of killing somebody pretty much every week.	Sandy	04/30/2015
Light rail should be the only option for travel in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons with ample bike lanes. This has worked well in Zion National Park.	Sandy	04/30/2015
Little Cottonwood Canyon is a treasure that is enjoyed by many various groups of nature loving citizens. Many of these uses would be negatively impacted by a massive transit project built to serve as a though fare to all the ski resorts. Let each canyon deal with its on load inn a reasonable and economic way instead of sacrificing Little Cottonwood for a transportation hub. The public is not demanding this so I have to ask who?	Sandy	02/13/2015
Make any private to public land transfers be to the state or local governments. Make no proposals to change federal lands to wilderness, monument, or other status.	Sandy	03/15/2015
No extra lanes or trains up Little Cottonwood canyon. Only more busses, and a more flexible bus schedule.	Sandy	05/01/2015
No extra traffic lanes! No trains up Littlewood Canyon!	Sandy	03/14/2015
No lanes and no trains up little cottonwood canyon.	Sandy	03/03/2015
NO LANES NO TRAINS!!!!	Sandy	04/29/2015
NO TRAINS OR LANES UP LITTLE COTTONWOOD CANYON	Sandy	04/29/2015
No trains or tunnels in the canyons or foothills	Sandy	03/12/2015
Not if the price is a train up little cottonwood canyon.	Sandy	05/01/2015
Not if transit alternative D is the price.	Sandy	05/01/2015
Once again, I am worried that the emphasis is on development and not preservation. I really want to see what we have protected for hiking, biking, photography, wildlife, backcountry skiing, etc. Sometimes it seems like it's all about the ski resorts here in Utah. But those other activities are just as valid and bring in revenue, as well.	Sandy	05/01/2015
Preserve the Backcountry to those who want to earn their turns, not to all lift users.	Sandy	02/05/2015
Preserving the water resources is the critical piece in this whole puzzle. Since we can't prevent people from moving to SLC, resolving the scarce water resources is vital.	Sandy	04/30/2015
Providing more water so more condos can be built at Snowbird and Altadoes not preserve environmental issues. It causes more issues.	sandy	04/07/2015
Providing rail or widening the roads in the Canyons only serves to increase the number of people who are using the canyon resources. If we are trying to limit environmental impact, this is the opposite of what we should be doing.	Sandy	03/16/2015
Putting a fixed transit system like a tram in the canyons would be a disaster. It would destroy the environment. High quality buses would be best with underground parking at the base of the canyons.	sandy	03/01/2015
Putting up light rail in Little Cottonwood will destroy the view of the canyons and destroy existing trails.	Sandy	04/24/2015
Rail and other fixed rail systems are a bad idea. Please get real and focus on realistic solutions such as bus or shuttle systems.	Sandy	03/08/2015
Save the trails, we want hiking, biking, & climbing! No extra lanes or trains!	Sandy	03/16/2015
Secure Grizzly Gulch from Alta. This area is a Key to public recreation at the top of Little Cottonwood Canyon. Do not allow any Aerial Trams or Gondolas across ridgelines or mountain public recreation areas. It will take away form the scenic beauty of the mountains for hikers, BC Skiers and all users.	Sandy	02/12/2015
See above	Sandy	02/16/2015
see above - private sector gains on the backs of the individual taxpayers and homeowners living in the sandy area the invisible, and unrepresented due to the wanted end result of the PRIVATE ski resorts on PUBLIC LAND (EXPANSION) is what the proposals are tailored around. Good luck to someone that would like to just enjoy the canyons. Are we going to make it pay to play as we have done with City Creek and American Fork Canyons? And have police outnumbering the people.	Sandy	04/04/2015
See above comment	Sandy	03/17/2015
See above- more people in the Cottonwood Canyons ruins it.	Sandy	04/30/2015
Snowbird has contributed to the congestion in the canyons. It will be the principal benefactor of any actions taken by Mount record. Why do they want to go along with the land swap? I believe it's because they have 2000 more units to build and where they going to build them.	Sandy	04/30/2015
Stay away from current backcountry terrain. Grizzly Gulch is a major access point for backcountry users and is the best spot to introduce new users into the Wasatch backcountry terrain.	SANDY	05/01/2015
The blueprint should include a broader scope for sustainable economic development of Little Cottonwood Canyon to go alongside the purpose of preservation of the watershed and natural environment. Look what has been done in the mountains of Switzerland for a good example.	Sandy	04/30/2015
The canyons should stay as pristine as possible. Making more roads and making it more accessible for more people to ruin the natural resources and wildlife. The canyons should not be ruined to make money.	Sandy	04/19/2015
The CCS favors ski resorts, back country skiers! ONLY 7% of Utahans ski and much less than that ski the back country! Let's look at issues that benefit the 93% of UTAH and Utahans rather than the ski resorts located in LCC, BCC! How about the daily gridlock west of I-15 for starters! Solve that issue that affects far more people ALL YEAR "ROUND!!!! If MA is serious about preserving the environment of our canyons then limit the number of people drawn to them! You don't drive more people to an area and make credible claims that you are doing so to preserve the environment! Such a ruse is laughable and only holds water for politicians! People in everyday life easily see through such a ploy.	Sandy	04/16/2015
The current stewards of the leased lands have done a fantastic job of preserving our lands. Those stewards should stay included in this process in the future. To have those lands only under one controlling group sets us up for failure. Continue to use the collective approach to preserving these lands.	sandy	02/23/2015

	The future of the central Wasatch should not be determined by developers and resort owners. The attraction is the accessibility from the airport or as a local, steep terrain, snow, and quality of the environment. Focus should be on getting people in and out with less drama and traffic and preserving the existing amount of terrain for wild skiing. I don't have much of a quarrel with the solitude and Brighton identified expansions, but do oppose any alpa or snowbird expansions in Salt Lake County or Utah and Wasatch counties.	Sandy	02/10/2015
	The idea of building a railway or dedicated bus lane up Little Cottonwood Canyon should be scrapped. We should simply invest in more bus service and put hard limits on automobile use in LCC, regardless of the day. Although the canyon already has a road, adding road lanes or a railway will immeasurably detract from the wilderness aspects of the canyon. Also, the idea of interconnecting Alta to Brighton and Park City, whether by ski lift or by road/rail tunnel, should also be scrapped. The mountain barrier between these communities provides pristine mountain experiences to many users, not just the super-fit backcountry athletes. Making a road or rail connection between LCC and Park City may seem like a good idea (another route beside I-80 and Provo Canyon), but at what cost? Do we really need another canyon to be bisected by a high speed road or railway? I don't think so. Should we work within the topographical constraints that nature has provided, and maximize efficiency in transportation users and workers within the canyon? I think so. Thank you for considering my comments. I have lived in the Salt Lake Valley since 1987, when I arrived and stayed because of the beautiful mountains. I would hate to see the mountain environment become nothing more than a high speed thruway, getting people hurriedly from point a to point b.	sandy	03/13/2015
	The idea of destroying the canyon with a train to stuff more people up the canyon to benefit the resorts is illogical at best and possibly criminal at worst	Sandy	03/06/2015
	The land swap makes a lot of sense for the resorts to improve the base of their mountains, but not enough to justify rail lines up the Canyons. I support the land swap. I am strongly opposed to making Little Cottonwood Canyon a major transit to Park City. The bottom of Little Cottonwood Canyon is very narrow and installing additional lanes and/or a rail line up the canyon would dramatically change the nature and current available uses of the canyon. The proposed blueprint is far to heavily favored on resort development, tourism and economic growth and does not do enough to preserve the pristine nature of our canyons, particularly the Cottonwood Canyons.	Sandy	03/14/2015
	The proposed deal will sacrifice Little Cottonwood Canyon by transforming it into a transportation corridor and will destroy much of its natural environment, appeal, and beauty. It would be one thing to build a rail line if there were no existing road, as such infrastructure might be necessary to allow Utahns to access and enjoy the canyons. However, doubling up on infrastructure in the canyon unnecessarily destroys the natural environment and beauty of the Canyon. Doubling up on infrastructure will likely stress the natural environment and may threaten existing species, wildlife corridors, watersheds, and other natural conditions. The proposed deal represents an elitist plan for the Canyons that will benefit only a small number of Utahns at potentially tremendous cost both to average recreational users and taxpayers. One of the primary focuses of the deal is to preserve "backcountry areas for dispersed recreation," a goal which benefits a vanishingly small percentage of Utah residents. Only about 7% of Utahns ski and the number that have the time, training, and resources to backcountry ski is much smaller. Yet, in order to benefit the admittedly small ("dispersed") number of people who can take advantage of backcountry skiing, the proposal sacrifices the beauty enjoyment of the lower part of the canyon - the part that Utahns likely access most frequently, including trails like the Quarry trail along Little Cottonwood Canyon. For most Utahns, the Canyons are a journey and an experience, and destination resorts like the ski-resorts are largely beside the point. Utahns love their canyons for the ability to hike with their families on trails that can be accessed from the valley quickly and for other similar recreational opportunities. Scarring the beloved Canyon landscape with additional, irreversible infrastructure development is contrary to the interests of these many Utahns who enjoy using the lower Canyons and benefits only a select, powerful, and wealthy few with the resources to take advantage of expensive skiing opportunities. Moreover, all taxpayers will be saddled with the enormous cost of this additional and unnecessary infrastructure. Additionally, this destruction of the Canyon is being suggested to address traffic congestion that is really only problematic on a few particularly busy ski days each year. The proposal flies in the face of good science and policy about confronting climate change risk. In the face of the risks and uncertainty associated with climate change, Utah should be investing its resources in robust, resilient strategies that allow us to respond flexibly to changing conditions, rather than committing massive amounts of money to an irreversible infrastructure project that may well be inconsistent with future needs and may saddle Utah's citizens with a project with no return on investment. Whatever one believes about the anthropogenic causes of climate change, there is little doubt that the climate is changing. What that means for Utah remains to be seen, but there is substantial risk that we will have many more winters like this one, in which limited snowfall and warmer winter and spring temperatures mean that ski resorts struggle to remain economically viable. There are also far more important risks associated with this potential climate change, including water shortages, increased wildfire risk, and inadequate capacity to store and collect water in existing reservoirs (which were designed to handle late snowpack melt rather than spring rains and early spring runoff). No one knows exactly how climate change will affect Utah, and in the face of such uncertainty, wise public policy requires choosing strategies that are resilient and "robust" - that offer benefits across a wide range of possible future scenarios, including those that we all hope will not come to pass (and this is true even if one doubts that climate change will materialize at all). Wise policy-making in the face of uncertainty also favors incremental solutions, rather than long-term, irreversible infrastructure investments. Incremental solutions allow adaptation to evolving conditions, rather than locking communities and taxpayers into expensive investments that no longer serve current needs and will not provide any reasonable return on investment. Of course, sometimes - even in the face of uncertainty - we have no choice but to make long-term, public infrastructure investments. In this case, however, there is no such urgency. Any need for increased transportation in the Canyons can be handled by incremental solutions like increased busing, shuttles, or perhaps "transportation system management alternatives," which meet short-term needs but allow us to remain flexible and nimble in responding to changed conditions. We should not saddle ourselves to an unnecessary and massively expensive long-term infrastructure when uncertainty and risk counsels incremental, adaptable solutions that can be altered to adjust to changing conditions. Building additional permanent and expensive infrastructure up our canyons will almost inevitably create serious pressure for future growth. The public will demand a return on its infrastructure investment, and that return is most	Sandy	04/29/2015
	There are very good things in this scenario (permanent protection of Mt Superior, Flagstaff Mountain and in-holdings in White Pine and Days Fork) and (prevention of Guardsman Pass development by increasing public ownership), but also very bad and concerning things (Snowbird's potential encroachment into Utah County); and one "DEAL BREAKER" - the protection of Grizzly Gulch. This area is too precious to be developed for skiing or housing EVER. This is an example of the legacy of the Wasatch. GOOD and BAD should be an option in the multiple choice if people are willing to further define what they mean.	Sandy	04/14/2015
	This proposal is to aggressive and lack environmental constraints.	sandy	05/01/2015
	This seems like a push from Snowbird and other business to capitalize on the "asset" of the mountains, thinly veiled by environmental responsibility. It's just going to turn our peaceful wilderness retreat into a tourist trap.	Sandy	03/12/2015
	Tying the land protection to a rail system is, in my opinion, a way to doom the land protection. A rail line I the Little Cottonwood would have huge opportunity costs for the region. It is unlikely to be funded regionally or federally without decimating the existing transit system.	Sandy	02/18/2015
	We do not need to expand the ski resorts or provide additional water for snow making or development.	Sandy	04/30/2015
	We need a system like Zion's National Park with more busses for Little Cottonwood Canyon. That should be the solution with more parking outside the canyon possibly in Salt Lake or lower Sandy. I want more busses, and no more digging into the canyon. The canyon is small, and should be preserved. Not to mention the water supply. We cannot endanger the watershed for the greed of UTA and ski resort owners. Extra lanes or a train would be a huge footprint in a little canyon, not to mention it would cut out recreational needs of Utah residents. Since cars will not be limited it is just more of packing the canyon full. The new transportation will be too expensive to ride, and will not help the residents. The maintenance would be a burden on taxpayers as well. It seems that the major transit system only benefits UTA and the owners of the ski resorts. I do not want to pay for that as a tax payer, and I do not want the money taken from education as an educator. Recreation will be limited by the expansion of a major transit system. Trails will be cut out and harder to access, as well as climbing, mountain biking, and more. Parking will be limited for things that the public residents enjoy. Only 7% of Utah skies and they drive to where they are going.	Sandy	04/30/2015
	We need to increase the bus usage and also possibly go to an even/odd license number system for travel up and down the canyon. A reasonable fee for driving in the canyon could also be imposed.	Sandy	03/12/2015
	We strongly object to both the process and substantive conclusions of the Mountain Accord deal. These comments represent only a few of the many important issues that this proposal has raised because of the difficulty of getting good information about what is actually being proposed (and the true cost to taxpayers of that proposal) and because of the shortness of the timeline for public comment. The report fails to adequately consider alternatives or adequately explain why some alternatives are being excluded from further consideration. The report fails to adequately consider alternatives or adequately explain why some alternatives are being excluded from further consideration. For example, one of the most obvious solutions for managing traffic in Little Cottonwood Canyon is increasing "bus service in mixed traffic up Little Cottonwood Canyon." This alternative, however, like many others has gotten short shrift in Mountain Accord's analysis. Specifically, the Transportation Purposes and Alternatives Report available on the Mountain Accord website proposes to drop this alternative from further consideration based wholly on a conclusory assertion, with no accompanying analysis or facts, that this alternative succeeds only in "reducing avalanche-related risk and delay" and would "fail to meet the other 13 purposes." No explanation is given as to why this option would not "reduce auto use and congestion in Little Cottonwood Canyon," "reduce vehicle emissions in the Cottonwood Canyons to improve air quality," "reduce parking impacts on environment, safety, and economy," "support land use goals for reduced sprawl and concentrated development," "improve access and connections for pedestrians and bicyclists," "protect or enhance the natural and scenic resources of the Cottonwood Canyons," "protect and enhance community character" or any of the other articulated goals for the plan. It defies logic to assume that more frequent and better timed bus service, coordinated with bus service schedules throughout the valley, would not decrease auto use, vehicle emissions, and parking demands in Little Cottonwood Canyon. This failure to grapple fairly with the issues at hand suggests a rigged, agenda-driven analysis rather than a careful, fair consideration of potential alternatives. Moreover, one wonders how the proposed approach "protects watershed health, water quality, and water quality" better than increased busing, given that the negotiated proposal requires providing increased water for culinary purposes to Alta and increased water (in unquantified amounts) for snowmaking at the resorts. Additionally, while Alternative D, Transportation system management alternatives--which "are combinations of incentives for transit use and disincentives to auto use, without adding new transit guideways or expanding roadways"--is mentioned as an alternative that will continue to be considered, the Report evinces very little actual consideration of this alternative. It seems that a deal has already been struck between the existing players (who do not represent all relevant stakeholders) and that other alternatives are falling by the wayside without careful study. There seems to be little actual data in the report, so it seems unlikely that any alternative has received even minimal consideration to be eliminated from consideration at this stage. The report also fails to prioritize the many listed goals in any meaningful way and assumes that increased tourism in the Canyons is an unmitigated good. No sense of relative priority is given and the report fails to explain, for example, why creating a unique "traveler experience" in the canyon should be given equal weight with reducing congestion and parking demands. Relatedly, the report also assumes that increasing tourism in the Canyons is an unqualified good without any explanation for why that is so. The proposed deal will sacrifice Little Cottonwood Canyon by transforming it into a transportation corridor and will destroy much of its natural environment, appeal, and beauty. It would be one thing to build a rail line if there were no existing road, as such infrastructure might be necessary to allow Utahns to access and enjoy the canyons. However, doubling up on infrastructure in the canyon unnecessarily destroys the natural environment and beauty of the Canyon. Doubling up on infrastructure will likely stress the natural environment and may threaten existing species, wildlife corridors, watersheds, and other natural conditions. The proposed deal represents an elitist plan for the Canyons that will benefit only a small number of Utahns at potentially tremendous cost both to average recreational users and taxpayers. One of the primary focuses of the deal is to preserve "backcountry areas for dispersed recreation," a goal which benefits a vanishingly small percentage of Utah residents. Only about 7% of Utahns ski and the number that have the time, training, and resources to backcountry ski is much smaller. Yet, in order to benefit the admittedly small ("dispersed") number of people who can take advantage of backcountry skiing, the proposal sacrifices the beauty enjoyment of the lower	Sandy	04/29/2015
	We will be needing the water in the valley so should not be giving more water to the resorts.	Sandy	04/24/2015
	While I agree with the increase in environmental protections, I am disappointed to see that the expansion of ski resorts was the trade-off.	Sandy	04/30/2015
	Your plan should also include the projected income of all parties who will benefit financially from the Mt. Accord and make it public by mailing, emailing and having it announced on the news weekly. We need to harvest and preserve water. Our state needs to develop the Bear River drainage to provide for drought years, and population growth. The LPF (lake Powell pipeline) will benefit long term southern Utah water needs. Man up and do the right thing. So called environmental groups oppose developing the resources that will maintain our species, provide agricultural water, recreation, shoreline, etc. It is a classic case of out of your nose to spite your face...sucker us with a few drops, when the answer to our long term water needs is the Bear River drainage.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	Protecting and increasing public and federal lands needs to be a huge priority, so anything that is a viable and permanent solution to that problem makes me happy.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	It's impossible to answer this question given the choices. The proposed protections are smart, important and in the public's interest. The fast rail proposal up the canyons, as the only option makes no sense. LCC is fragile. Why us to get people to other resorts? Use of cars must be limited, but this scenario makes no sense in its limitation of alternatives. Such actions will likely load the canyons with attracted customers, necessitating further massive development at the resorts and requiring that more precious land be made available to handle the crowds. It makes no sense. The Wasatch are not the Rockies, or the Sierra.	Sandy (Salt Lake County)	04/16/2015
	As acknowledged during the 2002 Olympics when it was deemed unsuitable for any venue due to the environmental damage it could sustain, Little Cottonwood Canyon is a very fragile environment. As a primary watershed for Salt Lake City, the preservation of land in this canyon is of paramount importance. The act of building a new transportation system up the canyon would cause significant alteration to the mountains in the construction zone, increasing silt runoff, disturbing migration patterns, damaging water quality, and creating significant noise pollution for an extended period (3 years?). Also, summer visitation to the fragile environments around Snowbird and Alta is kept to reasonable levels partially due to constrained transportation options. Once these constraints are removed, visits will likely increase materially, resulting damage associated with increased foot traffic in sensitive areas, more trash, significantly more human waste, and human food being consumed by animals. Additionally, the type of visitor will change from outdoor types, who typically have greater environmental awareness/respect to day-trippers, whose knowledge of forest protection practices is limited. The damage that day-trippers cause is evident in the campgrounds that they frequent.	Sandy (Wasatch Resort, LCC)	03/17/2015
	interesting how suddenly there is more water available when for years it has been stated that there is no water for private property owners in the basin	sandy ut	04/30/2015
	See above.	Sandy,	03/10/2015

	Does not serve the public interests. Too much land will be developed. Look at the plan! The majority of land will be open to public interests.	Sandy, UT	02/28/2015
	I just hope that it doesn't set up a scenario that somehow facilitates the ability of resorts to continue to obtain or lease USFS lands in the future.	Sandy, UT	03/14/2015
	I like the fact that trails will be maintained & hopefully the erosion of these trails prevented. I wonder how much backcountry terrain will be accessed from lifts instead of by skis. I hope that noise pollution isn't an added problem w/rail noises & diesel from the buses. I also I'm concerned about the effects of adding tunnels to access BCC to LCC & LCC to Park City. I also don't want to see Light rail into BCC. Add parking & then access canyons by bus. You should have stops for Dogwood, Storm Mountain, Spruces, Donut Falls (Etc). In LCC stops for Church Records, Gate Buttress, Red Pine, White Pine, etc.	Sandy, UT	04/26/2015
	Need to review more details on the proposed rail / transit stops	Sandy, UT	03/26/2015
	Pork trade-offs between land use and transportation are unacceptable in LCC.	Sandy, UT	02/23/2015
	The key factor is whether Grizzly Gulch will be protected from any further lifts or development of any kind. Other swaps of public and private land seem to make a lot of sense.	Sandy, UT	02/25/2015
	This proposal has some very good components, but also some dubious ones. The proposed land swaps do seem reasonable, and help to protect some contentious areas that should definitely not see development. Limited development at the ski resort base areas seems a reasonable compromise for the land that is being obtained for conservation. However, there are numerous components of this scenario that are not at the best interest of the general public. First, ski resort expansion is not necessary or desired. Over the past many years, ski resorts have continually sought expansion after expansion that has resulted in many past compromises that has slowly eaten away at the wilderness quality lands in the Wasatch. This needs to stop. It is time to make it clear that there is no reason that our already large ski resorts need to become larger. There is currently plenty of land to ski on at these resorts. This would be a huge loss for the environment and the non-motorized recreational community at very little benefit. Second, the inclusion of provisions concerning a mountain railway are unreasonable. This railway would come at an extreme expense to the citizens of Utah, and is not a prudent solution to the canyon transportation problems. It should not be a bargaining chip in these type of negotiations. The merits of the railway should be weighed on its ability to complete transportation goals and its impact on the environment, and not on the fact that it is in a complicated agreement.	Sandy, UT	05/01/2015
	As stated above I am concerned about any construction in the canyons but recognize that some must take place to accommodate transportation alternatives that would enhance transportation.	Sandy, Utah	03/03/2015
	Do I fully support the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance recommendations on the Mountain Accord proposal. No interconnect tunnel or train. Increased interconnect only serves to increase commercial development. Commercial development is something that should NOT be a priority in such a special environmental us area. Keep the ski areas within their current boundaries. Increased ski development is contrary to the economic and environmental protection for these unique areas. Perform the swap in Mt. Superior, grizzly gulch in order to maintain the ridge line as a park effects in LCC. Keep the Solitude Honeycomb lift to it's existing foot print. Improve the bus access, dramatically increase number of buses and install a reversible bus only lane on the existing road with environmentally esthetic avalanche sheds in high risk areas. A train and tunnels is a totally non stater economically and time frame wise DO NOT ALLOW THE MOUNTAIN ACCORD PROCESS TO BE MOSTLY AN INCREASE COMMERCIALIZATION PLAN. The lands you have are unique and must be preserved.	Sandy, Utah	04/27/2015
	We need managed horse use in the Salt Lake County canyons like American Fork Canyon allows!	Sandy, Utah	03/16/2015
	The stated benefits (preserving ridgelines and iconic landscapes; preserving important backcountry for dispersed recreation; increasing environmental and watershed protection) are dependent the successful completion of the mountain rail system or expanded I-210 and additional water availability and development to support the rail system. The requirements for rail, development and water isn't supported by the bus ridership numbers in the Canyon and would cause significant environmental damage to the very narrow Little Cottonwood Canyon.	Sandy/Little Cottonwood Canyon	03/14/2015
	Stop more development at Ski Resorts.	sandy/unincorporated SL county	05/01/2015
	To whom it may concern I think the canyons are too fragile for the large scale integrated transportation plan you outline here. I am against linking the resorts. I am in favor of light rail in Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons. I am in favor of buses in the canyons I am in favor a fee for vehicles to enter the canyons. That model worked well in Millcreek. Call if you have questions. Jeff Whiteley 801 943 3648 Sent from my iPad	Sandy	03/16/2015
	I like the Canyons Scenario. I don't like the idea of any "fees" or "parking/picnic strategies" for the Wasatch. You should not have to pay a dime to access public land in the Wasatch. The good thing about having access to the Wasatch Mountains is that it is FREE recreation. I never use Mill Creek just because they charge you at the entrance. I think the tunnel idea is crazy, too expensive and too much engineering (plus were in an earthquake prone area). I think the tunnel concept in the plan distracts from an otherwise mostly good plan. The tunnels are ridiculous and should be completely taken out. I don't want my taxes to pay for tunnels and I don't want to see that much construction in the Wasatch. I do like the idea of a light rail system/train route up the canyons and to Park City though. I would prefer light rail over bus or any tram/lift connections of the canyons. I would support a light rail system to Park City and up the canyons. I think that should be the focus for the transportation portion.	Saratoga Springs	04/30/2015
	I'm too wary of the non-public interests and insufficiently expert on the details to endorse anything that smacks of any hint of compromise with resorts and developers, who have already pushed too far.	Seattle, WA (formerly SL, UT)	02/05/2015
	I am an avid user of the central Wasatch. I hike, ski, snowshoe, bike, picnic, and regularly visit the mountains. I appreciate the opportunity to protect White Pine and Mt Superior. However, I oppose additional ski resort development, particularly into American Fork. Utahans are skiing less despite the population growth in part because of the cost. While I ski Alta & Brighton often, I worry that we are permanently sacrificing our natural local treasure so that wealthy tourists can jet in a few days a year. I for one refuse to scar our scenery so as to convenience tourists. Why not build a tram to Angels Landing too? Expanding resort footprints will benefit the non-Utahns at the expense of my future children and grandchildren. Additionally, any expansion into American Fork will inevitably result in future development in a canyon currently devoid of large scale commercial development. Additionally, recreation is more than just skiing. The recreation discussion continues to focus on skiing which requires significant infrastructure and the accompanying year around development. Meanwhile, less intrusive recreation such as hiking and snowshoeing and backcountry skiing gets overlooked. I do not want to always hike under ski lifts. Finally, the central Wasatch has few high elevation accessible backcountry areas left that are undisturbed. Once they are developed, then they are lost forever. Where is the discussion on the cost to the local taxpayer of fixed infrastructure or are we ignored because of the potential lucre of the almighty tourist? From an environmental perspective, more development will inevitably lead to potential impact on an already strained water supply. As the mountains receive less snow in the future due to climate change, the water supply will become increasingly at risk. The environmental concerns should trump economic development in the blueprint.	Sic	05/01/2015
	A light rail train does not sound "low-impact" to me... If you leave the road open, most people will still drive their car up the canyon. I don't want Snowbird to expand anymore, it's already big enough.	SLC	02/11/2015
	A reasonable compromise. What about the acreage in AF canyon? I like the idea of making Superior and Grizzly public land.	slc	03/02/2015
	After looking at the expansion of the Solitude resort I question if the area is going to include the lower silver fork private property area or if it is going up silver fork canyon to include the East facing slow know as the "Meadow Shoot." If it is to include this popular backcountry ski area then I would hope that the proposal be denied. Simply put that is one of the few locations that is safer on a more regular basis and regularly used by many for backcountry skiing. In addition, I started to use the backcountry because the price of lift tickets is above my price point. This has been a sad lose but the backcountry is really nice to have available. On a side note if expansion "must" happen then as a resident I would like to see the price of lift tickets significantly discounted for locals permanently.	SLC	02/13/2015
	as above	slc	04/12/2015
	Connecting the resorts is a land grab by the ski areas. They already have the best terrain and will not quit till they have it all. (by the way I am a resort skier not a back country skier) Park City area could have connected their resorts for decades and are only getting around to it due to one company ownership. Deer Valley and PCMR are separated by a rope and have never felt they needed to connect. Brighton and Solitude are connected and the connection has been open and groomed less than one month total in the last THREE YEARS. Alta and Snowbird are connected and the number crossing is a handful a day, with a few more on weekends. If you asked the ski areas for data they would give inflated numbers based on people having dual passes. Those people use both areas but RARELY on the same day. Interconnect is a farce and will do NOTHING for local skiers and is only a ploy for visitors.	SLC	04/30/2015
	Do not support expanding ski resorts or creating tunnels. These proposals hurt the environment and take away from the fastest-growing ski demographic which is backcountry skiing. In addition this blueprint will obviously be of significant cost with questionable and likely marginal economic benefit.	SLC	04/27/2015
	Getting more people to the Canyons more quickly does not help protect the watershed, the environment or nature in any way.	SLC	02/04/2015
	Having additional snow for snowmaking should not be at the top of the priority list for water usage in Utah. We live in a desert and therefore are short on water all year long. Why should I worry about the ski resorts getting extra water so they can stay open a few more weeks when they already made millions of dollars that ski season? Our water concerns should be placed in more desperate and realistic places. Having station stops that connect Little Cottonwood Canyon and Park City is completely unnecessary. It sounds cool and would definitely be unique and attractive to tourists but at the expense of our canyons and people's homes? I don't think so. Skiing is NOT the only thing our canyons have to offer and so should not be put at the top of our priority list and the owners of ski resorts should not have the most say in the plans for our canyons's future. This part of the proposal sounds more like what kids dream up together at the park because it sounds way awesome and different but in reality is unnecessary and unrealistic.	SLC	04/30/2015
	I like the land protection swap and making more of the pristine backcountry areas public land. I think this should have happened a long time ago, and the resorts got some crazy sweet deal on that land - land they should never have owned in the first place. I hope Alta can come around and make grizzly gulch public land. I think that Alta leases their resort land from the forest service for a fraction of what it would cost to own the land the run their operations on, and therefore Alta should be grateful of what they have instead of being greedy. No more resort expansions would also be ideal, as the resorts have enough terrain, land, hotels, restaurants already (in proportion to the total area we're talking about - we're not Colorado or Europe). Let's maintain the balance of this small area on planet earth that means so many things to so many people. Everybody always wants more more more more... and it's time to realize that once this land is gone, it's gone forever. enough is enough.	SLC	03/16/2015
	I oppose the tunnel idea, oppose mountain rail. Incentives to use buses, disincentives to parking.	SLC	04/16/2015
	I think it is critical to keep the back country in Little Cottonwood and Mountain Accord addresses this but any nearby development by Solitude that allows access to this ridge line near Grizzly Gulch would negate any of this progress. I am still unaware of any limitations on Solitudes side of the ridge. I would not want to see the mistake we made with 9900 and the Canyons.	SLC	04/28/2015
	I think lower Silver Fork canyon should be removed from the proposal. This will permit Yo-Yo skiing in silver fork and turn silver fork into a defacto part of Solitude Ski resort.	SLC	05/01/2015
	LETS NOT DESTROY THIS AREA. RESORTS DO NOT NEED MORE ACREAGE AND TRANSPORTATION ISSUES CAN BE ADDRESSED WITHOUT A RAIL SYSTEM. INCREASED BUS ROUTES OR CARPOOL INCENTIVES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED.	SLC	05/02/2015
	Little Cottonwood Canyon (LCC): UMA supports the proposed Land Swap providing permanent recreational access to what are presently private land areas north of LCC road extending from Twin Peaks Wilderness Boundary east to Twin Lakes Pass. The proposal to include Grizzly Gulch in this is critical to viability of the ski touring service we provide to guests. If ski resort expansion is allowed, b-c ski corridors within ski area boundaries should be provided for access to forest land, etc. Ski resorts deserve to gain developable lands around their bases as proposed. More water is OK as well. However, a Light Rail Transit and exclusive Guideway in LCC is a major expense and should NOT be a requirement of this land swap. UMA supports a vastly improved bus network, i.e. Transportation System Management Alternatives, including disincentives to private vehicle use, such as Trail Park Permits / Fees as a more feasible alternative than Rail. We do NOT support the construction of a new exclusive guideway for Buses. Whatever solution is adopted, should offer stops (if requested by riders) at Gate Buttress (1.3 mi.), Lisa Falls (2.7 mi) and White Pine (5.4 mi.) as a minimum. Big Cottonwood Canyon (BCC): UMA supports year round bus service in BCC, and increased frequency of buses bound for Alta picking up at BCC Park and Ride. Currently there are only two such offerings in the morning, at 8:21 and 9:06. At least one in the 7 am hour and possibly another in the 10 am hour would be very helpful to backcountry skiers doing bi-canyon tours from Alta to BCC. BCC bus should offer stops (if requested by dispersed recreation riders) at Storm Mountain (2.7 mi.), S-Turns (4.1 mi.), Mineral Fork (5.8 mi.), Argenta (7.1 mi.), Butler Fork (8.0 mi.), and Beartrap (10.7mi.) in addition to current offerings at Reynolds Flat and Spruces. UMA would prefer not to see expansion of Solitude into Silver Fork or Brighton into Hidden Canyon. This would result in less available land for the growing population of Backcountry Skiers. Ski resort ticket sales enhancements would not offset decreases in tourism due to shrinking terrain for ski touring. However, if this acreage is to become part of these resorts, any new lifts should not run to ridge lines and provide access (as side-country) to Silver Fork and the Peak 10,420 areas. Given the high snow lines in recent years, Silver and 10,420 are essential ski touring terrain and very heavily used.	SLC	04/30/2015
	NO TRAINS OR TUNNELS BETTER BUSES AND MAYBE LIMIT THE NUMBER OF CARS ALLOWED IN CANYONS AT ONE TIME NO SKI RESORT EXPANSION	SLC	03/13/2015
	Protect our backcountry access!	slc	04/30/2015
	See above - big projects will hurt the Canyons more than smaller and more realistic projects.	SLC	05/02/2015
	See comment above. The rest of the plan should not go forward without the land transfer outlined in this scenario.	SLC	02/07/2015
	See previous comment	slc	02/05/2015
	Skip the train idea. Too many trails used by bikers, hikers, and wildlife viewers would be affected as would the habitat for the wildlife.	SLC	04/30/2015
	The canyons have high traffic which adds to air pollution and water runoff contamination, better mass transit would be a huge improvement.	SLC	05/01/2015

	The less development the better. We must stop costing our sleeves our resources for money.	SLC	04/18/2015
	The mountain rail system is a boondoggle. We should improve the existing roads and mass transit system.	SLC	03/18/2015
	The plans to transfer private lands to public ownership will contribute to the primary goal of maintaining the world class near wilderness environment of the undeveloped canyon lands. Attempts to expand and develop "world-Class" ski resorts in the cotton wood canyons with connections to Park City are in conflict with maintaining the current near wilderness environment.	slc	04/28/2015
	The ski resorts seem to be the major beneficiaries, with the public paying for the improvements. Please put a stop to ski area expansion.	SLC	05/01/2015
	This goes against what makes these individual canyons unique.	slc	03/27/2015
	This is a small area. It is not the vast expanse of the Alps or other large ranges. There is critically little Backcountry/undeveloped terrain already. The ski resorts will not make a dime on this proposal ( other than using it as an excuse to raise ticket prices...which will drive more people away from the sport). SLC and the Wasatch are unique, and should be protected as is, and not developed.	SLC	02/26/2015
	Too much ski area development. Too much conversion of public land to private.	SLC	04/30/2015
	Yes to land swaps and the purchase of private inholdings for public good. Excellent. If we can arrive at an agreement where the resorts can acknowledge their development boundaries, and where extra terrain and economic zones can be given to them, maybe we can move forward without the constant wrangling and sudden development schemes that have characterized the last decade.	SLC	03/14/2015
	This will ruin what makes BCC and LCC canyon so unique. The will all but destroy the backcountry experience for those who live here and those who travel for what we have. The only ones who will seem to benefit from this plan are the corporate backers and the resort owners ( who no by the way are mostly non Utah owned business's ). Do Not Destroy what makes the Wasatch mountains the treasure they are.	SLC ( Big Cottonwood Canyon)	05/01/2015
	Provide protections against the expansion of Park City/Canyons. Limit their ability to connect Park City to Big and Little Cottonwood. A lift or transit between these 2 canyons doesn't make sense for tourists or water quality and environment protection. The existing route between Snowbird and Alta is barely sustainable. Skiers spend more time transiting between the resorts than skiing. A transit line from Park City would be even longer, and take time away from enjoying the sport from skiing, and would significantly degrade the environment and water shed. This should not be allowed.	SLC, Millcreek #4106 SLC, UT	04/24/2015 04/17/2015
	See above comments. "If it ain't broke don't fix it."		
	I am not fan of a proposal to connect LCC and Park City by tunnel. There are 2 different cultures. LCC - Snowbird, Alta where majority locals, "mountain people" recreate. Park City - Snoh people, mostly out of state tourists. Bringing those tourists into LCC will destroy the beauty we have left in this small canyon. Light rail transit is the idea I like. Sandy-Alta Please get inspired by Switzerland with LRT. Thank you.	Snowbird	04/30/2015
	A tram from park city to the cottonwood would be ineffective. A train into the canyons sounds like a great idea but if I understand correctly, a tunnel would be created between the two canyons and into park city? This sounds awesome but wouldn't it have a pretty substantial impact? Buses and trains also would be less effective for reaching areas other than the major resorts our a few key spots along the canyon, leaving many people driving. Overall I'm impressed by the breadth of thought and possible solutions covered in the study.	SOUTH JORDAN south jordan	04/30/2015 04/26/2015
	As I said up above, do not consider any connection between the ski resorts.	South Jordan	02/05/2015
	Does not address how to connect the 4 cottonwood canyon resorts	South Jordan	04/30/2015
	Excepting for water, the proposal seems to be well thought out.	South Jordan	05/01/2015
	Grizzly Gulch MUST be included in the protection, not just under consideration.	South Jordan	04/28/2015
	I fully support protecting as much wild, backcountry land as possible from further expansion of the ski areas, or other commercial interests.	South Jordan	
	I would prefer the ski resorts remain privately owned and operated. They will have a more vested interest in maintaining them than the "public", namely local government. This will allow local, state and federal government insure that public land stays public. I do not support an easier way to connect Park City and the Cottonwood Canyons, they do not have compatible orographics. I believe the crowds in the Cottonwood Canyons on powder day, especially Little Cottonwood, would eventually hurt all resorts. I suggest a backcountry (or side country) system that would allow a relatively safe way to interconnect between the resorts, allowing more experienced tourists an opportunity to discover backcountry in a more controlled way.	South Jordan	05/01/2015
	On the map it shows that the land near Tibble Fork Reservoir may become private land. I am against this. This should still be public access land for hiking and equestrian use. This area should not be privatized.	South Jordan	02/18/2015
	See comment above	South Jordan	04/30/2015
	This plan doesn't serve public interest. It serves someone's pocket book. I am disgusted that this is even being considered. I am one that loves hiking and exploring our beautiful mountains and do it on a regular basis. Please do not destroy what we have!	South Jordan	02/08/2015
	Traffic in the Cottonwood Canyons has not been as bad in recent years, however, rail networks would still drastically improve the ability for users to have easy access and use sustainable transportation options.	South Jordan	04/05/2015
	Trains and tunnels!!!!	South Jordan	03/12/2015
	I'm interested to see learn about the feasibility of a rapid bus or rail system. I imagine the rail would be cost-prohibitive, but better transportation options to ski resorts would be great.	South Jordan, UT	02/09/2015
	The canyons need to preserve natural beauty as well as utilizing the most advanced transit needs. I believe twin trams could save time and money.	South Jordan, Utah	03/08/2015
	I would like to see sustainability requirements placed on the proposed new developments.	South Lake Tahoe, CA	02/14/2015
	Would like to see Grizzly Gulch, White Pine, and Mt Superior added to protected lands.	South Salt Lake	05/01/2015
	I strongly support the Cottonwood Canyons Scenario, especially the land swap that includes Grizzly Gulch. Giving the ski areas the parcels of land they request in exchange for land parcel they are willing to give up seems like a very reasonable and beneficial compromise.	South Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
	I think avoiding/preventing another ridge-top monstrosity like what is currently being built at Snowbird is critical.	South Salt Lake, UT	03/05/2015
	I feel this will only inundate our mountains with sound and air pollution. I feel that a train up to Park City would be beneficial, but we should not put a train up Big and Little Cottonwood. Nor should we connect those canyons with the other canyons by train. It would destroy the peace that we have in the mountains. Let's keep our wilderness wilderness.	South Weber St. George, UT	02/05/2015 03/09/2015
	It all depends on the final design. The questions are too general for a good answer!		
	I want more data about the specific parcels being considered for purchase for public protection, and why these were selected. I want more data about the specific parcels being considered for ski expansion, why they were selected, and specifically what type of expansion would be allowed. With water quality, and water availability being a core value, I question the proposal for increased water usage for snowmaking. Again, we need to work WITH the changes occurring in our environment to identify alternatives to our traditional economies (just as the historic mining, timber, & ranching economies of the Wasatch Mtns. have had to do). I adamantly oppose a new connection of any type other than trails between the Cottonwood Canyons and Park City/Summit County. NO TUNNELS. NO TRAMS. NO SKI LIFTS. The damage to the environment & costs of building and maintaining far exceed any economic benefit. The "dream" of staying at a lodge and skiing a resort on 1 side in the morning; then skiing, having dinner, and staying at a lodge on the other side is a nightmare. How does one get their luggage and gear to the next lodge? Or, if a person just wants to ski one side, then the other, and go back to their original starting point, how does one get back at the end of the day (or late night)? Each of these scenarios requires a motor vehicle at some point. They do not reduce traffic or pollution.	summit county	02/28/2015
	Transferring private lands to public entities would not ensure preserving lands from future development. The political pressure to develop these areas would not cease as a result of the mountain accord and future Utah congressional delegations will likely find themselves pressured by the existing resorts and other developers to open up these public lands to additional development. The land swap as envisioned which would pass title of much of the land in the Alta base area to the Alta Ski Lift company would be an economic bonanza for the shareholders of the Alta Ski Lift company. It would also make the Alta lift company far more valuable to an acquirer like Vail Resorts who need developable land in the base area to build out according to their model. This would come at the expense of the broad public who owns the area, through governmental entities, right now. I have no idea what the Alta Ski Lift company plans to do and count many of the individuals managing the resort as friends. However I do not think it is appropriate to provide an economic bonanza to a private entity at taxpayers' expense.	Summit Park, UT	04/16/2015
	Anything that can be done to preserve open space and increase public land holdings is a good thing. I think the Scenario is a good start to that.	Taylorsville	03/29/2015
	Big Cottonwood has more visitors than Little Cottonwood, yet only local bus service is being explored in that canyon. Why is enhanced bus or BRT not being considered, in Big Cottonwood?	Taylorsville	03/17/2015
	Of course, the devil is in the details. That said, I endorse the effort to provide permanent protection for over 2,000 acres of holdings owned by the ski resorts. This will provide much needed certainty for these lands and provide quality dispersed recreation, including backcountry skiing, hopefully in perpetuity. The Blueprint did not make it clear (at least to me) whether these holdings would be purchased by the federal government as funds became available, or if the resorts would continue to own them but sign some type of memorandum of understanding (MOU) that they would henceforth be managed by the USFS, or managed under USFS regulations, with public access allowed. Perhaps that remains to be determined. Nor does the Blueprint specify just what additional protections these lands would receive. I assume that ultimate authority by the land management designation the holdings receive. I'm not convinced that any of the federal land management designations (i.e., Wilderness, National Monument, National Scenic Area, etc.) identified in the Blueprint are warranted or needed for this acreage, if the management practices implemented prevent degradation of surface waters within the Canyons. Any of these proposed designations, but especially designation and management as a Wilderness area, might galvanize opposition to and possibly scuttle this land management proposal. The information concerning the benefits to the resorts, primarily Alta and Snowbird, is vague, so I am reticent to endorse this portion of the scenario. I do however applaud Mountain Accord for presenting the transit tunnel proposals between LCC and BCC, and between BCC and Park City. I have numerous concerns and reservations about the tunnel proposals but acknowledge that the tunnel options need to be evaluated, particularly if we do not wish to see Guardians Pass become a main thoroughfare between SLC and Park City during the winter, or additional backcountry acreage consumed by new lifts to connect the resorts. Hopefully a comprehensive EIS will thoroughly examine the transit tunnel proposals. The Blueprint does not mention a consideration to expand the Alta ski area into the Mt. Wolverine/Catherine Pass/ Mt. Tuscarora area that I was informed of through Save Our Canyons back in February. Is this proposal still on the table? I do not support such an expansion. Some questions: The Cottonwood Canyons scenario mentions 258 acres for base area management (item # 2). I assume this is to accommodate transit stops in LCC, BCC, and Park City and is a cumulative figure (estimate)? This acreage seems high if it is only for that purpose. Would the additional water for snowmaking (item # 3) come from dewatering and diversion during tunnel excavation? Item # 5 states that the resorts would benefit from "approximately 416 acres in American Fork Canyon." Would this be an expansion of the Snowbird resort? The map that accompanies the Cottonwood Canyons scenario does not show any expansion in this area. In summary, I remain neutral / undecided on this scenario for the Canyons, primarily because of my concerns re: transit tunnels between LCC, BCC, and Park City, but endorse proceeding with an EIS for the tunnel(s) proposal.	Taylorsville	05/01/2015
	One important traditional land use has been hunting. Hunting should be identified and protected as a legitimate use of these lands.	Taylorsville	04/30/2015
	I have nothing at the moment but I think the scenario does a great job at looking at future issues with this development.	Taylorsville	03/10/2015
	Less development and more preservation.	Theocracy Utah	03/12/2015
	No changes, please!!!	Toronto	03/16/2015
	This scenario just continues the unsustainable model of putting more housing and services in the Canyon. We will have to revisit this almost immediately after implementation as proposed. Can Only by avoiding the resort model can we make canyon access sustainable. Housing and services to the north of the canyons and providing efficient transit is the only even moderately sustainable path forward. It seems that even though the resorts are largely on public lands and have recently shown aggression toward public lands outside their allowed boundaries, this scenario has the resorts as the only important stakeholders. I reject this model.	Vancouver, BC	05/01/2015
	I would prefer light rail over the car congestion that is a large impact problem now.	Vernal	04/12/2015
	How would the public access these new lands? Overland trams/Gondolas, or a tunnel through the mountains at the ski area base?	WEST_JORDAN	05/01/2015
	This leaves ski areas unrestricted while restricting other recreational usage.	West Jordan	02/28/2015
	This proposal could have a negative impact on access to trailheads and trailhead parking. I do not support any "improvements" that would otherwise restrict access to trailheads and related parking areas in either Cottonwood canyon or along 9400 south adjacent to the north Bells Canyon access point	West Jordan	03/15/2015
	We salt lake city residents dont want this! It is not going to benefit us. It will only benefit your pockets!	west jordan	03/27/2015
	You will ruin public lands and the wildlife.	west jordan	03/14/2015
	I support the idea of NON-interference with 9400 south bells canyon parking lot and trailhead	West Jordan	03/14/2015
	Leave the cottonwood canyons alone! I'm all for light rail but connecting the canyons not at all! Big and Little Cottonwood are unique in their own ways and The history alone in Grizzly Gulch is unbelievable!	west Jordan	03/17/2015
	Leave the Cottonwood canyons alone! No tunnels trains and resort expansion!!!	west Jordan	05/01/2015
	It would be a fantastic plan to preserve all of this land. It represents much of the most beautiful areas in the Wasatch.	West Jordan, UT	02/04/2015
	DON'T RUIN OUR MOUNTAINS!!!	West Jordan0	03/13/2015
	How is "new culinary water for up to 108 units at Alta" going to be accomplished? What constitutes a "unit"? This blueprint should be accessible by a general audience. Where is this water going to come from?	West Valley City	03/18/2015

	<p>1. I believe Mountain Accord is amiss in not placing more emphasis on active transportation solutions and making associated communities bike friendly as a stated goal; 2. Should a link between the Cottonwood Canyons to Park City become a reality I am opposed to any aerial connection such as a tram or fancy chair lift; 3. Recreation user conflicts between hikers and bikers on Central Wasatch trails is only going to get worse; I believe Mountain Accord is errant in not laying a groundwork to resolve this problem; 4. Increases in people populations will also increase dog populations, and ergo, there will be greater canine impact in the canyon watershed over time, as with hiker-biker conflicts; I believe Mountain Accord needs to be on record with a strategy to minimize dog presence in the Central Wasatch with alternatives such as using designated utility corridors crisscrossing the urban scape as off-leash dog parks.</p>	West Valley City	02/17/2015
	<p>As a resident of the Salt Lake Valley, I am concerned about the protection of our watershed and the environmental stability of the Wasatch. I am also terribly frightened in regards of what has happened on the Eastern portion of the Quairrh Mountains, which now has been controlled by a single for profit company and environmentally destroyed in the interest of profit by a global mining conglomerate. I have reservations about the One Wasatch proposal and it sounds good, but I do not think having some ridiculous mega-resort is truly beneficial to helping preserve balance and good stewardship of our mountain jewel. I think we need to restrain any disillusion of grandeur and focus on how to maintain and protect the Cottonwood Canyons, without turning it into some sort of resort freak show. We should resist the urge to try and compete with Lake Tahoe. We are not Lake Tahoe, we are Salt Lake City. I am all for increasing reasonable access, and I think that some transportation improvements would go a long way to help that. I suspect that MANY people would appreciate having better bus canyon service, both in winter and during the rest of the year. Many of us want to go up and enjoy the canyons, but we also want to protect the environment as well. There really should be a major inquiry into expanding the UTA services, most of us who enjoy the canyons would love to see better access through all seasons, and we would be willing to not drive if the transportation could be implemented to assist with the access.</p>	West Valley City	04/30/2015
	see above comments	Weston, MA	02/24/2015
	Solving the scattered land ownership makes sense. But the development threat seems over stated. Reasonable engineering standards would prevent most road access.	Woodland	04/29/2015
	Little Cottonwood Canyon can never be Park City, easier access and perhaps gear storage at rail stops would be helpful and revenue producing.	Woodridge IL 60517	04/30/2015
<b>Please provide any additional feedback on purposes or needs for transportation improvements in the identified corridors.</b>			
	Any proposal that involves punching a tunnel through the top of either Canyon is responsible stewardship of the natural resources and will mar the natural beauty that myself and other visitors expect when visiting the Cottonwood Canyons area.	Albuquerque	03/04/2015
	I like the tunnels idea between the canyons, could help air quality though that isn't a permanent solution, just buys us time.	Alpine	02/08/2015
	If more roads are built or if existing roads are improved more people will use the canyons and mountains. Why do we want to encourage more people to use the canyons when the canyons and mountains are currently over used?	Alpine, Ut	04/30/2015
	When making rules for vehicles, do not restrict vehicles that do not impact the environment. Blanket "no vehicles" statement could restrict my flying a paraglider over an area and landing in an emergency. I do not use a motor of any kind and the fabric of my glider does not even break the stems of plants when I land on them. In flight I move silently over head unseen by the majority of those on the ground. When seen I resemble the soaring birds I fly with more than any mechanized device. In an emergency landing I pack up and walk out literally leaving no trace.	Alpine, Utah	03/15/2015
	As a 3rd year seasonal worker in Alta, I do not own a car and am always shocked by how many people up here DO own cars. I think there is too little be done to disincentivize the use of cars in the Canyons and that the proposed transportation solutions seem more like wishful thinking for 5-10 years down the line. In the meanwhile, I think a toll should be placed on cars driving up canyon. Of the proposals I like the idea of a light rail connecting the best.	Alta	03/16/2015
	Express bus from PC makes sense. Tram from Brighton to PC makes sense. Buses up BCC make sense. Railroad to Alta and Brighton makes no sense. We live in Alta year-round and are very concerned about the notion of a railroad being built up LCC. Where would it go? If on Hwy 210, there will be disruption to automobile access for years and severe avalanche danger all along the route probably requiring sheds to be built over both the rail line and the roadway. Sheds over the roadway will lead to severe black ice problems for drivers. If the railroad is on the south side of the canyon it will have to be carved mostly out of pristine nature and where does it go once it leaves Snowbird? Up the Bypass Road? There isn't enough room for two tracks and all the homeowners will violently object. Tunnel under Peruvian Ridge? Good luck! Across the Creek to the Hellgate Condos and then up Hwy 210? Severe avalanche issues and all homeowners along 210 will fight it. And the cost of building a rail line??? It has to be in the billions. It makes absolutely no sense to go rail when a high-speed tram or gondola could move the same number of people just as rapidly with a minimal impact on nature and the existing infrastructure. It is very clear the UTA just wants to build a railroad and is dismissing the tram/gondola solution without even considering it. All the "we are going to protect nature in the canyons" stuff is hypocritical nonsense if the solution to transportation issues is to construct a railroad (which will need 2 tracks) up through a wilderness area. I'm disgusted.	Alta	02/10/2015
	I am in favor of a trail vs. bus transportation	Alta	02/24/2015
	It's difficult to completely understand the purposes or needs without being involved in the engagement process amongst stakeholders. Reviewing the alternatives and purposes gives an understanding of the process of getting to the A&P but how to evaluate and weigh them as non-participant is tough.	alta	02/10/2015
	Train system needs to be all inclusive to reach full potential of Mountain accord	Alta	03/07/2015
	You cowboys need some professional outside help.	ALTA, UT	03/07/2015
	The transportation issues should not be lumped together. There are really 3 issues. 1) do we want improved mass transit up LCC. 2) Of what type should it be? Train, bus, ski lift? 3) Should it go through to Big Cottonwood and Park City. Yes on a system. I think it should be an electric train. No on the tunnel. Ski lift ok.	Alta Utah	04/30/2015
	I feel a BRT up Little Cottonwood Canyon would be a relatively cost effective and relatively easy program to implement. An incentive of some sort to use this system would need to be implemented, a more user friendly bus schedule and increased secure long term parking options would need to be provided.	Alta, Utah	04/29/2015
	<p>Salt Lake Valley The Salt Lake Valley has significant transportation issues. Our valley continues to be "car-centric" with a large number of single occupancy vehicles (SOVs) on our roads. The existing mass-transit system in the Salt Lake Valley is under-utilized and below capacity. Resources are needed to increase ridership of the existing SOVs. Additional express bus service is needed in the Salt Lake Valley. An example of this is the need for express bus service from downtown Salt Lake City to Cottonwood Heights via 700 East and the Van Winkle Expressway. Consideration should be given to the construction of a "belt route" rail line along the east and south sides of the Salt Lake Valley. Such a rail line would connect the University of Utah to the Blue TRAX line in Sandy. Considerations should be given to lowering fares to encourage ridership on UTA buses and rail lines. Save Our Canyons believes that the greatest public benefit would be achieved by focusing investment on mass-transit in the Salt Lake Valley. Cottonwood Canyons and Mill Creek Canyon Save Our Canyons believes the best method to improve transportation, while preserving the wilderness character and natural habitat of these canyons, is to implement a reliable, affordable, and efficient shuttle system using vans and buses. This shuttle system would be operational year round, but would have higher capacity during peak use periods. For the shuttle system to be successful, additional park and ride lots need to be developed. These lots would be developed throughout the Salt Lake Valley. Existing and future transit hubs would also be used as boarding stations for the shuttle system. The shuttle system would be designed to provide service for all canyon visitors: resort skiers, dispersed users, hikers, resort employees, summer season visitors, and others. Current congestion problems in the Cottonwood Canyons are largely associated with ski resort operations, most notably on weekends and holidays. The shuttle system would provide express shuttle service to each ski resort from park and ride lots/transit hubs. Winter express shuttles for dispersed use would also be part of the system. These shuttles would provide transit to users from park and ride/transit hubs to winter trailheads. Similarly, in summer, shuttles would provide hikers express service from park and ride/transit hubs to trailheads. The proposed shuttle system is NOT a traditional multi-stop bus service. The proposed shuttle system is one that conveniently transports individuals from park and ride lots and transit hubs to mountain locations with "express" service. The shuttles would have a limited number of stops, and in many instances would provide nonstop transit service (most notably to ski resorts). A key feature of the shuttle system would be short transfer times at park and ride lots/transit hubs and at mountain locations for return service back to the park and ride lots/transit hubs. Shuttles will need to be able to meet peak demand. The success of this system is dependent on convenience and short wait times for users. Low fares need to be a part of the system to encourage use. A shuttle system using vans and buses has the benefit of being highly flexible. The shuttle system could easily (and cheaply) be modified as demands change in the future. There needs to be an evaluation as to whether this shuttle system is publicly or privately operated (or a combination of both). There should also be an evaluation of the feasibility of a system of vans for "home to mountain" service that would augment the shuttle service described above. Such a home to mountain system would resemble an airport limousine service, with scheduled pick up and return times. The vehicles used in the shuttle system would be vehicles appropriate for mountain travel, including travel through inclement weather. Ideally, these vehicles would utilize clean fuel systems (e.g. natural gas) to minimize impacts to air quality. Coupled with the shuttle system, there should be consideration to implement "congestion pricing" for private vehicles in the Cottonwood Canyons. Congestion pricing is a market based approach to reducing congestion. Congestion pricing is utilized in power marketing, where users pay a higher price for power during "on-peak" hours. There are also many examples of congestion pricing in transportation. The adjustable rates for use of the HOV lanes on I-15 is an example of congestion pricing. Congestion pricing is being used in the European cities of London, Stockholm and Milan to reduce traffic. In these cities, private vehicles must pay a fee to enter the "high-use" area of city center during peak congestion periods. These systems have been successful in reducing traffic. Congestion pricing in the Cottonwood Canyons could be implemented during peak traffic periods to reduce the number of private vehicles during peak use periods. Private vehicles would be required to pay a "congestion fee" to drive up the Cottonwood Canyons during said peak periods. Initially, this congestion fee may only be collected on weekends and holidays during the winter season (consistent</p>	American Fork	04/14/2015
	There needs to be more focus on public transportation and less on the car. The canyons should be weaned off of car use for anyone excepting someone who lives full-time in that canyon.	Berkeley	04/30/2015
	email with comments	Big Cottonwood Canyon	05/01/2015
	Agree on reducing pollution, user fee, and potentially limiting access on busy days. Unlimited numbers of people can not be accommodated with any plan.	Bluffdale, UT	03/31/2015
	More attention needs to be given to protection of the resources in my opinion	Boise, Id	03/06/2015
	Alternative D needs more study and consideration. This seems like the most reasonable way forward.	Bountiful	04/29/2015
	I hesitate to make a traffic corridor through Little Cot to Park City.	Bountiful	03/21/2015
	I worry about the land being "fractured" by roads or lifts through the canyons.	Bountiful	02/05/2015
	See comments in Cottonwood Canyons	Bountiful, UT 84010	03/31/2015
	I favor tunnels between the canyons vs. an aerial system and do think that year round connections between the Cottonwood canyons and Park City could be developed as long as key links are underground rather than tearing up the mountainside to build roads. Any public transportation option should be non-polluting. I do want to protect existing backcountry recreation areas, particularly Grizzly Gulch and feel that interconnected ski areas is a marketing gimmick rather than a necessity. Of immediate need is a better transit system between Park City and Salt Lake City, which would provide commuters with an alternative to the current singular alternative of automobile transit on I-80. Either rail or BRT should be implemented on a priority basis. Yesterday I took the Park City to Kimball Junction bus, which on it's govt route, took 1 hour to complete it's run. Express service with few stops is needed for the Park City area. Priority protection and increased acreage for wilderness should also be a priority.	Bountiful, Utah	03/14/2015
	I support (again the European method) the electric light rail option connecting Alta/Brighton and the Park City side. This would appear to offer the greatest people mover throughput while offering travelers the greatest comfort (over aerial tram). LRT up Little truly is the most realistic problem solver while continuing current bus transit (UTA) up Big.	Brighton	04/14/2015
	I think the summer bus service for Big Cottonwood canyon is a great idea. Maybe even provide the bus service for free to encourage more usage.	Brighton	04/27/2015
	<p>A train/light rail system with limited stops from downtown SLC/SLC airport, up LCC (stopping at Alta and SB), through a tunnel into BCC (stopping at Brighton parking lot) through a tunnel to Park City (stopping in downtown PC) is the best option for transportation, the environment, preservation, recreation, and all of the interested economies. With a rail system you will discourage driving, and better control mountain Access with limited stops, not only for skiers but for all recreation and mountain enjoyment. People do not like to ride buses and will not use them. Trains are comfortable and reliable and people will use them. Tunnels have minimal environmental impact and preserve natural aesthetics. The European countries which share the Alps also care deeply about their mountains and preserving the environments, rely on the mountains for recreation - and they are completely dependent on well thought-out train systems that very delicately transport millions of people through a very well preserved environment. Recreational demand on these mountains will only increase - so let's do it right and manage the recreational pressure with a rail system.</p>	Brighton Utah	03/17/2015

	<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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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! 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. 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>	Brighton Utah 03/16/2015
	<p>In the big picture everything proposed just puts more "pressure" on the big and little cottonwood canyons by putting in more urban based transportation.</p>	Brighton, UT 02/09/2015
	<p>I would like to propose that the existing roadways be relocated away from Riparian areas (streams), with two tunnels being built in Big Cottonwood canyon from Ledgemere to above the Storm mountain area and the second from just below the S-curve to just below the Laurel Pines area. The roads between these tunnels should be relocated away from the stream beds using snow sheds in snow slide areas. The UTA does not provide transportation in the summertime to the canyon as it is, but should provide summer vans as a stopgap measure, until further needs can be assessed. Further, the remaining roadways should be re-contoured and returned to their former natural condition with a small, narrow, unpaved, summer service road where absolutely necessary. The Little Cottonwood Canyon Transit plan should follow suit with a similar system proposal by the residents and stake holders, with the environment and watershed protection being of paramount importance. Neither canyon should be linked or otherwise connected to the Park City, Deer valley, Midway or Heber areas. In fact, I believe a scaling back of the existing roads should be implemented.</p>	Brighton, Utah 03/06/2015
	<p>Option B utilizing Buses appears to be the best and most feasible option. Tunnels, Lite Rail and Aerial Trams appear to be not cost effective and possibly more impactful on the existing environment. Most of the Corridor Purposes criteria appear to reflect good and sound ideals.</p>	Brighton, Utah 84121 05/01/2015
	<p>Please, please do not consider a rail system along Wasatch Blvd. from Ft. Union Blvd. south to Little Cottonwood Canyon!</p>	c.h.c., 84121 03/16/2015
	<p>No gondolas or trams due to operation capability on windy days. Prefer buses and light rail. RE: Little Cottonwood. You may have to enforce a "commuter cars only" rule meaning no more single drivers. However, if this lousy warm no snow weather continues, it's all moot. Little C is really only horrible on snowy days. However the pollution that travels up that canyon on busy days needs to be addressed. I think Mountain Accord is doing a terrific job developing sound proposals for a very complicated issue.</p>	Charleston, Utah 02/09/2015
	<p>Need to go with rail up canyon and link to park City. Would be significant less likely to use if were buses.</p>	Chicago 02/09/2015
	<p>I would like to see buses run every 30 minutes. there are dead spots in the bus sched (bcc after 12:30) that make buses inconvenient. parking is also an issue.</p>	cottonwood heights 03/12/2015
	<p>Add a toll booth it would keep down traffic, trash, pollution, and it would make money.</p>	Cottonwood Heights 03/27/2015
	<p>Again, I appreciate the global look at transportation scenarios for the canyons for the future, but I believe we need have a specific plan of action for the immediate/short term needs as well. There are too many master plans that sit on the shelf and never benefit the purpose they're developed for because the planning is for too far in the future. Please look at the immediate needs as well as the long term needs.</p>	Cottonwood Heights 02/27/2015
	<p>Again, the idea of having to trade a decent transportation solution for increased development is tragic. Do not create the opportunity for development by offering us one thing we've been asking for for years (public transport) in exchange for the loss of the small amount of open space we have between the very crowded SLC valley and Park City basin.</p>	Cottonwood Heights 04/07/2015
	<p>Alternative D (Transportation system management alternatives) is the only reasonable proposal. Light rail up the canyon is not realistic. Any exclusive guideways are unworkable. An aerial tram up the canyon is a joke! The accord seems to be a sham for the ski industry.</p>	cottonwood heights 04/30/2015
	<p>Am personally against any connectivity that increases private vehicle use in Big or Little Cottonwood Canyons.</p>	Cottonwood Heights 03/12/2015
	<p>As I mentioned above - I am very supportive of light rail to/from PC via LCC and tunnels. I think this option will prove to be amazing - assuming the system pans out as we expect. Heavy powder-day traffic won't render the system unusable and the system will still be financially viable even when running with limited passengers on some days. I've heard comments along the lines of, "it's perfect the way it is. Leave it alone!" I doubt anyone who has experienced the mayhem on a heavy snow day would make such a comment. The lineup of cars is totally unacceptable and the behavior I've witnessed is even more unacceptable. Let's realize the potential of this area by not being afraid of positive change. In general, we should do a better job of discouraging autos/encouraging bicycles in the canyons.</p>	Cottonwood Heights 04/08/2015
	<p>avalanche sheds, light rail, wider roads, and incentives/disincentives, and possibly more parking are the only things little cottonwood needs, there is zero need to connect the back with the front (by lift or tunnel), anything summit county (deer valley, valley) is doing is strictly for tourism. I'd gladly pay \$345 per year per person to NOT bring more tourists to the cottonwood canyons. I agree that NO improvement to guardsman should happen. Making that road accessible year round would only make congestion worse in big cottonwood. It's already made it way worse in the summer months because of the recent paving of said road.</p>	Cottonwood Heights 02/24/2015
	<p>Bike Commuters - Widen the lanes between 7200 and Bangle Blvd. Bus usage is dropping off and I feel it is due to the time commitment that is involved compared to driving yourself. If bus happens it would need to be made more efficient. Has there been much discussion to having a daily fee to drive (at least in the winter). If you drive in a personal car you pay if you are in a bus it's free. To avoid an actual toll booth there could be a photo booth similar to photo cop. Of course weather would play a role in the effectiveness. Ideally it would help eliminate congestion, and give the freedom for people to bring their gear if they plan to do more than resort skiing that day.</p>	Cottonwood Heights 04/26/2015
	<p>Corridor connections between canyons are a bad idea. They will increase the rate at which people access areas, but they do not increase the capacity of those areas to support increased crowding. I do think that public transportation of the canyons should be a priority, but there should be limits on how many people can be at the major recreation areas at a single point in time. It is impossible to accommodate large numbers of people in wild areas and still keep those areas looking and functioning as wild areas.</p>	Cottonwood Heights 03/10/2015
	<p>Cost (or relative cost at least at this point). Without cost and ultimately an idea of the likelihood of the proposals actually happening it is hard to judge the various alternatives. Realize that this is a blueprint of a blueprint, but it seems you are asking people to get on board with some proposal in the interest of garnering support while some of these proposals are likely not realistic, and we are guessing you know it.</p>	Cottonwood Heights 02/04/2015
	<p>Don't like improving Guardsman to year round. Seems like it would offer an alternative to the new transport option from Little to PC that we just spent \$555 on while increasing traffic in Big and PC.</p>	Cottonwood Heights 02/11/2015
	<p>Expanded bus service should NOT be dropped from further consideration! It meets or exceeds 13 of the 14 criteria!!! Number four is the only one it does not meet. This must be added to truck tax payers into building a two billion dollar train while stealing their land.</p>	cottonwood heights 03/13/2015
	<p>Fine with aerial transportation (is it year-round for hikers and other canyon visitors?) and improved and maintained Guardsman Pass. No to tunneling.</p>	Cottonwood Heights 04/15/2015
	<p>For the LCC corridor: As for the trains: 1) what is the capacity per hour of the system in regards of moving skiers up and down lcc? and how does this relate to a busy day at alta/snowbird? 2) I am guessing we are talking about moving perhaps 70% of the skier traffic per day - so maybe 5,000 people on a peak day? Is this realistically possible? 3) I am assuming this will lead to long delays waiting for the train after a hard day on the slopes. Who will want to wait in a queue for a long period of time? Will the train allocate equal seating to both of main stops? Or will it "fill up" at Alta on the way down - leaving frustrated peoples at Snowbird. 3) as for feasibility and funding... what is the expected expense of such a project and how will it be subsidized? Will the ticket price be prohibitive? Will folks just assume pay some sort of parking fee as opposed to paying for the train? Will the parking fee be per car, or charged per carload (4 people in a car pay 4 times as much). If it's a per car fee - surely a car of 4 folks will be cheaper to park than 4 round trip tickets on the train system. 4) How much thought has been given to more frequent bus service with a snowshed solution to mitigate the road hazards? This would allow peak hour service adjustments to accommodate the morning and afternoon. 5) is the public perception of a fancy shiny train as opposed to a boring old bus partially responsible for the train proposal?</p>	Cottonwood Heights 03/05/2015
	<p>Get ONE Wasatch on the table!</p>	Cottonwood Heights 02/12/2015
	<p>I am opposed to train or light rail in the canyons or up to Park City. I am opposed to year round road at Guardsman Pass. Let people enjoy the mountains closest to them or use the bus or car when needed.</p>	Cottonwood Heights 04/26/2015
	<p>I do like the idea of increase bus service, but hate the idea of tunneling into our mountains and the environmental impact that construction of a light rail would cost.</p>	Cottonwood Heights 03/16/2015
	<p>I highly disagree with the use of Little Cottonwood Canyon as a railway to better serve as transportation. The Temple Quarry Trail is highly used by many types of enthusiasts i.e., biking, running, site seeing and hiking. If you take away our trail system you take away from our canyon and what it has to offer. I am also a ski enthusiast and disagree that this system would better help our "Canyons." Right now we cannot even support the amount of people travelling up the canyon to ski or backcountry ski. There are times the lift lines are so backed up that it literally has become a problem and causes tension. Now you want to put a railway in and send more people up the canyon in which we can't even support. I believe this is all based on bringing more money into the state for their own benefit, not looking at the "big picture" and who actually utilizes these canyons and how it will affect those actually "using" it. Do Not take away my Temple Quarry Trail and Do Not put this system in to benefit yourself.</p>	Cottonwood Heights 05/01/2015
	<p>I only have input on the Cottonwood Canyons (CC). A rail system seems very excessive, expensive and impracticable. I am in favor of improving the bus service and then charging a toll on private vehicles in the CC to limit the number of vehicles and improve the bus service. The roads are generally good and could be widened in spots to accommodate faster and more frequent bus service. I am not in favor of a ski link joining Park City to the CC. The population of areas east of the CC will likely grow very dramatically and providing mechanized access for many additional people will degrade the quality of the experience in the canyons. Park City area residents chose to live there because of the existing special and desirable characteristics of their community, the same is true for residents on Salt Lake. Park City has a huge amount of ski terrain and it could be expanded further without impacting the CC. Park City area residents chose to live there without any reasonable expectation that they would have mechanized access into the CC and the Mountain Accord should not be designed to give them a windfall to the detriment of Salt Lake residents who will have a degraded experience. I am in favor of land swaps that will preserve or improve the current environmental conditions while giving the ski areas and other land holders as good or better economic value in concentrated areas near the current road systems. I am in favor of foot trails that would link the CC and Park City areas but not mountain biking. The presence of mountain bikes on trails seriously degrades them for hikers. Separate mountain biking trails could be established.</p>	Cottonwood Heights 04/30/2015
	<p>I personally would like to see light rail up each canyon. But I also think that it needs to be integrated with the light rail plan in the valley which requires some more lines on the East side and integration into the canyon transportation plan. The answer is not huge parking garages at the mouths of the canyons. I like the tunnel link concept with light rail as well.</p>	Cottonwood Heights 03/09/2015
	<p>I prefer ground options over aerial. I especially don't want to see an aerial connection over grizzly gulch.</p>	Cottonwood Heights 04/30/2015
	<p>I should first say that good work is being done in the I-80 corridor and summit county corridor. Now lets talk about the contentious one: First I don't believe that purpose 4 is actually necessary. It seems as though this is solving a problem that doesn't exist. Second, these purposes do not have equal weight, maybe they should be considered with a weighting factor? purpose 7 needs to be more specific. Are you trying to keep parking out of the canyons? out of the city? away from the bottom of the canyons? only in the copper mine? people are going to park somewhere, where is it acceptable? Purposes 5, 6, 7, and 9 are natural consequences of purposes 2 and 12 (which are almost exactly the same thing). It seems as though this list was written to give some extra credence to more development. purpose 14 is too vague. this leaves us with purposes 1,2,3,11 and 13 as actually useful goals</p>	cottonwood heights 04/24/2015
	<p>I think that a solution is needed to make transportation between SLC and Park City as this is a major highway. Decreasing congestion here could improve business transportation that frequents this roadway. I disagree with the proposed transit solutions for Little/Big Cottonwood. I think that the great thing about the current transit situation is that it limits the number of people that can be in the canyon at any one time. Increased accessibility via mass transit is going to increase the amount of people in the canyon. This may yield economic benefits but these benefits are outweighed by the loss of the outdoor experience. The crowds of people that transit could potentially cause are currently limited by the flow of traffic, and the availability of parking. I frequent the Cottonwood Canyons during both the winter and summer and have had to return home because there is no parking, this wouldn't happen if I could take a train up the canyon. Therefore the numbers would increase, and the outdoor experience would become like the Snowbird lift lines on a powder day. For any that have experienced this there is a reason people say "No friends on a powder day."</p>	Cottonwood Heights 03/13/2015

I would support a train up Parleys because I believe tourists coming into SLC Airport would be more likely to utilize it and then would be able to take advantage of Park City's easy transportation.	Cottonwood Heights	04/29/2015
I strongly oppose putting a light rail up Little Cottonwood Canyon and tunnels to connect the canyons. I also oppose any ski interlink between the resorts as proposed by One Wasatch. Transportation development should have a minimal impact on the environment, which these would not. I support using increased bus service for summer access to the canyons.	Cottonwood Heights	03/29/2015
I'm in favor of restricted access to ensure protection. I'll gladly pay a user fee if it will help block future expansion of transportation into the backcountry. Leave it as it is and limit the number of people in and out is the only way to truly protect it.	Cottonwood Heights	02/04/2015
Increased bus service in mixed traffic does meet most of your corridor purposes. More frequent Buses is the best and cheapest. Your corridor purposes are written to get your pre-determined desire for a Train.	Cottonwood Heights	05/01/2015
Intended outcomes stated are very laudable.	Cottonwood Heights	03/23/2015
It really depends on how these alternatives are implemented. There are not yet enough details about each alternative. If all major population centers can be connected by LRT's and express buses that are efficient, with well placed park and ride's, then alternative A would seemingly meet the regional transportation needs. It depends on how this is received by the public. They must buy in to make it work. Don't try to minimize personal automobile use by imposing fees; that will not affect much of the financially well to do population of mountain and canyon users. Perhaps limit the number of vehicles allowed to be in and travel the canyon each day. This is a very expensive project that someone is going to have to pay for. All citizens would benefit from these improvements in ways that are difficult to measure financially, and should therefore contribute something, but big business will be the real benefactor in a monetary sense and should therefore be the primary "investor".	cottonwood heights	03/13/2015
Just need to keep moving forward to learn consequences of each proposed action. (or potential consequences) At some point there will be an increased need to connect the value of the needed resources to competing needs (i.e. why recreation vs education, how does transportation affect future water needs and rights, etc.)	Cottonwood Heights	04/29/2015
More buses in the same roadway. No more Lanes or Trains.	cottonwood heights	04/29/2015
More detail is needed. The referenced transportation document is poorly edited, and hard to read. Images are not rotated and very pixelated.	Cottonwood Heights	02/04/2015
My only opinion is one of further transparency. It seems ridiculous. That not one "meeting" has been scheduled at Brighton high school and another at Alta high school. Why the subject is being investigated for opinions in SLC and not areas involved, suggests a lack of transparency and deceit. My neighbors are already starting petitions.	Cottonwood heights	03/17/2015
Need to understand better visualize the proposed impact of light rail, including 3D images of current state versus proposed state	Cottonwood Heights	03/15/2015
No extra lanes and no transit/tunnels. Buses only.	Cottonwood Heights	03/19/2015
No light rail, no bus rapid transit if it involves building a bus lane, no aerial transportation (will destroy the back-country forest land). The ski areas in both Little & Big Cottonwood Canyons should provide charter buses to it's employees, that would help with parking and traffic in the canyons.	Cottonwood Heights	03/16/2015
No tunnels.	Cottonwood Heights	05/01/2015
Option D for LCC/BCC is the only acceptable option in my opinion. Improve the resources we have and don't add roads or tunnels. Tunnels in BCC/LCC are absolutely unacceptable - a disastrous and terrible way to destroy our mountains. To drill a tunnel through the mountain to link the resorts would be a travesty, even if it goes by the euphemism of offering an "evacuation route". Wilderness is beautiful because it is natural and unmitigated. That risk (avalanches, snow storms, etc.) is an essential part of the experience, and when you venture into the wilderness you have to accept it. Let LCC and BCC be that wild and untamed experience. Trains, dedicated bus lanes, and overhead lifts or gondolas are ridiculous wastes of money and environmental disasters. Improve the utilization and service we have by changing public opinion about using mass transit and offering incentives and disincentives for driving cars. And accept the fact that this is a limited resource, to be protected as a wild and precious finite treasure, not to be overrun by hordes of irresponsible and disrespectful people. Improving transportation to bring more people to the area is a narrow economic focus that sacrifices environment for money.	Cottonwood Heights	03/06/2015
See above.	Cottonwood Heights	03/09/2015
The accent should definitely be put on public transport to the Cottonwood Canyon resorts.	Cottonwood Heights	02/06/2015
The bus needs to run more often. People need to be encouraged to ride the bus. Charge a lot for parking and a discount on passes if they ride the bus up to the Resorts.	cottonwood heights	04/29/2015
The gondola or ski-lift needs taken off the table immediately. I will not support any further movement on this proposal if it is still on the table in the next round. The ski resorts need to be responsible for 100% of the cost of the tunnels. No public land should be given to the resorts for the construction of the tunnels. The light rail tickets need to be financed in a way that locals can afford them (think along the fee levels associated with Millicreek, but with access to both canyons). Pricing by family rather than individual. The Park City Connection up Parleys. Yes, something needs to be done and public funding is acceptable. Anything with a trailer needs to be forced into one lane on the far right side, separated by barriers. Much of the non-tunnel cost of the light rail lines needs to be paid for by an increase in the gas tax. This mode of transit needs to be competitive with a car for a family of four or it will go unused. If it is only for tourists then it will be a black eye on the region.	Cottonwood Heights	03/02/2015
The idea of a train or fixed guideway up LCC is appealing (and cool, frankly), but has issues. It would seem to require that backcountry users pay the (presumed) automobile entry/parking fees, which is mildly discriminatory, unless stops were put in at places like White Pine and popular climbing areas. A tunnel through Grizzly, while a cool idea, also raises questions. Ecologically I'm sure there are issues that the EIS will take into account, but I'd also like to see the price for construction and use. It would certainly increase connectivity, but I don't see how tunneling would reduce congestion any more than one train that runs up LCC and one that runs up BCC.	Cottonwood Heights	02/12/2015
The ideas put forth are good ones, the cost is the underlying question and where does the funding come from.	Cottonwood Heights	03/12/2015
The items outlined under "corridor purposes" are specific and understandable.	Cottonwood Heights	03/06/2015
The need is for the Ski Resorts to require, all but the most critical upper management to ride the Bus! Why is this discussion even taking place while so many of them are still driving?	cottonwood heights	04/29/2015
The proposed blueprint states that it seeks to "preserve the legacy of the Central Wasatch" and then proceeds to "modernize" the area to death to principally serve the tourist population at the expense of the local experience. As a professional in transportation planning and traffic modeling, I know that traffic models are only able to forecast how locals (NOT TOURISTS) move in the system. Yet the primary user base of connections between the Cottonwood Canyons and Summit County would be tourists. I have yet to see convincing evidence that cross-canyon traffic significantly contributes to traffic in individual canyons. These seem to be HUGELY expensive infrastructure projects (tunnels, trains) to only serve the convenience of winter tourists tourists while saddling the local economy with the cost amidst an increasingly uncertain future regarding winter precipitation, investing in dramatic, investive infrastructure that primarily gets used for 4-5 months of the year seems incredibly short-sighted. Less invasive options, such as improving Guardsmans Pass to provide a transit-only connection in the winter time could be a wise investment and have been prematurely dropped from consideration. I remain skeptical of the demand and contribution that cross-canyon traffic generates. It is worth mentioning that up-down canyon transit access and parking pricing are such a key part of this plan is a wise step. That was the only aspect of the plan that prevented me from marking "very poorly."	Cottonwood Heights	02/05/2015
The solution is cheap and easy to start. More Buses, more often during the Ski season. Charge a lot of money for parking at the Resorts during Ski season.	cottonwood heights	04/29/2015
The uta bus system does not work very well as it is. It would need a lot of change.	Cottonwood Heights	04/30/2015
This like many of the questions are designed to guide the conversation to your desire for a Train or more lanes up Little Cottonwood Canyon. Traffic in LCC is only a problem for a few hours 12 times a year, less than that this year.	Cottonwood Heights	03/16/2015
Tunnels are not good it will release more pollutants into the water. Trams are not OK. Stop with this idea. (Wasatch one -Ski Link whatever you want to go with) Trams are for Europe. We are not Europe!! Transparency. It seems to be that the plan has been drawn up in this state of Utah. It seem this way from the beginning and all mountain accord is doing is letting the people down slowly. Look at what the church did to a beautiful area around the great buttress. Look at the vote in the state there s no realization what the people really want. Money always wins. Is this what Utah wants? Not if they know the truth, not just about money!	Cottonwood Heights	03/12/2015
We don't need more roads. We need viable mass transit. Trains and tunnels would be the best, albeit not the cheapest. The backcountry land would remain intact, and transportation would be solved. And if it eventually connects to the East side of the Range toward Heber, the mountains local population could now chose to live in a way cheaper community and help spread the population growth of the SLC Valley.	Cottonwood Heights	04/29/2015
What's required in ALL canyons is a separated, future-forward engineered, weather-protected right of way for mass transportation up and down both canyons—not a permanent "solution" that needs to be removed or completely re-engineered at huge cost in 30 years. The "5-15 year" solution should be BRT, with an eye to replacing that solution within the protected ROW as more efficient technologies evolve. But the long term solution needs to also take into account how quickly technologies are evolving, and leave room for future improvements. Whatever is in that protected ROW should not utilize in any way interfere or utilize the existing inadequate road base.	Cottonwood Heights	03/03/2015
WINTER WEATHER SHOULD BE ACCEPTED AS A RISK OF BUSINESS IN THE CANYONS AND SHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED AS A PURPOSE TO CONTROL, ESPECIALLY IF THE SKI RESORTS ARE NOT WILLING TO ACCEPT ALL FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS. IT IS NOT NECESSARY TO HAVE OTHER EXITS TO THE CANYONS, LODGE INTERLOCK DAYS ARE FEW PER SEASON AND NONEXISTENT MANY YEARS-IT IS PART OF OUR CANYONS' CHARM AND THE SOLUTIONS ARE OUTRAGEOUSLY EXPENSIVE FOR A SMALL INCONVENIENCE	Cottonwood Heights	03/12/2015
would need more details	Cottonwood Heights	03/09/2015
Year round bus service is the most efficient and best way to reduce transportation problems in the Cottonwood Canyons. Buses should be free and subsidized via fees on autos. Improved bus service is a better alternative than trains. Tunnels, although good on paper, are probably not cost effective.	Cottonwood Heights	05/01/2015
Yes Little Cottonwood has the largest amount of congestion - but year-round bus service in both Little Cottonwood and Big Cottonwood seems like a no brainer. I don't understand why light rail wouldn't be considered as a viable option between the airport and Park City. It seems like rather than use the University Line - It would be better to create a new line without its issue.	Cottonwood Heights	02/06/2015
You've lumped useful ideas, like train service up BCC and LCC, with unrealistic ideas such as the tunnels to connect the Wasatch Front and back	Cottonwood Heights	02/27/2015
The type of mass transit in this plan is of concern as it is not defined as to what form that would take, which I'm sure it will as time goes on however connecting the ski resorts can only benefit the economy as a whole. The option to drive a personal vehicle up the canyons must always remain open year round it can't be like Zion's National Park where you must take a bus during peak times.	Cottonwood Heights	02/12/2015
I disagree that there is a critical need to have more people access our watershed. I believe that we have a stewardship to future generations to protect clean air and water. We can grow our economy in other ways and attract tourists to sites that are not critical to our life-sustaining resources.	Cottonwood Heights City	02/20/2015
On any "new snow" day the current transportation corridors are backed up for miles. Hordes of people are on the canyon roads and the roads that lead to the canyons inching their way. If canyon use were limited with a presale of lift tickets or some other regulation, problems with transportation could be resolved.	Cottonwood Heights City	04/21/2015
Don't hurt the rock climbing boulders or cliffs, please.	Cottonwood Heights, Utah	05/01/2015
Light rail up the canyons, without a connection to Park City, would be my strong preference. Bigger roads are not a good solution.	Cottonwood Heights, Utah	03/05/2015
The hidden tracks proposal to place tracks on the south side of Little Cottonwood Creek, thereby displacing the trail used by valley residents to enjoy the mountains and not just the ski resorts extinguishes my access to a mountain experience. I am opposed to this alternative. Therefore, if one of the goals is to maintain the mountain canyon experience for hikers, nature lovers, and climbers, then the proposed blueprint is a failure and deception.	Cottonwood Heights, Utah	03/15/2015
The accord excluded limitations to access. Further loading of these areas is not in communication with the proposals listed in the Accord. Example: Currently, parking is the limitation that enforces access. Eliminating congestion via passes this restriction already in place. Over flow at trail heads should already be eliminated, not enhanced.	Cottonwood heights	02/05/2015
I think light rail links would be much better than buses and cleaner with less environmental impact	Deer Valley part of year. Otherwise London	02/05/2015
A train from SLC to Park City is a better use of transit (and less environmentally dangerous) than one through the Cottonwood Canyons.	Denver	03/03/2015
As a tax paying snowboarder, I find any expansion of Alta extremely offensive. How dare you try to even further limit accessibility in the Wasatch. This plan is a direct attack on snowboarders and shows the extent that discrimination is accepted in Utah.	Don't worry about it	04/30/2015
I love the light rail up Little Cottonwood to Park City	Draper	02/05/2015
I would love to see large park n rides at the bottom of the cottonwood canyons with increased bus service, more stops at trailheads, and avalanche bridges.	Draper	02/04/2015

	Stewardship of our Watershed Health and Recreation Resources vs Killing the Goose that laid the Golden Egg. Elements of the Wasatch Accord "proposed blueprint" are very good, but some of the options still under consideration represent significant short sighted folly, in my view. The Express bus service to Park City is a very good decision. Use of NG and low emissions buses would make it even better. Relative to access into Little Cottonwood or Big Cottonwood, managed access with preference and significant incentive for express bus (low emissions) into the canyons makes great sense. Several options on the transportation table will almost certainly exceed the carrying capacity of a healthy watershed, resulting in degradation of the mountain recreation experience and healthy watershed. While the Wasatch Accord and blueprint study notes the trips to the Wasatch are nearly 2x that of Zion NP and population pressure is expected to increase many times over in the future, all but one of the transit alternatives are based on the premiss that added transportation of more people is better. Quite the contrary. Look at the heralded successful approach of Zion. Leadership and stewardship of the Wasatch would emulate that successful approach of managed access to retain the recreation experience and health of the ecosystem. Notably, Zion does not have the same pristine drinking water supply water quality resource to protect, yet the value of a reliable and high quality water supply in the Wasatch will increase dramatically to supply the growth in the region. The only sustainable transportation options are those which recognize and honor the healthy population carrying capacity of the mountain watershed, both in terms of vehicles coming up the canyon, but also in the safe number of people who can and should be "extracting" recreational resource value from the area. Do we want an experience that boasts 80,000 persons on the mountain a day with respective "footprint" of deleterious impact on the recreation and local environment, or a healthy experience which boasts a quality recreation and quality watershed health? The transportation decision we make will dictate the protection or decimation of our resource, and respective value we receive in return. What is the healthy carrying capacity, and what is the transportation management scheme which assures that? That is the question and strategy we should follow.	draper	02/15/2015
	The proposal relieves economic congestion to the Park City area, in exchange for land protections surrounding the Park City area. It 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, developers will benefit wildly with large property/business owners, while local, Salt Lake Valley people stand little to gain.	Draper	03/06/2015
	Tunnels are the way to go. Maybe there's some federal money to help with this job-creating project.	Draper	02/10/2015
	We need designate best parking as carpooling lots in upper LCC and BCC and possible pay to park for solo drivers. Need more park and rides near mouths of LCC and BCC and more and better bus service and no billion dollar trains and the accompanying view and watershed impacts. All season passes should include ski bus pass access.	Draper	04/05/2015
	Over the long term, more rail and less bus would be desirable, if expected usage justifies the cost.	Draper, Utah	02/09/2015
	The plan does not address pedestrian and cycling needs. Will the PRATT trail connect Parley's Canyon to the Trax line along I-15? Will there be additional trails that run through Holladay, Murray, and Sandy that connect I-15/Trax/FrontRunner for walkers and cyclists?	East Millcreek	02/05/2015
	Would like to see shuttle in millcreek canyon and year round bus access in cottonwoods	East millcreek	05/02/2015
	It's time to take a step into the future with a transit approach that takes cars and buses off the roads and provides mass consumer access to the resorts without detracting from the natural beauty of our canyons. Trains are the answer.	East Millcreek Township	02/05/2015
	Again cost should be a major factor in this discussion. The difference between a BRT lane up I 80 and a new high speed rail is probably huge NOT showing what those estimated costs are today (we have built both here in UTAH recently) is telling me that someone may have an agenda... Please show what is would cost per mile to construct a BRT lane from SLC to PC Please show what is would cost to build a high speed rail line from SLC to PC Please show what the cost of tunnel construction and maintenance would be (show the cost of re-imburement for water that gets re-directed) Also show the cost of Gondolas per mile. Transportation planners are finding cost per mile as well as the smooth and continuous transport of people in gondola cabins is a good investment. Yes they are susceptible to wind and weather there will always be the need for good unbiased cost/benefit analysis.	eeefurum	02/05/2015
	Jason Hammond I would like to see an underground rail system going up Little Cottonwood Canyon that connects Alta, Snowbird and Big Cottonwood resorts and continues over to Park City. This system would cost more but the long term benefits and savings would be worth it. People need to understand that not just skiers will benefit, but essentially everyone who wants to visit these areas for whatever reason year round would have this option. If we made the underground system big enough and fast enough, people would also use it for work commuting between SLC and Park City. This could eliminate the future need for a rail system up I-80. An underground train would relieve auto traffic and pollution, remove the need for snow removal, eliminate being stranded up the canyons due to roads closed/avalanche etc, create faster arrival times than autos, negates parking issues, and minimal impact on the environment because we can bury the system and replant over the underground rail line. People from Ogden to Provo could take light rail from their home cities to the underground train up Little Cottonwood canyon year round to resorts, cities and shopping in Big and Little Cottonwoods and on to Park City.	Farmington	02/26/2015
	A realistic, more economically feasible solution for Little Cottonwood Canyon needs to be implemented. Connecting canyons via tunnels is unnecessary and very expensive. The exact same statement can be made for the construction of a light rail. Utilizing natural gas powered buses that can respond to the demand is a much more environmentally and economically responsible.	Granite	02/12/2015
	Increasing bus service in mixed traffic up Little Cottonwood Canyon fails to meet corridor purposes? Really? 1) Large scale development is against Best Management Practices of a Watershed. 2) Buses already provide competitive transit service. 3) Avalanche related risks and delays "will continue to be a challenge" (e.g. Executive Summary) 4) Evacuation options don't include buses but they have these new flying buses that are called helicopters. 5) Buses would reduce auto use and congestion in Little Cottonwood Canyon. 6) Air quality is poor because of individual vehicle traffic, buses would help alleviate this. 7) Buses would reduce parking impacts overall. 8) Land use goals are pertinent only to the interests of resorts that don't want to build a parking structure. 9) Improving "traveler experience" would be affected by buses because they have larger windows and you don't have to focus on driving. 10) Access for pedestrians and bicyclists would improve with the addition of a small-short bus stop at the top of the Little Cottonwood Trail. There is already a large parking area across the river from an abandoned pavilion that could easily be converted for pedestrian and bicyclist access. 11) Travel reliability during inclement weather will continue to be a challenge no matter what you do and this point is misleading and should be omitted. 12) Buses already provide competitive transit service. This point should be omitted as it is largely addressed in point #2. 13) Discouraging one person per vehicle use would protect and/or enhance the natural resources of the canyons. 14) Most of what I see proposed by Mountain Accord demolishes and degrades the community of Wasatch Resort.	Granite	03/15/2015
	The only alternative that makes any sense is to plow Guardsman and make the road better. Still, why? That would increase problems with air quality. Air quality in the canyon is great as it is! Perfect! I go up there to get away from the air quality at the bottom of the canyon. Who was the bright person who thinks we need to fix an invisible air quality problem in the canyons? Sounds like the same person who works for Monsanto who thinks we have to genetically modify corn so we can feed the world.	Granite	02/04/2015
	Again...no tunnels!	Granite, Utah	04/30/2015
	Digging tunnels is NOT the solution!! We need to incentivize people to use the already existing transit, ie if you ride the bus to ski you get X off your ticket/pass...or creating a lane that is just for bus use so if we drive we can see the obvious benefit to taking the bus. A tunnel to Park City is not cost or environmentally effective...why not work to create a routine all day bus system up/down Parley's that would not only serve skiers but also people that work in PCS/LC. Bottom line, unfortunately, we are a very "ME" focused society, so we need to find a way to convince people that using public transit is beneficial to "ME", ie. I can do work and respond to txt and email on my way to ski and take care of business so my ski day can be that much longer, and I don't risk being a distracted driver!	Heber	05/01/2015
	I believe you have shown transportation alternatives using a tunnel between the front and back Wasatch to be limited to rail or bus. I strongly support a limited purpose tunnel as opposed to a tunnel for private autos and trucks. I also think (if not included) that an elevated light rail going over Highway I-80 from the base of the Wasatch mountains on the west to Quins Junction should be considered.	Heber City	02/10/2015
	More buses that are low emission vehicles, no cars with single drivers and tolls for non-hybrid, non-electric carpool vehicles.	Heber City	04/09/2015
	Reducing automobile is the primary goal which in turn has a positive effect on all "purposes". The greatest challenge will be changing the habits of Americans who prefer the convenience of driving over a mass transit 'way of life'. The goal has to be reduced automobile traffic - not a means to expand the resort footprint.	Heber City	03/26/2015
	I like the light rail transit, bus rapid transit, aerial transportation and the transportation alternatives that dissuade automobile use. I agree with the express bus and the express bus with HOV from the airport to Park City. I vote for the light rail transit or the bus rapid transit for the Summit County Connectors.	Herriman	04/30/2015
	Use your feet or ride a horse especially if your not from here	Herriman	02/10/2015
	I think the plans need to recognize that the canyons are used in three distinct ways: 1--Summer. Fewer visitors doing many different things. Parking lots are often full. People are going to many various locations. Traffic is not a major problem (now) but access points are generally insufficient. Note full lots at most hiking trails, notably those in the Albion Basin. 2--Winter, typical day. Current transportation and access seems to be working well. 3--Winter, holiday and weekend. This is the current problem. Too much traffic and environmental impact. However, this really is only a few days a year.	Herriman, UT	03/11/2015
	Guardsman's pass already connect BCC to park city, why not just pave the dirt sections and plow it in the winter and only allow busses to connect people along guardsman's pass? A train is just flat out excessive and would be a disaster to the mountain environment. I think a better idea would be to have something similar to what they do at Zion's national park, where you park and take the bus to where you want to go and no cars are allowed. You could have a big parking garage where the current park and ride is at the base of BCC and have busses that go up both canyons all day and restrict all cars, or add a significant fee to drive a car up like \$30 or something.	Highland	04/16/2015
	no trains...we have enough skilifts...no trams	Highland	04/16/2015
	The fastest growing area along the Wasatch Front is Utah County, and this is where a third of the Wasatch Front lives today. I would like to see more options for getting to the ski areas from Utah County. For instance, a single ski lift and parking lot near Tibble Fork Reservoir in American Fork Canyon to Mineral Basin/Snowbird may alleviate drive traffic up to LCC/BCC/PC via a third.	Highland	03/12/2015
	Try a shuttle service like they have in Zion National Park.	Highland	03/06/2015
	ALL TOO WELL TRAINS OR RAILCARS UP AND DOWN THE CANYONS. WOULD BE KINDA COOL. It seems rather European.	Holladay	03/26/2015
	Build the underground train tunnel first. The underground tunnel between Park City and Alta should be Priority One in the plan with Bus Rapid Transit solutions for the canyon passengers for the immediate future. The skiers are in Park City where the hotel and restaurant development is appropriate. If it only takes twenty minutes to travel the eight miles underground from Park City to Alta on a speedy light rail train in any weather, you could eat dinner on Main Street and sleep slopeside that night at Snowbird. What a great marketing tool for Utah skiing, and for our wildflower hikes and tram rides in the summer. Barely 5% of Utah residents ski. Fewer are going to ride a slow cog railway once an hour when they can drive in half that time. Let's spend the Billion dollars where it counts and make a ski resort link to rival Grindelwald, Switzerland.	Holladay	02/10/2015
	DO NOT connect the Wasatch to Park City by tunnel or light rail. It would ruin the Wasatch ski experience.	Holladay	04/28/2015
	Ensure that dogs and their owners have access to Millcreek Canyon!	Holladay	02/06/2015
	Extending TRAX up I-80 to Park City makes a lot of sense. The other options - the ones that seem to be at the top of the stack - not so much. Depending how they play out, they support either a Disneyized outdoor experience (not a plus!), or the urbanization of the upper Wasatch.	Holladay	04/15/2015
	I agree with most of the listed purposes for the Cottonwood Canyons. However, I do not agree with purpose statement 3 (reduce avalanche risks or delays). I think that when there is a risk of avalanche, we should not be traveling in the canyons, and the cost of creating a transportation system that would not be subject to avalanche risk would be extremely expensive and damaging to the canyons. I do not agree with the listed purposes for the Summit County connectors. I think that if we improve access from the Airport to Park City, we would not need any of the improvements listed for the Summit County connectors.	Holladay	05/01/2015
	I am concerned about the idea of a train because of its permanency and undetermined effect it could have on watershed. Optimizing the bus system would be a better first step and there are so many examples that could be looked at throughout the United States and its national lands. Of course, parking at the base of each Canyon would most likely have to be expanded. Also: 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. Incentivize ridership by making the bus fee free or only a nominal price. No tunnel linking LCC and BCC.	Holladay	03/14/2015
	I can appreciate the options that are on the table, but data and evidence has not been provided that would leave me supporting a tunnels between canyons. It seems like a long term solution to a potentially short term problem (i.e. disaster shutting down a canyon).	Holladay	05/01/2015
	I don't believe connecting the major resort canyons is necessary, although it appears that way in your list of purposes. Improving transportation up the canyons, especially big and little cottonwood will be absolutely necessary for the future, but an alternative that avoids building tunnels or gondolas between canyons is the only way to preserve the unique nature and beauty of the Wasatch. Some of the purposes listed may have to be sacrificed to accomplish this preservation.	Holladay	04/14/2015
	I like the parts about preserve the natural environment and improve the air quality. I don't like the idea of more busses competing with cars on the narrow and winding canyon roads.	Holladay	02/20/2015
	I personally like the tram/gondola transit suggestion! Less road traffic. More scenic. Parking Problem (like at PCMR parking lot) I think a parking garage, above or below ground would be a great solution to not having to cut thru more territory horizontally.	Holladay	02/10/2015

	I support reduced automobile usage and disincentives for automobiles, especially single person transport to recreation areas (one person, one car)	Holladay	04/16/2015
	I think that all of these options are worth exploring in order to come up with the best possible plan. Again, I don't know enough about the overall impacts and implications of each plan, but I like that there is thought being put into all of the options and what might be the best solution.	Holladay	04/29/2015
	I would agree that there is a transportation issue in little cottonwood. To dig tunnels or construct ski lifts (gondolas would just bring in more people and congestion to an other wise already congested ski resorts again diminishing the outdoor / mountain experience. The Canyons MUST remain "lead end canyons". At this point I would favor of a designated turbo bus lane, and a some what restricted private vehicle usage in the canyon. All resort employees and season pass holders ride for free etc. or some sort of incentive to bus ride or ride share some how. I would however be in favor of a rail line to Kimball Junction and Heber then down provo canyon. I believe this would have a year round effect and help with day to day commuters. NO TUNNELS AND NO CANYON CONNECTIONS! did you here me? NO TUNNELS AND NO CANYON CONNECTIONS!	Holladay	03/11/2015
	I would like to see a more frequent bus system in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons year around with stops at major trail heads. Parking should be limited at ski resorts and trail heads. Park cars at the park and rides and take buses up the canyons. I like the idea of mass transit service up Millcreek canyon. I do not want any more interconnects other than buses between ski areas and resorts.	Holladay	03/16/2015
	Increased public transportation to and from the airport would be helpful. Trams, gondolas, and drilling holes through the mountain to connect Park City with the Cottonwood Canyons are terrible ideas. Linking Park City to the Cottonwoods is going to have a serious adverse effect on Salt Lake County outdoor enthusiasts. My family used to love Snowbird and Alta. The skier experience at those resorts has become a nightmare and I will no longer take my parents, siblings, or children to those resorts in the winter. Even though the snow is much worse at Snowbasin, my friends in Davis County and north now refuse to come to the Cottonwoods because it is such an unenjoyable experience. Connecting Park City to the Cottonwood Canyons will strain the canyons' environmental resources and push the locals who really treasure those canyons out of them in favor of tourists and casual observers who have no incentive to protect and preserve the canyons.	Holladay	04/30/2015
	It's pretty clear that the skiing industry is driving this, as the issue of connectivity between Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons is mainly a winter time issue. Same goes for Park City to Big Cottonwood Canyon. Hence all funding for any solution should be via a ski ticket tax. Switching non-winter transportation to buses will solve your list of problems without costing that taxpayers. Those who want this should be willing to pay for it. Failure of this is grounds to kill Mountain Accord.	Holladay	03/04/2015
	Linking ski resorts should definitely not be a goal. Few skiers would take advantage of it and it would scar the back country.	Holladay	02/08/2015
	Rail is the only way to avoid gridlock in the cottonwood canyons and PC in the medium term. The roads are already ridiculously crowded a lot of the time.	Holladay	03/12/2015
	Seems like a HUGE monetary outlay to get light rail up there. either way, increased construction, increased impact as a result of the construction- this will have to be closely monitored and hazards mitigated. in the end- on a high snow day when little cottonwood canyon is most congested- how often will trains run- how many additional recreators will UTA get up there? one of my gripes with light rail now is the lack of peak use accessibility- i.e. downtown events, late night and early morning routes for employees of the airport, etc. these issues would have to be fixed for light rail in the mountains to be effective.	Holladay	02/04/2015
	Some of the items are completely useless to maintain the current feel of the canyons.	Holladay	03/16/2015
	The concept of putting a train up Little Cottonwood Canyon to solve the sometimes chronic car traffic issues should be considered separately from the concept of connecting Alta with Park City through a tunnel. Accepting bus rapid transit in a dedicated third lane along with snowsheds and highway realignment need not rule out an underground tunnel to the Backside. The underground tunnel solution tying the three communities of Alta and Brighton to Park City must be considered independently of the hill-climbing cog railway proposal. Transit solutions that do not require a central railway yard in Salt Lake Valley could function independently as a closed loop system, wholly underground, with daily maintenance performed at a service facility that is part of the terminus. The underground environment in a tunnel is at constant temperature, protected from the weather. This is nothing like outdoor highways and rail lines. A cog-rail train pulling a string of cars adequate for canyon travel is costly over-engineering in a tunnel. Furthermore, it can't provide prompt travel on demand that a queue of, say, driverless, programmed shuttles based on technological advances which might become reality within the next decade. An electric shuttle car system on a closed-loop track would be economically practical in a tunnel. Transportation choices must not be limited to transportation hardware manufactured for other legacy projects so that the discussion of the best transit modality for Little Cottonwood Canyon won't be influenced by the interconnect decision.	Holladay	02/24/2015
	The light rail tunnels seem absurd from little cottonwood to Park City.	Holladay	03/15/2015
	The real issue is this, the entire proposed transportation changes all make sense..... UNTIL we start thinking about combining the canyons and park city areas. THAT one proposal creates so much conflict and hypocrisy that I cannot even fathom why it is being proposed. It disturbs the natural balance that has always made the separate areas of Big, little and park city special. Even with the areas being completely separate, it is still less than 1hr of driving time to get from one to the other maximum.... that is STILL faster than almost any other cluster of resorts in the United States!!! So what's with the urge to push for this? Simple: economic gains for individuals and private entities (not necessarily taxpayers) and a blind belief that connecting these areas will somehow enhance the user experience and cut down on environmental impact??? Huh? Blasting a tunnel or degrading a beautiful skyline with a gondola is going to satisfy this requirement? Nope. My resolution: Keep all resort areas separate, however, enhance the user experience getting to and from the resorts. Up the efficiency and safety levels. We have had UTA in Utah for years and NOBODY uses it. Making people pay more to drive their own vehicles is going to send the wrong message and only upset the locals. Instead of penalize people, INCENTIVISE people for choosing the option you would like to see happen.	Holladay	02/17/2015
	A train up Little Cottonwood to Park City!!! Probably the craziest thing I have ever heard of. Billions of dollars for little return. And yet you have taken the increased bus transportation OFF the table. Wow. I would think a number of large parking structures located in the SL valley feeding a viable bus system would serve the same purpose at a far less cost. When did we suddenly decide we need evacuation routes for the canyons anyway? Earthquake? hope the tunnels hold up.	Holladay, UT	03/13/2015
	Except for the canyon connections which are not necessary!	Holladay, Utah	03/03/2015
	All I saw was the tourists flying in and you trying to get them to Park City faster. Put a light rail up Parleys for all the poor folks who work in Park City and all those who live in PC to come down to work in SLC. Allow only buses up the Cottonwood Cyns.	Ivins, UT	03/13/2015
	I'd hate to see a timid approach here, relying on buses and trams that could become the status quo for many, many years to come. Would hope the commission stays aggressive and looks into approaches that can carry large numbers of passengers with a low carbon/air quality footprint, without the need to transfer modalities (from bus to rail to tram).	Kamas	03/04/2015
	No road/rail/snow link from Sandy/Alta/Brighton to Park City. Utah does not need to copy the mistakes made in Europe. Rail to Park City, rail to Little/Big Cottonwood resorts would be costly but in the end beneficial. Especially if protected from the avalanche/rock slide areas.	Kamas, Utah	04/27/2015
	I say neutral only because there are some questions not answered. I do like the idea of express buses from different locations in the valley. Some of the questions that are not answered by the Mountain Accord in regards to transportation and the proposed rail system, is how do people get on it? Where will people park? If it is not a good alternative, people simply will not use it. They are going to have to park somewhere and the current park and ride locations are not large enough to accommodate much more than they already do. I would like to see more buses before rails. Express buses that would leave even from 1-15 to the canyons with minimal stops (Perhaps on weekends and holidays - the highest user days of the resorts). I also think a tunnel is a bad idea--those cars would have to park somewhere and there already isn't enough, especially on weekends and holidays. I'd like to see more thought given to cheaper mass transit options that would not require parking, like the added benefit of not increasing the size of the roads, whereas a rail system certain would. Creating an avalanche reduction structure like a covered road through the slide paths would help reduce congestion on avalanche mitigation days and would reduce the need for artillery to be fired.	Kaysville	04/29/2015
	It would be best if rail was up Parley's Canyon as well as Big and Little Cottonwood. If they all link together that is great, if not, that is okay as well.	Kearns	04/30/2015
	Express bus versus rail up I-80 is a mistake - while the bus could be faster, it does not have the ease of understanding nor the higher appeal that rail has, resulting in higher tourist usage of transit in areas with rail. Considering traffic as well, the time differences may not be as extreme as expected. The Cottonwoods connection to Park City is also concerning for economic reasons; tourists / residents of SLC could just spend a day skiing the PC slopes, and then return home without any benefit in terms of tax or bed bases for PC.	Kimball Junction	04/29/2015
	I have not met many people who have the ability, let alone desire, to ski from Park City to Alta or Snowbird in the same day. Why are we planning for a market that doesn't exist? The dream of connecting resorts via alternative transportation methods is that of a poorly thought out long term environmental impact and is instead an unbalanced approach to meeting the economic needs on one group. Rather than looking at expanding transportation across recreational corridors, it would be more prudent to upgrade and provide alternatives within the existing footprint of the current infrastructure to meet the travel needs of the public. Develop and focus on option D!!!	Lahaina, HI	03/16/2015
	Eliminate existing roads, convert one or more to electric rail only.	Layton	02/06/2015
	No rail, ever!	Layton	04/12/2015
	The rail system up the canyons will be the answer for the future. However, we need to assure a high capacity system for the high demand in the future.	Layton	05/01/2015
	Mass transit needs to consider dispersed users, ESPECIALLY if fee usage is explored. Otherwise, I doubt people would be upset with increased bus capacity/affordable rates. Coming down LCC in the winter can take hours.	Layton, UT	03/30/2015
	All information provided so far is inadequate because numbers are not given. The public needs to know costs and environmental benefits and costs. There is no discussion of making Little Cottonwood Canyon a car free zone like Zermatt of Saas Fee. There is no mention of the railroad which used to serve Alta. The description of light rail does not include the fact that grades in a tunnel may exceed 4 % because there will be no snow, ice or water in the tunnel. The public is not given any information concerning the ridership thresholds necessary to make each system financially viable.	Lebanon,N.H.	03/07/2015
	Transportation is the key and needs to include some modest increase in capacity up/down the canyons during peak winter times. Big/Little Cottonwood need to be increased to three TOTAL lanes, use two up in the morning and one down then switch to two down in the afternoon with one up during the winter season. During the summer season use only one lane up and down and use the third lane for bikes and other non-motorized travel.	Lehi	04/30/2015
	We cannot leave the option open for both tunnels and aerial tramways. If the tunnels are approved then the option for above ground infrastructure should be eliminated.	Lindon	02/04/2015
	ski lifts are more efficient than 15 passenger vans and Escalades	Litchfield, Ct	03/04/2015
	NO LANES NO TRAINS UP LITTLE COTTONWOOD CANYON.	Logan	03/02/2015
	All you have for Little Cottonwood Canyon as to what meets your "criteria" is a train or a four lane highway. 94% of your transportation committee was in favor of more buses. Do that, simply more buses. As far as "critical transportation needs" your studies include 12 snow days and holidays. Besides most of the people driving up there will not pay an exorbitant cost to ride the train or major four lane bussing system. Snowbird has said that they will not limit the number of cars up LCC, and I know the Cummings are calling the shots so no you are not helping with traffic. You are just putting more cars up there.	Logan Utah	03/10/2015
	The answer is not to punch holes through mountains. Use existing travel corridors (parley's, Big & Little) for LRT routes. The concept that we litter the landscape with endless travel corridors for complete access to any where from anywhere is outright insane. It undermines the fundamental purposes listed and exposes it for the money making scheme this really is. So you cannot go from Brighton to Park City to Snowbird on a gondola or train in 45 minutes oh well. Take pride in preserving what you have for your children and their children. We have light rail to the airport across the salt lake valley. Enhance this infrastructure with canyon routes to all major resorts using existing travel corridors. Co locate rail with roadway. Use tunnels where it makes sense due to geographic constriction or avalanche slide path. Need some help look to Europe my friends. I know it is hard to consider the notion that someone might have already done this a time or two but hey amazing things happen all the time.	Logan, Utah	04/30/2015
	Being able to get up and down the canyons without a car or relying on the bus... excellent.	Marietta, GA	03/23/2015
	I am aware there is a real movement to pave Guardsman Pass all the way over and then keep it open year round. First I would like to voice a resounding no to that idea. Why? One reason is Utah's ski bedroom Park city would flood over the pass to BCC both summer and winter. BCC does not need that added pressure from non locals. Or those who call them selves locals. Next the added cost to maintain that area of roadway will far outweigh any benefit. The construction alone to make it " safe to drive " would be ridiculous. That is not even talking about the cost to do so or the time it may be closed due to construction. Who will it really benefit? Me you the long time local who knew it as a rocky unmaintained pass over the back-county to park city or Heber. I first drove it in 1965. I thought I had discovered Nirvana. How about the added auto pollution, stress on the water shed, traffic, wildlife, and the soon to be lack of access to those areas I used to savor because it was more difficult to get to and no one knew of them. I can think of several. Just take a look at the Scott's pass area off Guardsman's - years ago you could drive there if you had 4x4 and on over to desolation lake down to what is now the canyons or down to Mill-Creek-- that stopped but you could still walk/hike it. What is now called the Crest used to be a haven for Sheep -Yuck. They are gone now and the watershed is better for it. But it has been invaded by another scourge.... Mt bikes. This trail used to not even have a foot print on it until Mt biking got out of control. It is now totally destroyed. How many pass along this trail daily? My point is we cannot take it back !! Such will be the same for paving and opening Guardsman Pass year round. People- People- traffic- regulations and loss of wilderness. Stop it now. Just like One Wasatch, Ski-link, - and all of the other Money land grabbing Outsider ideas that are coming along. Kenney Ken Gardner SLC, Utah	Midval ,Utah	03/26/2015

	Light rail up little cottonwood canyon and tunnel connections are terrible ideas. The construction will damage the ecological system and also cause noise. It is the best to leave the canyon as is. I doubt the traffic will get any worse since it is limited by the capacity of the ski resort, number of available climbing routes, and hiking trails. People who love nature and enjoy the canyons don't want you to change anything. I don't like the idea of bringing more tourists here. Our economy is good enough for us to live happily. Why trying to make more money by sharing our resources with more and more tourists?	Midvale	05/02/2015
	no ridge line trams for transportation, this is an eye sore for our beautiful mountains and a danger to migrating raptors, etc. I like the idea of rain transit through the canyons to reduce automobile traffic but ONLY as long as it can be done with little impact to the environment and safe for wildlife (any possibility of running that train up the canyon underground, maybe directly under the existing roadway?? This would cost more for sure, but would be safer for people and wildlife, cause less damage in the canyons themselves, and would be a solution without the canyons visually looking any different with the train running under the road that is already there.	Midvale	02/15/2015
	Tunnels, bus service, user Fees -- Get real --	Midvale UT	04/09/2015
	Trains: extremely expensive per passenger mile. Train from SLC airport up Parleys to Park City; would visitors use this? If Park City makes it so uncomfortable to have a car in town maybe tourists and locals would use a train or rapid bus system and then the local Park City free bus system. Park City should expand the bus service out to Route 40 at Quinn's to take some of the Kamas, Heber and Provo traffic off the PC roads. I live in Midway and would use a regularly scheduled bus from Quinn's Junction especially during Sundance and for summer events. Make the third lane of SR 248 for buses only coming into town in the morning and going out in the afternoon. The continued growth in Wasatch County will increase traffic into Park City and should not be ignored. Interconnect between Park City and Cottonwood ski resorts. This may only increase traffic up the Cottonwoods. While it would be a great tourist draw it may produce an even bigger traffic nightmare. The ability to ski more than one area in a day is important for some skiers. Interconnect: any above ground interconnect such as an aerial tram or gondola should be done with as little impact on the back country as possible. A tunnel interconnect would be the best way except it would be cost prohibitive. Can't see 2 ski areas being able to come up with those funds. It should not be a public project.	Midway	05/01/2015
	CLOSE BIG & LITTLE COTTONWOOD TO CARS IN WINTER!!! The canyon traffic is outrageous, unnecessary and really contributes to air pollution in the valley. There is no reason to have cars up the canyon in the winter. None. Zip. Nada. Eventually build a light rail system up Big & Little with a separate bike lane. Not sure I fully understand why Big is being shut out of the Light Rail system concept. Until those Canyons are closed to cars in winter this will be a meaningless make work plan. GONDOLAS SEEM SILLY AND LOW CAPACITY.	Midway & Park City, UT	02/24/2015
	I like the idea of the light rail system. However, I mainly use the canyons in the summer, when ski bus service is suspended. In the summer I would use a bus system to get up/down BCC or LCC if it would drop me off and pick me up anywhere along the canyon - So I can get to the trailhead of my choice.	Millcreek	04/26/2015
	I like the lite rail idea.	Millcreek	02/24/2015
	See comments above re: Millcreek, Holladay and CH.	Millcreek	04/10/2015
	The scenario is generally good in terms of the transportation purposes or needs, but poor in terms of proposed alternatives. I do not support the intent of Purpose #9, and question why it is included. Why does a transportation system need to be a "unique, attractive traveler experience" as stated? One of the problems the Blueprint is attempting to deal with is heavy usage within the Cottonwood canyons area, so why make an attraction out of the transportation system? The "attraction" should be the Canyons and mountains - the transportation system should be a means to get there, not an attraction in and of itself.	Millcreek	04/26/2015
	The shuttles will see little use if schedules are not convenient. A train may keep a more reliable schedule with less manpower	millcreek	02/05/2015
	Again, not supportive of connecting Park City and Canyons with tunnels and trams. Understand that we need to improve public transportation in the valley in general but currently it is very difficult to get around on public transportation if you don't fit the perfect 9-5 commute. It is unfortunate the our city is already designed to have us sprawled all over the valley with very few businesses in walking distance to where we live.	Millcreek Township	05/01/2015
	As one who drives up the canyon midweek and weekly (I've used the bus, but personal situation does not allow for that at this time), the road up LCC is deserted, BCC as well on a huge majority of days until it snows significantly (at least a foot). The bus capacity is so minimal. Why aren't there more buses and better buses that could be used on peak days? Weather reporting is good enough to anticipate this. The reason for lack of bus use is primarily the lack of capacity and convenience. The number of hitchhikers is minimal. I found it interesting that in one graph, Peak flow down the canyon at the end of the day is greater than the peak that occurs earlier. Seems like these data could be utilized by UTA. People dribble in, but lifts close and we all have to go home at the same time. I know that there is an initiative to start accessing the tunnel proposal, i.e., consultants are being lined up to look at hydrology, etc. I asked why we aren't seriously looking at the road for BRT and proposals there? Things stated are too general and seem to more contingent upon what resorts and those interested in that kind of economic development want. Hard to hear here with these kind of contingencies when we don't even know what Alta wants to do regarding Grizzly Gulch. There seems to be a disconnect between environmental goals, transportation, economic. It's more what stakeholders want, we throw into a pile, but meanwhile were making decisions and moving forward. So, the blueprint is the process. That is probably what is so confusing and frustrating.	Millcreek township	04/30/2015
	It will need to be priced in such a way that people will use it. And very convenient. It may even need to be like Zions eventually and be mandatory.	Millcreek Township	04/09/2015
	Move aerial transit to the "Alternatives Proposed to Drop from Further Consideration" section. An aerial transit system fails to meet goals 8, 9, 13 and 14. Quality recreation experiences are totally extinguished by the presence of transit structures and roads to serve them in the mountains. Parley's Canyon would be better served by a complete, paved trail system connecting Emigration Canyon to Summit Park. Propose user fees equal to transit (bus or shuttle) fees in the Cottonwood Canyons to encourage transit use.	Millcreek Township	05/01/2015
	The proposed transportation solutions are ideal. Implementing them in a cost-effective manner will be the largest challenge. Barring the implementation of mass transit in each of the identified corridors, a ski lift connection as envisioned in One Wasatch will be a better alternative than inaction, and Mountain Accord should avoid actions that will block One Wasatch until and unless it is clear that the transit alternatives will be built.	Millcreek, UT	03/14/2015
	I am ok with rail up and down LCW or BCW. Completely against any rail or aerial transportation to LCW or BCW. There is no need to tunnel- come on.	murray	05/02/2015
	I love the idea of public transportation up the canyons. I visit little cottonwood canyon often in the summer and it is usually packed with cars at all the main trail heads. It's a hassle trying to enjoy what you want to do recreationally, and puts a strain on the environment as well. The suggested fare to enter the cottonwood canyons I feel is a good idea, especially if a lower fare or no fare were attached to those riding public transportation up the canyon, to encourage people to take that option.	Murray	04/26/2015
	I think that a train going up to Park City would be an amazing addition. If it were to function year round, a huge number of mountain bikers that would benefit from it. As I mentioned in my previous comments, I do not think that there should be land taken away from backcountry recreationists to put a tram connecting BCC/LCC to PC. I do not feel that making this connection is beneficial, but more detrimental. Part of what make Park City, Alta, and Brighton so great is that they are small, secluded, and have a character all their own. Once you start connecting them, they will lose the feel that makes them what they are. I agree with improving the transportation going up the individual canyons, but I do NOT agree with connecting them. I think any of the options for improved transit going solely up LCC and BCC (which end at the top of the canyon where they are now) are good. I just do not think that they should continue to connect to the PC area.	Murray	04/05/2015
	It seems that too much traffic will go through cottonwood canyon and buses are not running on natural fuels or electricity... The emissions on those are pretty nasty. Now I know that UTA has already acquired a few electric buses and maybe those could be designated to drive through these areas. I would feel this to be more acceptable.	Murray	04/20/2015
	Mountain recreation is very important to me and is one of the primary reasons I make Salt Lake City my home. The automobile congestion in all of the canyons is reaching, and on many days does reach, maximum capacity. A focus on environmentally friendly transit is incredibly important to maintain the beauty and accessibility of our canyons. A train or gondola or light rail or some type of transportation rather than a bus or car solution must happen for us to sustain the pressure on our canyons. Not only for locals, but transit will also help boost tourism and the economy. I have many friends that live in Denver that complain about what a nightmare it is to get to the mountain recreation due to continuously packed roads. Many of them even fly here for the day because it takes less time to get to a resort here on a plane than trying to drive to Vail. Let's not become Denver. Thanks for trying to come up with a solution now rather than waiting for a breaking point.	Murray	04/29/2015
	Option D with BRT and no tunnels would have the most benefit and the most flexibility, the least expensive and most importantly protects the watershed!	Murray	02/09/2015
	We need to know what alternatives are being considered, this document is a bunch of vague ideas without a plan. Really poorly written and general; what are we considering DOING to make transportation better while accommodating residents? What are we doing to MEASURE what is there NOW so we will know what to do with it? Numbers have their uses and all I see here are general statements of high-blown ideals, when we need DATA to determine what needs to be protected and how to do it while development occurs.	Murray	04/25/2015
	You are considering a lot of things. Good luck! I mean that.	Murray	03/12/2015
	Have reservations re: number 12. What does that mean?	Murray	03/05/2015
	Bikes (see above comment)	Murray, UT	05/01/2015
	If a main goal is to "Protect watershed health, water supply, and water quality", we shouldn't want to "Create unique, attractive "traveler experience" to increase tourist and resident visitation"	Murray, UT	04/30/2015
	Maximum conservation. There are no "critical transportation needs" in this situation. Even positing that term tends to favor the development side of this committee.	Murray, Utah	04/28/2015
	Transportation alternatives must be economically feasible. Expensive buses and rail can only run if they can be financed and have sufficient ridership to be viable	Murray, Utah 84107	04/30/2015
	Seems a waste of tax payers money.	New York	03/03/2015
	I would hate to see any further encroachments on wasatch back country, i.e. segmenting of open spaces with man-made structures. Even if it is a tunnel and especially not if it is an above ground structure. I believe it is OK and reasonable to expect that persons in Park City or Heber may have a less convenient means to access the cottonwoods.	North Salt Lake	04/30/2015
	tunnels seem like a good idea but way to expensive since the cost won't be born by skier only. Only if it is born by the resorts should it be considered. I also don't see the reason to connect park city with brighton in the winter any other way than lifts. This would be much better than a road in winter.	North Salt lake	04/29/2015
	Make a plan and go for it. This idea of every stake holder have a say is not and never will work. It never has and with money at stake the public will probably have little to no say.	Oakley	04/07/2015
	No trains. No discentives. Minimal tunnels. I believe it can be done with buses. Delays are a part of life.	Ogden	04/16/2015
	Repeated from above ... "Light rail transit(LRT)in exclusive guideway up Little Cottonwood Canyon to the Park City area, including tunnel connections between Alta, Big Cottonwood Canyon and Park City." The foregoing is an encouraging quote from the study. The most "exclusive guideway" would be a master tunnel with Draper as the portal into the "front" with respective branches to access all ski areas and Park City proper. There is Global precedent for such tunneling. Such precedent has been expressed in its very early conceptualization by Master Geologist Leon Hansen ... deceased. There are many of us who believe that a "Super Tunnel" would remediate if not eliminate most environmental concerns and create a cornucopia of economic activity. The father of the Utah Tunnel concept is Leon Hansen, a Leon was a Masters degree level geologist who had a lifelong working relationship with the Greater Park City Mining District of Utah. Leon has held senior positions with several large, international, mining enterprises. There exists a repository of proprietary data that confirms the existence of precious metals resources that equal or exceed what have already been recovered from the mining district prior to its closure. Mining was halted decades ago because the metals resources were impacted and impounded by water in the mines. Leon believed that the water in the mines is a resource even more precious than the remaining gold and silver reserves. If the waters are recovered, the metals can also again be recovered. Synopsis: The Utah Tunnel will be a tunnel like many other long, long tunnels. New York-85; Sweden-51, Japan-33; Moscow-25; Madrid-74; LOETSCHBERG-21; Chunmek-31; Utah Tunnel-21 The Utah Tunnel would also be 21 miles long and most like the LOETSCHBERG tunnel. Loetschberg is the longest land tunnel (21 Miles) in the world. The Loetschberg tunnel took eight years to build and cost \$3.5 billion. The Loetschberg tunnel transports skiers to Swiss resorts more quickly. The Utah Tunnel would be a multipurpose/multi use resource. It will Convey...Water...Strategic minerals...Tourist transit to world class ski and recreational resorts...and other economic benefits to all of the citizens of Utah. The Utah Tunnel...can be done...during economically difficult times. The famous symbols of recovery in the West during the Depression included: Hoover Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, The San Francisco Bay Bridge and the Golden Gate Bridge. The Utah Tunnel will develop the following resources: Water...Multi-Millions of gallons from aquifers under and around the Uinta and Wasatch mountains recovered. Strategic minerals...\$0,000,000,000 (at thousands of dollars an ounce) of water locked, precious metals (gold, silver etc.) resources freed!!! Travel to ski and recreational areas...rapid, uncongested, and safe transit from the airport and other points to resort areas developed. Hydro and Geothermal power...other economic benefits... The tunnel from Draper to Park City will pass under three of Utah's most famous ski resorts. The plan is to connect those resorts with the tunnel thereby ensuring safe and rapid transportation from the Salt Lake International Airport to the resorts. It is our understanding that there is an existing railroad right of way from Draper to the Airport. Submitted respectfully by ... Wayne L. Wickizer Wayne L. Wickizer - Chairman Golden Lamp Regional Center, Inc. First National Bank Building 2nd Floor 480 East 400 South, Suite 201 Salt Lake City, UT 84111 United States chairman@goldenlamp.org Skype = wwickizer1 Business 801-528-3732 Home 801-326-4960 Cell 435-828-0496 Wayne LinkedIn = http://goo.gl/Rqz9vd Website = www.goldenlampregionalcenter.com	Ogden and Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	do not want trains, trams or more ski lifts polluting the landscape in our mountains and do not support selling off public land to real estate developers	Orem	04/16/2015

I don't believe #9-"Create unique, attractive "traveler experience to increase tourist and resident visitation" should be on the list. People visit to participate in outdoor activities (all seasons) or to simply enjoy what nature has provided us. I also feel that #1 and # 13, protecting the watershed and the natural and scenic resources, should be the highest priorities. If we get those wrong the entire project is a failure.	Orem	03/15/2015
I would rather not see multiple modes of transportation up the canyons, but if it has to happen, I just hope that the deer, elk, moose, etc. are kept in mind... they need ways to get across these roads or tracks with out a higher risk of getting hit.	Orem	03/04/2015
Trains up and down the canyon and linking thru to Park city.	Orem	02/07/2015
I like the ideas here for the most part considering we cannot stop the growth of Utah and the tourist industry. Options to discourage automobile usage is good, there should be incentives like free buses. I liked the trail maintenance, safety, and water conservation. I don't like connecting the 2 Cottonwood Canyons with any form of transit, but I could live with that. I cannot live with connecting Park City to the Cottonwoods that is a wrong idea through and through regardless of form of transit, train gondola, etc. say no to this proposal.	Orem Ut	04/23/2015
There are only two routes in and out of PC. This creates natural bottle necks that need to be addressed to lower the traffic volume. See my comments above.	Park City	03/16/2015
...however, I don't think a few of the goals meet the #1 goal on the list, which is protecting the watershed and natural environment. We should be making the Wasatch easily accessible in the winter, maybe not so much so in the summer. Adding a rail system and paving Guardsman Pass would effectively pump many more millions of people into the mountain range annually. Is this what we want?	Park City	02/24/2015
A lot of the proposed transportation such as light rail, tunneling, etc. will be way to expensive and probably will not happen. Highway access to Park City from the Wasatch canyons will just make the traffic in the Park City area that much worse. Buses most likely make the most sense for transportation because of their economy and efficiency. Parking areas need to be increased in order for an increase in bus ridership.	Park City	03/15/2015
additional roads are unacceptable. I haven't decided on tunnels yet - depends on the details.	Park City	04/30/2015
Again I question the need to go to the Cottonwoods from Park City. I personally would love to see this but it makes it hard to digest. So for these reasons I mark "neutral" I personally would say well or very well otherwise. Anything we can do to increase air quality and reduce congestion.	Park City	02/25/2015
Again you present false choices. We think that connecting the resorts would be good. Two to three lifts would do it. Two to three lifts!! how many acres are we talking in the Wasatch? Three lifts would spoil the experience. The majority of people came here for the skiing, we're a ski community. When you're 200 feet from a lift in the back country you don't even know it's there. There is plenty of land for all. Put affordable transit up the canyons not rail boondoggles that people will be paying for forever. Put a transit hub in SLC to take airport visitors to a central area and then run frequent buses up little and big and to a PC hub. Stop there and let the destinations solve their own problems. Again this could be done now!	Park City	04/29/2015
An aerial tram from Sandy to PC does not help in the summer. We need to think about transportation that is not just for skiers but people going to and from work.	Park City	03/06/2015
As I mentioned above, the ball is in our court to decide how tourists should be transported. Let's make it both cheaper and more fun to use sustainable modes of transportation.	park city	04/30/2015
As previously stated, I am absolutely opposed to any connection in any format between Little and/or Big Cottonwood Canyons and Park City, Summit County or the Wasatch Back. If Mountain Accord, Salt Lake City & County, Sandy City et al want to destroy your environment and way of living I will be sorry but not a part of this disaster. Leave us out of the operation. Period.	Park City	04/28/2015
As stated above..	Park City	05/02/2015
BRT along I80 corridor would be effective. The idea for a tunnel seems like a waste of resources. It would encourage, not discourage, vehicle traffic in Little Cottonwood. If traffic in the tunnel would be dumped out into Park City, where would that be? It would bring more cars to complicate the current traffic situation, not fewer.	Park City	05/01/2015
Bus only in Little Cottonwood and multiple options up Parleys	Park City	05/01/2015
Buses are not the answer, not enough flexibility and slow.	Park City	05/01/2015
Cottonwood Canyons - good plan I80 to Park City - we need light rail it's the best long term solution, also creates local jobs and most importantly reduces emissions Summit County Connection - we need light rail	Park City	04/30/2015
Digging tunnels for transportation purposes through scenic mountains is absurd and environmentally destructive. It would change watershed and ruin scenic beauty forever. I personally don't understand the insatiable need to connect the resorts in the first place.	Park City	04/11/2015
Do not build a rail tunnel from Cottonwood Canyons to Park City - too expensive, too many environmental risks (including water), and makes it a passageway instead of destinations.	Park City	04/30/2015
Each corridor should be handled separately and not interconnect at all!!! No rail, no tunnels, no above ground connections between canyons.	Park City	02/05/2015
Fact is, the American public is addicted to the automobile. The only way to cut increasing traffic is to promote and make accessible means of rapid transit that has good frequency, is safe and affordable. Trains and electric tram/buses could do this. If one looks to Europe for models in cities such as the Hague and various others, one will find that they are highly utilized. If one looks to the various connected resorts in Europe they can note that all of this is possible with chairlifts, trams and gondolas. We in the Wasatch are no different. Unfortunately a few misguided so called environmental groups have temporarily hijacked this but I believe prudent well informed minds will ultimately prevail.	Park City	02/25/2015
Focus on I-80 for mass transit. Please.	Park City	02/04/2015
get Vail to fund some of this!	Park City	02/24/2015
I am not in support of tunnels connection the Wasatch Front and Park City.	Park City	03/12/2015
I am opposed to any tunnels between Big and Little Cottonwoods and to Park City. I am also opposed to the over the snow options. Any transportation option that could adversely impact the environment (rail, adding new lanes etc.) should undergo an EIS.	Park City	04/30/2015
I am opposed to gondolas, trams and tunnels. I don't care about a "unique visitor experience." I care about the environmental impact of these proposed transportation options, and I really couldn't care less whether people in Sandy can ride a tram to Park City. Park City is a unique historical town and shouldn't be turned into a suburb to SLC or Sandy.	Park City	04/30/2015
I don't see how this will assist the possible future residents and tourists in Brighton Estates.	Park City	02/04/2015
I don't think we need to open up the backside of PC. Why go all the way up either Cottonwood to get to PC? I-80 seems more appropriate. THAT'S where we need new transportation options.	Park City	04/16/2015
I have no philosophical objections to any of the transportation alternatives: BRT, light rail/tunnel/snowshed, elevated lift/tram/gondola. Having just come from skiing in Europe's Alps, I find rail/tunnel to be quite acceptable. I strenuously object, however, to the perceived notion that automobile traffic in Park City is not worse than automobile traffic in the Cottonwoods. That notion is fallacious. If Light Rail/Tunnel in Cottonwoods is the answer, then Light Rail up I-80 MUST be built at the same time. There is no conceivable or economically viable way to offload rail/tunnel traffic efficiently to Park City from Cottonwoods, unless there is also light rail up I-80. It must be built at the same time, if it is built, at all. Park City's resorts handle significantly higher volume than Cottonwood resorts and contribute far more tourism dollars to the economy of Utah. Though it is possible that I-80 traffic is not threatened at present, automobile congestion in Park City has reached an intolerable level presently. It's unfair to assume that Park City does not deserve the same investment in transportation infrastructure as Cottonwoods.	Park City	02/17/2015
I have used I-80, Parleys Canyon, for 30 years. It occurs to me that capacity of the interstate can be increased with intelligent and well managed systems vs. adding more lanes. Are transit options viable year round or just during the high tourist seasons? We all like where we live and don't want to see us end up like other metropolitan areas. Keep up the effort on pulling this all together.	Park City	02/06/2015
I think the focus has to be on transportation options that are affordable and efficient. I don't like any of the bus options. Buses move at the same pace as a car, are less comfortable and the overall travel time is a lot longer. The only type of mass transit that should be considered and invested in are trains. While more expensive initially, they are more efficient to run, have high reliability and can be designed so that they get you there quicker than in a car. Take it from a guy who commuted into NYC for 23 years by train. The train up Rt 80 through Kimball Junction to Park City makes sense. Not so sure about the one through the Cottonwoods.	Park City	02/19/2015
I think this is crucial to the whole plan. Limiting the amount of cars into the central Wasatch would not only help environmentally but also enhance the experience for visitors. The train system is a great plan along with connection of the ski areas with aerial lifts. This is way overdue the positives impacts for Utah out way the negatives by far.	Park City	02/25/2015
I would like to see a train that runs in a C starting at Kimball Junction ending in the cottonwood canyons with the airport in the middle, running in both directions. I have no issues with the cottonwood PC connection. I just think it should be made over the snow (gondolas etc).	Park City	02/08/2015
If only Alternative D was on the table I would rate my answer 'very well'.	Park City	04/26/2015
Im a bit confused as to how connecting cottonwood canyons to Park City will help reduce the traffic and congestion in the cottonwoods. Won't more cars be traveling up to lcc and bcc in order to access pc through the new tunnel? how will this help the canyon roads? I can see that it could help I-80 but that isn't usually the problem. I read the 13 point objectives but I'm still a bit perplexed.	Park City	03/12/2015
Improve bicycle transportation.	Park City	05/02/2015
In my opinion, the rail system should not be considered because of the environmental impact...the construction of tunnels along with the rails are not necessary. Implementation of disincentives (charge for parking) are needed and an expanded bus system would be a good solution.	Park City	04/27/2015
Increased bus transit. Great. A light rail (or other form of rapid transit) from SLC to PC along already existing I-80 corridor. Great! Access from LCC to PC via tunnel? WTF? Come on, who is making money off this ridiculous scheme. Increased usage on Guardsman? Talk about a bottle neck when that traffic hits Deer Valley residential and resort roads. Aerial transit from Sandy to PC??? This is getting out of control. It's laughable that anyone would even consider this a good idea or meeting the so-called Mountain Accord principles relating to the environment.	Park City	04/30/2015
It is important to see data on the economic feasibility of the various proposals and for some of the proposed funding models to be shared with the public.	Park City	03/11/2015
It seems silly at this point to consider any corridor to Park City other than I-80 with trains and expanded bus service to a transit center, possibly at Kimball Junction to encourage public transit use. To consider blasting a tunnel through the Cottonwood Canyons to Park City or even year-round access over Guardsmans Pass is foolish since Park City's surface streets are already at traffic saturation point. Getting more traffic up here faster will only compound our problems. In the Cottonwood Canyons, a per-car fee for any less than a three person carpool, supplemented by expanded park n ride and free bus service to the ski resorts. If the Cottonwood Canyons opt to install a train system, that should stay on the Front side of the Wasatch. As the Wasatch Front becomes increasingly populated, the mountains will become a recreational resource that users will need to pay to use, either in canyon usage fees or parking for individual cars.	Park City	03/17/2015
It seems UTA could have better coordination for routes connecting Park City with the airport and other Salt Lake destinations (so it wouldn't take so long and have so many stops and connections).	Park City	04/26/2015
I've witnessed the increase in automobile traffic this year during ski season, so I like both the airport/PC rapid bus, and the Little Cottonwood/PC transportation proposals. I think the purposes are good.	Park City	05/02/2015
Keep trains in Switzerland, on I80, and in SLC. Make people ride mass transit up individual canyons. If you build it they will come! It may take longer but they will adjust.	Park City	04/30/2015
LRT up the cottonwoods is a great idea, but don't create any connection tunnels. Still tunnels to protect from advances on the roadways are appropriate. Should consider increase BRT and/or LRT but without tunnels. Consider rail line on I-80 and bus HOV on I-80.	Park City	04/04/2015
Mountain Accord Comments (Glenn Wright, Park City Resident) The Recreation and Environment pieces of this project are well done and mostly of concern to Salt Lake County. The Transportation element is more controversial. My comments are based on the document called Mountain Accord Transportation Corridor Purposes and Alternatives 2/3/2015 I favor a combination of alternatives B, C and D. -BRT or bus up both Cottonwood Canyons, with other traffic restricted to commercial vehicles and residents only. -Aerial connection from Park City to Brighton. -Express Bus from SLC airport connecting to a BRT line from Kimball Junction to the resorts and Quins Junction. -Aerial Connection - similar to the Peak to Peak Gondola at Whistler ( <a href="http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peak_2_Peak_Gondola">http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peak_2_Peak_Gondola</a> ). The Aerial connection to replace the Town Lift and start on the west side of the ski bridge, with stops near the uphill terminus of the Crescent Lift, proceeding to a point near Scott's Bowl or Puke Hill, terminating at Brighton base area. This lift is about twice as long as the Peak to Peak gondola at Whistler which cost \$51M CDN. I suggest that it be built in a public/private partnership between the resorts and the UTA or UDOT, to be operated by the ski areas during the ski season and by resort personal, but paid for by the public partner during non-resort operational hours and days. Express Bus - This service must be easy for the visitor to use and include a system to seamlessly deliver luggage to the final destination (perhaps in different vehicles) as well as merging into a robust BRT spine on SR 224. The Chamber of Commerce and travel agents should be promoting mass transit before the visitor arrives and attempt to intercept visitors before they hit the rental car counters	Park City	03/08/2015
Mtn Accord is completely ignoring a European model of how to get between resorts/lift-served skiing. One Wasatch is ignoring One Wasatch, which is a brilliant idea!	Park City	04/08/2015
Need bolder solutions to getting vehicles out of the corridors and more use of transit, linked to valley and to the airport	Park City	02/06/2015
need way more details...don't know about guardsman road between pc and big cottonwood...looks like a can of worms...	park city	05/01/2015
No aerial connection between Park City and Big Cottonwood. Tunnel or Guardsman.	Park City	03/28/2015

No trams or gondolas! That is not an efficient way to travel and would be a 'novelty'. I would not drive into Park City proper, have to deal with parking, and hop on a gondola that gets me to the ski hill far after first chair. How effective are the buses in the Cottonwoods working? PC bus is free and does not see heavy ridership. If the buses aren't full now, then putting more buses on the road will not make people take buses.	Park City	04/28/2015
No tunnel for rail to Park City	Park City	03/13/2015
NO tunnels! How can they be considered good for the environment? Boring thru rock? It is especially disturbing with not even a guess at cost. I think there need to be more incentives to not drive up the canyons. Then more buses would make sense. People adjusted to riding mandatory buses in Zion Canyon. The same is true for Parleys Canyon. When they first started running buses in Aspen 40 years ago, hardly anyone rode them. It didn't take long before they were crowded. My employer paid my fare.	Park City	05/02/2015
No tunnels, no connection from Cottonwoods to Park City. No benefit. High cost. Improved connections from Salt Lake to Park City should be added. Give tourists and employees a real alternative for accessing Park City. I question the impact of BRT on the Parley's route without making significant disincentives for SOV traffic.	Park City	04/25/2015
Only if D is implemented do I believe the alternatives address the problems. The canyons, particularly Little Cottonwood cannot sustain the construction of additional traffic ways.	Park City	02/28/2015
Over the snow connections seem to have been eliminate unilaterally and without public opinion. the public needs to know how, whom, and why this big of a decision was made.	Park City	03/11/2015
Park city is totally overwhelmed with traffic. Opening up Guardsman's pass to rail, bus and private vehicles would help solve this. Pine Canyon rd should also be opened up year around. Soldier Hollow should be reconsidered as a skier access point with runs coming down from Brighton. A UT epic pass should be created for all the resorts to encourage and allow locals to take advantage of the incredible resources that are in our back yard.	Park City	03/28/2015
People like to drive and be in their cars. There would need to be high level of public transit, and high dis-incentives (cost of parking, etc) for people to not drive up the canyons. Reduced individual driving would decrease parking needs and vehicle emissions. Again, people like to drive in cars from SLC airport to Park City. A HSR could be put in up Parley's Canyon to Kimball Jct, but you would need Uber cars, or similar vehicles to meet transportation needs in Summit County.	Park City	04/29/2015
Please see above.	Park City	04/30/2015
Prefer the alternative plans. I am somewhat skeptical about the tunnels. Am not opposed to rail alternatives	Park City	04/30/2015
Probably the only thing that makes sense are lots of buses and satellite parking lots in the Park City area. I hate to say this but paid parking in town is the only thing that will spur skiers into riding a free bus to and from a free satellite parking lot. It will turn many skiers off but they will get used to it. Light rail will not work. It is too limited in the volume of riders that are needed to amortize the cost of development and operation. Tunnels are crazy, water issues shut down mining in Park City. Buses work for some of the National Parks, why not for the canyons. Finally, someday a time will come when the resorts will no longer be able absorb creases. Ski pass sales will be limmated and pass prices unafordable to most. Enough will be enough. Good Luck, Randy	park city	03/28/2015
rail system too expensive and will take to long to implement provide free, reliable, timely, first-class (like a nice train) bus service in lcc and bcc. somehow make all 7 ski areas charge for parking, acquire parking area, such as gravel pit on wasatch blvd, to serve as transit center for all lcc and bcc buses. buses to be modern low- or no-emission vehicles (electric, nat gas, hydrogen) based on technologies already in existence and economical. bus frequency to be extremely high during ski season commute times. Lower frequency at other times. rider should have mind-set that it is easier (as fast, cheaper) to park and ride the bus than to drive up the canyon in their car. provide van service for dispersed recreation users e.g. bc skiers accessing mineral fork trailhead in bcc. i see no reason to try to link Park City with lcc and bcc	Park City	03/15/2015
Rail system.	Park City	02/23/2015
Rapid transit, car pool lanes and park and ride lots. Incentives for people to car pool and take affordable public transportation.	Park City	02/06/2015
Remove cars at least from little cottonwood.	Park City	03/14/2015
Remove the tunnels from the plan and I would give the proposal a big thumbs up. Keep the tunnels and the plan is a bad joke that Utah tax payers will be paying for years.	PARK CITY	05/01/2015
See above. This issue ruins the whole thing for me because it so drastically impacts the environment.	Park City	04/30/2015
Should add "reduce auto use and congestion in Big Cottonwood Canyon and Parleys Canyon" in addition to Little Cottonwood. Even if you believe these corridors are ok right now (I don't), they certainly won't be in 20 years. Should also add "Park City to the Cottonwood Canyons" because that will help achieve the other goals. Park City government is against this because it would give residents and visitors alike options other than Vail Resorts and Deer Valley, who would like to have a captive audience. Stand up to the Park City government; they are not representing their residents, but big business instead.	Park City	03/16/2015
Still need to see cost estimates to evaluate properly.	Park City	02/09/2015
The best corridor to Park City is up Interstate 80. A 180 bus system or a train system could be used that would connect into the present UTA system and end in the PC area. Park City has traffic problems within the city and does not need additional auto traffic. Parking is a problem at the resorts. HOV lane are not a Solution because of additional auto traffic. Light rail or HOV bus only would be a good solution.	Park City	04/30/2015
The cost of rail to the Canyons is dead on arrival. In state that can not fund education adequately it is hard to see this as a priority. Instead of going to Switzerland maybe you should go to Vancouver Canada and see how they use bus transportation to avoid building expensive highways and railways	Park City	02/08/2015
the difficulty for 224/248 is how to make it convenient to get from my house in pinebrook to pcmr without having to drive to a central transit facility, jump on a bus/light rail and get there without taking 45 minutes or longer depending on stops and number of transfers.	Park City	02/06/2015
The light rail systems and bus system up I-80 are nice but there is no talk of improving the flow of traffic into Park City. A rail and bus system will be nice but the traffic is still going to be absolutely crazy if the population and tourism percentage increases are accurate for year 2040. I have seen the traffic get to be twice as bad in the short 5 years I have been living here. The traffic has increased and the roads have stayed the same. I believe this is a bigger issue.	Park City	02/05/2015
The need for the LCC/Park City corridor is clear that it's primary purpose is to provide access to the ski resorts - when LCC needs to close for avalanche control, car congestion, etc. Do Alta and snowbird skiers want more people at the resorts and lift lines? We know the resorts don't increased access and people will logically lead to ski area expansion, additional lifts, more people on the mountain, etc. If LCC was closed for avalanche control, people will most definitely drive to PC to get on the train to get into the canyon. That just creates additional traffic/pollution for the entire wasatch. I do support increased human powered trail networks between LCC and PC.	Park City	05/01/2015
The need for transit over or through the mountains into Park City is not needed. The alternatives from SLC to Park City are much more interesting.	Park City	02/07/2015
The option of being able to transport from PC to the cottonwoods without driving I-80 and contributing to Wasatch Blvd traffic is very good. Whatever options exist (eg. if bus or aerial), it would be ideal if these were available for extended hours to help those who would use it for work.	Park City	02/05/2015
The proposed system does not appear to improve commuting between Park City area and the SLC valley areas.	Park City	04/26/2015
There should be further review of transportation opportunities outside of buses and light rail for the wasatch front between big and little cottonwood canyons. Additional multi use recreational trail development should be a focus as well. Light rail between Salt Lake City and Kimball Junction should be a focus. Also some type of multiple use recreation trails between Salt Lake and Park City should be considered.	Park City	02/19/2015
This is an example of why the 4 focus areas need to be integrated. Asking about the transportation options in isolation of the other 3 areas is not helpful. Again, I need a compelling analysis to understand the development needs and goals of the Blueprint. For example, how many additional skier days are desired or to be allowed? How about an option of limiting number of people per day that are allowed up the canyons? It seems disingenuous to not clearly articulate development or enhanced usage goals that drive the Blueprint.	Park City	03/26/2015
TO BE ABLE TO POSSIBLY CATCH A TRAIN FROM PARK CITY TO THE AIRPORT OR TO ALTA WOULD BE AWESOME I LIVE IN PARK CITY AND HAVE WANTED THIS FOR YEARS PLEASE CONNECT ALL THE RESORTS I ALSO SKI THE BACKCOUNTRY AND HAVE FOR YEARS I SKIED 9900 FOR YEARS AND UPPER MILL CREEK THERE IS SO MUCH BACKCOUNTRY TIMAPANOGAS, BOX ELDER, BACK OF SNAKE CREEK, LAKE BLANCH, EXCEDRA. PLEASE DONT LET A HAND FULL OF PEOPLE STOP THIS AMAZING OPPORTUNITY. SAVE OUR CANYONS FROM OUR CANYONS .	PARK CITY	03/02/2015
Train, NO Cars, NO YES YES YES... C. Same as above but with aerial transportation (such as a gondola or tram) in the segment between Big Cottonwood Canyon and Park City. D. Transportation system management alternatives, which are combinations of incentives for transit use and disincentives to auto use, without adding new transit, guideways or expanding roadways.	PARK CITY	02/25/2015
Transportation is a major issue, but choosing environmentally friendly options is KEY. Trains are great options for Heber to Park City to SLC, but to put a train up LCC and BCC would have a MAJOR environmental impact that would be negated with an effective bus system.	Park City	03/16/2015
Tunnel or aerial transportation across the Wasatch is undesirable.	Park City	02/05/2015
Tunnel or aerial tram bwn Park City and Little Cottonwood canyon or excellent way to improve access bwn resorts greatly increasing value and attractiveness. Same goes for light rail up Little Cottonwood canyon from SLC. Non-stop express bus from SLC airport to Kendall Junction where it makes short stop before express connect on dedicated corridor to Main Street and on to Deer Valley would be awesome. At present, the time required to make this journey is far too long so most people rent a car or drive their own vehicle. Need to expedite this option as way to encourage visitors to skip rental car thereby reducing parking issues and emissions.	Park City	04/11/2015
Wasatch front and back have unique characteristics, while integrating recreation across them via lifts and trails is an excellent idea, building roads and trains to expand the metro area from wasatch front, through the wasatch, and to the wasatch back is a BAD idea. Please go back to the drawing board and take OneWasatch concept, possibly building upon such with some better transportation to the Cottonwood resorts from the Wasatch front, possibly with some better transportation on the Wasatch back, but no new transportation corridors through the Wasatch other than by ski lift and ski trail (which is great and will have no environmental impact, roads, tunnels and pollution from vehicles will).	park city	04/09/2015
We really haven't been fully informed of the Accord's plan.	Park City	04/29/2015
whoreish and gross	Park City	04/30/2015
your immediate focus shouldn't be on the corridors it should be on the visitor mobility today... They may not come back to ride your train	Park City	02/24/2015
Aerial gondolas are terrible idea. Appear to be only another way to push for condo/hotels in the backcountry for the real estate developers. Besides the view shed destruction, the land impact of the towers there will be a stream of garbage across the landscape when the snow melts. Hope nobody gets sick in the middle of the long transit. I see that Guardsman Pass development is not preferred but what happens when if the tunnels cannot be built? Carefully designed and implemented Guardsman Pass development would minimize environmental impact to an existing route on the periphery of the core Wasatch and proposed wilderness area.	Park City	02/24/2015
B is the best transit option	Park City	02/24/2015
See above	Park City	03/07/2015
As a Park City resident, I won't support an over the mountain rail system to Park City from the Cottonwoods and Sandy. An over the mountain to Park City tram, or train seems like it'll be both extremely expensive to build/maintain, and very slow. Increased bus service and park-and-rides for the Cottonwoods seems more achievable and useful than a light rail.	park city	05/01/2015
DROP A, B, C. Keep D. DO NOT drop alternative E and F. 7 Do NOT build railroads into LCC and BCC. Instead, build upon the existing infrastructure and create incentives/disincentives to reduce the use of private cars to move skiers, other recreational traffic, and resort employees to the canyon resorts. 5. Do NOT create a new "corridor" between the Wasatch front and Park City via LCC, BCC, and one or more tunnels. 6. Consider opening Guardsman Pass during the winter months, but ONLY to public transportation, emergency traffic, and special permit holders. Note that the majority of the MA transportation group supports some usage of Guardsman pass.	Park City, UT	03/16/2015
Little Cottonwood Canyon/Park City is not a "Corridor". They are two separate areas and should stay that way. These plans look like an attempt to maximize profits for Vail Corp! We don't need to and don't want to maximize tourist flow into Park City. It will destroy its character. We do not need and do not want to see a train from Kimball junction to Park City. As a tax payer, I don't want pay for a train from the airport to Park City.	Park City, UT	04/08/2015
see earlier comments	Park City, UT	04/30/2015
"Little Cottonwood Canyon/Park City Corridor" is a false pretense. There is no "corridor" other than ski touring unless you create one. Leave it as-is. I am an expert in this regard, skied for 11 years in LCC while living in Salt Lake City. Have skied/lived in Park City for the past 2 years. Tell me, what do you "improve" by connecting them?	PARK CITY, UT	04/26/2015
\$5 Billion Ouch! Why spend \$5 billion if the resorts can be connected by 3 to 6 chair lifts? Buses, etc can take people to access their nearest Resort. Chairlifts, Gondolas and Trams can take people the rest of the way to the Resort(s) they want to ski. As someone who has been traveling to Europe twice a year to ski, chair lifts and Gondolas make sense. I look forward to seeing Utah ski areas connected in a way that is environmentally sensitive but not at this expense. Please allow the Resorts to bear the bulk of the burden of connecting multiple ski areas instead of the tax payers.	Park City, Utah	02/11/2015
Light rail connector would be the best option. Hard on environment during construction but should be a lower impact in the long run. Weather and avalanche issues must be a big ? still	Park City, Utah	05/02/2015
	Philadelphia	02/06/2015

I am looking at this from the viewpoint of a frequent visitor. I come to ski Park City 1-2 times per year and have recently bought a condo in Park City. The first thing I want to mention that the signage for the ski areas on the interstate within SLC is deplorable. There is only 1 old sign, at 1 of the junctions, letting people know that they are heading in the right direction. The highway up is always fine it is the obvious fact that everyone is funneled onto the 1 road that causes the jams. There already could be better use of I40 and the back way in onto Kearns. Certainly more corridors would create more options to spread out the traffic. Personally I would still rent a car to get up to PC with my wife and all our gear for a week of skiing. That being said I would use an express bus to come up to any of the resorts for a day of skiing or hiking. I would much prefer driving to on of 3 or 4 park and ride lots, to too many stops delaying the trip up the canyon.	Phoenix	03/17/2015
Leave the canyon as is. Do not tear into nature.	Plano tx	03/05/2015
1st I've heard of a light rail (on tires?). The problem with taking transpo up the canyon (I NEVER have, despite being curious) is that I have no clue where it goes, where it picks me up, how late it runs. There's just no clear bus stops. So I simply don't use it, and likely never will. A light rail would have clear stops and posted schedules, just like Trax. THAT I can trust and would use. Consider using rails (if the slope isn't too steep). I can't explain it myself, (but I am guilty): Put it on rails and tons of people ride it and want to ride it and think it's cool. put it on tires and people go, "meh". Explain that and you win the public transpo paper of the year award. Embrace it, and take home the trophy.	Pleasant Grove	05/01/2015
Rail would be a good idea in this scenario.	provo	02/06/2015
Continued support of UTA bus routes would better serve more recreation users of the canyons.	Provo, UT	02/09/2015
I support the establishment and maintenance of well-groomed trails for hiking, biking, and ski touring. Beyond that, any increased infrastructure (roads, rails, tunnels, lifts) is a mistake and will come at the expense of the public. I do support extending "ski bus" service through the summer on existing roads.	Provo, UT	02/06/2015
Train transit would hurt water quality, and ruin the beauty and naturalness of the canyons.	Richfield	04/08/2015
no new roads, railines or tunnels in little cottonwood cyn.	riverton utah	04/30/2015
I am concerned about the tunnel that was mentioned in the blueprint that would lead from Alta to Big Cottonwood Canyon. I feel that it might do more harm than good. Honestly, who really needs to visit both canyons in one day? You either ski and hike Little Cottonwood, or Big Cottonwood. I don't feel a tunnel connecting the two at the top would be a top priority. Plus it would be crazy expensive and that money would be better put to other uses like obtaining more private land, extending the light rail, or at least putting nicer bathrooms on the Crechet lake trail. )	Rose Canyon	02/05/2015
devil is in the details	Salt Lake	04/30/2015
I am a backcountry skier, hiker, fisherman and general muscle-powered user of the Wasatch. I encourage all planning that comes from this process, with particular attention to the following issues- 1) Water quality preservation is of utmost importance. 2) Transportation by car should be limited, bus service improved, LCC particularly should be examined for possible shuttling, train service, or similar alternatives. 3) No tunnels through the mountains, no gondola, ski lift or mechanized transport should be considered. 4) No further ski resort expansion should be allowed, particularly in Grizzly Gulch, Flagstaff, White Pine, American Fork side of the divide. 5) Overall enviro concerns must take precedence over developers' and resorts' needs. Chris Proctor 1464 East Emerson Ave. Salt Lake City, UT 84105 801.466.1905	Salt Lake	04/17/2015
I like the idea of improved bus service or light rail but with NO TUNNEL to PC! The canyons should not be super-accessible to all. That is how wilderness areas become destroyed. Make people work to get there and it creates respect for the land.	Salt Lake	05/01/2015
I like the improved transit in each of the canyons. I hope it could also improve the road biking conditions with lanes or wider shoulders!	Salt Lake	05/01/2015
I like the purposes though they seem a little biased towards the overly expensive solutions (rail)	Salt Lake	04/19/2015
I support the evaluation of transit in both Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. I do not support the aerial lines to Park City. I do not feel the Mountain Accord properly addresses many of the issues associated with access to the ski resorts on the Salt Lake City side. Many local patrons will continue to drive as opposed to a bus system. A BRT would be great and perhaps a train as well to reduce traffic. However, there is little incentive if it cannot provide expedited access as well as address the transit parking problems. More often than not, the lots are full at the current bus stops. Will said train have two tracks? What will be lost in the addition of right of way? These should be addressed, loss of hiking, biking and climbing routes would be unacceptable. If the train or BRT is full, will patrons need to wait 40-60min for the next to return? Currently there is no incentive to take the bus to the resorts save for poor weather and full lots at the resorts.	Salt Lake	05/01/2015
I take it on faith that the train is the long term best solution. I think support for the train, and the acceptance of the price tag along with the disruption that happens during construction, will be enhanced if the public is better informed about how this solution ultimately is the safest, most cost effective, and environmentally benign. I imagine graphs that show a time in the future when buses and trains intersect and the upfront cost of the train is shown to be a better longterm investment.	Salt Lake	04/30/2015
Most of the ideas make sense, but the tunnel in particular seems excessive and contrary to many of the other goals of the plan.	Salt Lake	03/25/2015
The rail proposal, especially the idea of tunnel, I find dangerously amusing. A proposal to build a really expensive transport system to benefit a couple corporations? I would laugh if I didn't worry it would actually happen. Expand the bus service! Currently to get a bus to Alta without 2 exchanges or driving to the canyons and leaving my car at the park and rides I have to get my family to the stop at 7:30. No buses currently stop at trailheads. We already have most the infrastructure, let's use it.	Salt Lake	04/30/2015
The range of options is too wide at this point to comment generally, but I will say that all of these proposals focus on the need to accommodate and increase the number of users in each canyon. If there is an imbalance between the number of people using the canyons and the amount of access, perhaps we should focus on reducing usage rather than increasing access through transportation. Expanding wilderness designation and requiring permits to access popular areas, along with limiting development will have a more substantial impact on balancing transportation needs with demand than roads, buses, trams and trains all combined. Mass transit is favorable to increased private options though.	Salt Lake	04/30/2015
Transportation needs are perceived by the ski resorts and developers, but the current system of cars + buses works fine and is a much better alternative than an expensive transportation system that would accelerate the destruction of the natural beauty of the still undeveloped parts of the wasatch.	Salt Lake	04/05/2015
We have lived in Emigration Canyon for over 25 years. Its road is not a highway-it is a residential neighborhood! We all walk it-bike it-walk our dogs-walk our kids-the cars and increasingly the motorcycles speeding puts us all at risk. We don't have the room to make it wider for anyone. A bike lane will only squeeze us all that more tightly. It will also take much needed parking areas away from the people who live here-pay taxes here-who clean up the canyon after all the day use recreation occurs. We don't just ride into the sunset-we live here and are heavily impacted by all the many uses. We think the only fair way to make the canyon safer for us all-is to lower the speed limit significantly! A speed limit in a neighborhood is usually 25-30mph. This will give people more time to react to oncoming danger-it will keep all the fast cars and motorcycles from going 60mph. Also-we rarely see any speed regulation here-it's rare to see a cop waiting for all the many speeders that enjoy the canyon all weekend-it could pay for the police force if they kept after them.	Salt Lake	03/22/2015
Worried about decreasing snow days - climate change and general warming increases the need to make snow to make money - water resources for - fees at the base of the canyon. for - more parking at the base of the canyon - against - fees for parking in the canyon - increase ticket price to gain more cash if you must	Salt Lake	04/15/2015
no extra lanes and no trains up Little Cottonwood Canyon.	Salt lake city	03/10/2015
I think the tunnel with a transit system is a better idea and more efficient system than a tram would be, if I had to pick one. I think a transit in little cottonwood canyon is a good idea, but I also do fear how that could affect the appeal of hiking and climbing in the canyon during the summer but something must be done to stop all the driving and traffic in the canyon. I also think that with respect to the bus system in the canyons something is missing. Instead of just going from the mouth of the canyon to Snowbird and Alta, there should be in between stops. For people going on hikes and or climbing in the canyon, you could take public transportation to a location for instance in between Snowbird and the mouth or the canyon. I think this would be more incentive to take the bus up the canyon. Currently you cant stop halfway up the canyon and therefore are forced to drive up to get where you want to.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
It is unnecessary to provide a transportation link between the Cottonwood Canyons and Park City. The need is for a viable mass transit system that serves access to the Cottonwood Canyons from the Salt Lake Valley. Please do not build tunnels thru the mountain. Instead, we need restricted car traffic and a vibrant/frequent bus transportation system such as has been implemented in some of National Parks (e.g. Zion).	Salt Lake City	02/09/2015
To encourage people to use public transportation it's also important to think about the experience when you get off of the bus or tram. Is there a convenient place to leave your ski bag etc.? In the summer perhaps this is less important. It may be necessary to impose parking fees and/or an entrance fee like with Mill Creek Canyon, as well to encourage individuals to use a public transportation system. Also, how do you get to the transportation take off points and is there adequate parking and is it safe?	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
* Rail is absurdly expensive and unnecessary and often a cover for urbanization. * Buses are sooooooo much more worth the investment. * Getting people out of cars IS a worthy goal * Focus needs to be not just on tourism, but on getting ordinary people (especially workers and low to moderate income people) to the places they work	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
-I do NOT support any transportation connection between Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons to Park City. -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. -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. -I do NOT support building a tram, gondola or any other aerial transportation option to connect the Canyons to Park City. -I support improving public transit transportation incentives and options for movement up and down Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon along current paved road footprints. I support removal and restoration of Guardsman Pass Road. -I do NOT support transportation goal #4 providing new evacuation routes out of both canyons. This transportation goal should be removed from the list. One way up and down traffic is a normal and natural condition and limit on growth the Wasatch. If development cannot increase in the canyons due to safety concerns, development should be limited. Unnatural creation of alternative evacuation routes is unnecessary and does not consider appropriate development within the landscape.	Salt Lake City	03/01/2015
1) Any light rail or bus service must be at similar traffic speed to driving. 2) In order for the mass transit options to be used they should be very inexpensive and not over crowded like they are now. A family of 4 will not take the bus for \$36 for day of skiing and if they are trying to go near the opening of the lifts it will be standing room only. It should be very cheap or free and subsidized by ski passes. Add an extra \$1-2 to each ski pass sold to subsidize mass transit. 3) A dedicated bike lane would be good for safety, traffic, and driving an environmentally low impact recreation in the canyon.	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
A few comments: 1. A shuttle system is a GREAT idea! Right now the canyon is at capacity (car capacity). If more users are going to use it, a shuttle is necessary. I do feel that the speed limit should be reduced, and there needs to be limitations on how wide the road becomes. As I own property in the Firs development in Millcreek, this is important to me. 2. The only way rail makes sense in the Cottonwoods is if driving private cars is limited to land owners in the canyon or there is a hefty \$5 fee (ala Millcreek). 3. The land swaps seem fair to me, but there needs to be zoning restrictions so that a Brighton Hotel (for instance) cannot be 20 floors tall. This way we retain as much of the traditional character of the place as we can. But I do feel that if Grizzly Gulch isn't part of the agreement, then there should be no land swaps at all. 4. I very much oppose any type of transportation linking the ski resorts that would put any kind of tram/ski towers over the ridges between big and little cottonwood canyon. The only place it makes sense to link the canyons is brighton/PC through hidden canyon. UNLESS we are talking about tunnels. 5. I think it important to establish legitimate trailheads for some tenuous situations, such as Heughs canyon, for instance. 6. Mountain Accord should seriously look at stopping motorized access in Mineral Fork. There is motorized access for almost the entire northern and southern Wasatch. While the number of hikers increases, the amount of land set aside for hiking is not getting any bigger. Mineral Fork seems like the best place to do that. 7. Make sure the new parking lot at Wasatch Mountain State Park is not so close to the cabins up there. Cabin owners don't want it, and recreationists also don't want to see cabins there either. There are alternative locations for that (abnormally large) parking lot further down-canyon that make more sense.	Salt lake City	04/30/2015
A free shuttle bus up the cottonwoods is a good idea. Maybe to pay for it, there can be a fee station for cars at the bottom similar to how millcreek canyon is now. People can either pay for an annual car pass or use the free shuttle. An express shuttle should take people straight to the resorts and another shuttle should stop at each fork (for hiking, climbing, bouldering, backcountry skiing, etc). Do not waste money and resources connecting park city to the cottonwoods. People can make a choice where they want to vacation and drive around if they want. I think that a light rail train up I-80 is a fine idea.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
A rail system in the canyons is an appalling idea. A more efficient bus system and more benefits for people who choose to carpool would be a start, with a better organized and larger parking area at the base. Minimal tunnels over LCC road to deter the larger avalanche paths and decrease closures would be an ideal compromise.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
A sustainable transportation solution is critical. I am concerned about the high costs for rail.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015

	A train is not desirable for reasons of cost and land use. But mostly for cost. Buses need to be considered, but starting over from scratch in almost every way. UTA's current service is mediocre...let's think out of the box and make the bus experience fast, cheap, and enjoyable. A city bus that goes up the mountain (what we have now) is so thoughtlessly uncreative. Bike lanes are a significant improvement. Off road trails that roughly parallel the CC roads should be constructed/completed in both big and little cottonwood. The idea that additional ski lifts will contribute to a significant reduction in traffic is basically laughable. Known bottlenecks on the cottonwood canyon roads should be addressed. The egress changes and staffing from snowbird entry 1 on peak days are a significant improvement. Let's see more of these proposed and piloted. Other areas include the merge at the mouth of LCC (more 2 lane uphill lane-age to facilitate the merge, perhaps an alternating light similar to freeway onramps). Also the light at the 'la caille' intersection where Wasatch separates from SR 210 should be removed in place of an overpass and merge lane for north bound traffic from the Wasatch onto SR 210.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	A train is not warranted given so few days high demand annually, and given the high costs and environmental impact during construction, as well as critical access issues for backcountry and climbing endeavors. Furthermore, a train should only be considered one more cost effective methods have been implemented with little success.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	A train to Park City makes some sense as it is a major population center. But a train in Little Cottonwood is nonsense. Vans/buses could meet the need while also being able to make the frequent stops required for summer hikers, etc. who access many trailheads.	Salt Lake City	03/09/2015
	A tunnel connecting the resorts would not eliminate auto congestion. Express buses and user fees might cut the number of cars. Other options would affect the natural beauty of the canyons.P.S. People don't necessarily want to ski at several resorts in one day.	Salt Lake City	02/06/2015
	Add a bus lane to LCC. We need a solution now, not in several decades.	Salt Lake City	03/11/2015
	After reading the blueprint, I can see that a lot of time and effort went into it. Overall, I think you all have done a great job. However, I cringe at the thought of a train going up and down Little Cottonwood Canyon. Our national parks have used shuttles and buses very effectively with much less impact. Would that not be preferable?	Salt Lake City	04/18/2015
	Again, I have mixed feelings. The goals and purpose are awesome, but I just didn't find the information relating to the areas I want. See above comments.	Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
	Again, I question the feasibility of a rail up Little Cottonwood Canyon, simply on the basis of cost alone. I understand there are conceptual funding sources, but will the cost be justifiable?	Salt Lake City	03/09/2015
	Again, I saw undecided because this all depends. I absolutely, positively do not want ANY surface transportation connecting any of the canyons, be it a road way, a train on the surface, or a lift/tram/gondola/whatever people mover you want to say. As for the option of a tunnel, again, it depends. Can you get me some renderings of what the light rail will look like going up my canyon? Is it going to be a direct replacement for the road? How will it effect the watershed? If it isn't an eyesore, and it doesn't disturb the environment, and doesn't take away from my current recreation area, I'm okay with it. If it goes against any of those things, I'm against it. A way to help with the gridlock in the canyons would be to expand bus times. Right now, there are a good amount of times buses leave the park & rides in the valley or mouths of the canyons before about 11AM. After that it drops off significantly. I understand there are most likely less people wanting to take the bus up at those times, but a lot of times, that's when I'm wanting to go up, and there's no bus for me to take.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	Again, providing a connection between Park City and the Cottonwoods is unfavorable by pretty much any consistent ski user in the Cottonwoods. It would also hurt businesses in Park City as people would prefer to take their business to the Cottonwoods due to lack of snow in the Park City Resorts.	Salt Lake City	03/10/2015
	Agree with increasing public transportation in canyons. Especially financial incentives and disincentives for personal vehicle use. Shuttle/buses seem more efficient than train systems.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	All of the proposed "improvements" come at a great cost in all areas you claim to want to make better. Putting express buses and trains up the canyons will not solve the problems. If nobody rides the buses now why would they want to ride them in the future? Plus part of the awesomeness about the little cottonwood canyon is that there are no tolls. Its small and welcoming. Charming. People from out of town like that about us! We're not elite like some other big resorts. Take action on your proposals and you take away that charm that keeps people coming back.	Salt Lake City	02/12/2015
	Allowing for express buses to make the canyons trips just as quickly as driving is imperative. Most commuters from the valley would rather ride than drive, but it has to be just as fast and less expensive than their 14 tank of gas. Alternatives A and B likely require either widening of the LCC road or building a new corridor, which may have profound environmental impacts, cost hundreds of millions of dollars and put more people in the canyons, which increases the desire for resorts to expand into new terrain to provide that service to more users. The construction impacts alone will degrade the quality of the environment in the canyon, faster than the current situation is. The idea of induced demand works just as much here as it does on a highway. Also, this approach is pushing an issue that primarily exists Fr-Su and on holidays. Not sure why "competitive transit" is an option. If you are looking at transit, how about "accessible transit" that makes it convenient, comfortable, easy, etc. If it happens, UTA cannot operate it. It has to be a unique organization that is capable of dealing with trains that can handle a lot of gear (bikes, skis, snowboards) and not be subject to UTA's business models. It will also have to work in conjunction with the private auto to work well. There is nothing inherently wrong with a car that has 4 or 5 people in it going to the resorts. It makes no sense to try to offset travel reliability in inclement weather. Even transit suffers in bad weather, which is evident in the Salt Lake Valley. It is a mountain area with extreme weather, there is no way to really mitigate it. Sorry that the resorts see less revenue when the canyon has to close. Is the priority people or dollars? Along the same lines, has there really ever been a huge worry about evacuating LCC or BCC that it would lead to the need for tunnels to PC? Could PC even handle that? I could see it in times of forest fire, but BCC already has Guardsman in the summer.	Salt Lake City	03/05/2015
	Although I believe rail is a good alternative, I suspect the cost-benefit analysis (including the EIS) will ultimately doom this proposal, as well as that of tunnel(s) linking LCC/BCC and BCC/PC. Ultimately, I believe that limiting auto traffic, improving bus service and building avalanche sheds may be more cost effective as well as more flexible.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	An aerial transport link would diminish the aesthetic and natural qualities of the Wasatch canyons. Other methods must be prioritized.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	An Unpardurable Sin The quality and quantity of the snow, steep beautiful terrain, and easy access make the skiing/riding experience in the Wasatch Mountains (backcountry and resort) world class. This is a special place. But the quality of the skiing experience in the central Wasatch is in jeopardy. I see the proposals for expansion by the resorts and Ski Utah's "One Wasatch" simply as marketing tools to attract more tourists to our world-class resorts. As a native Utahn, Snowbird season pass holder, and frequent backcountry skier, I don't believe these proposals for expansion are in our community's best interest. The Alta and Snowbird ski resorts cannot accommodate more skiers/snowboarders without further compromising the already crowded skiing experience that exists there. Who wants to stand in longer and longer lines while waiting to ride the greatest snow on earth? Not only are the lines insufferably long, with larger and larger crowds the snow gets "skied out" faster and faster. Is this the kind of experience Ski Utah and the ski resorts want for their customers? At the same time, the backcountry cannot afford to be annexed any more by the resorts without compromising the riding experience there. The ski industry in Utah has an insatiable appetite for expansion and development at the expense of the environment and wilderness experience. Both the resorts and the backcountry/wilderness can co-exist harmoniously but it's time for permanent hard lines to be drawn. Tunnels and aerial trams connecting the Cottonwood Canyons and Park City would desecrate what little is left of a wilderness/backcountry experience that exists in the glorious but fragile central Wasatch range. Why connect the resorts? If I want to ski at Alta, I go to Alta. If I want to ski at Deer Valley, I go to Deer Valley. The concept of an interconnect is just a sightseeing gimmick for tourists. No local would dream of wasting quality ski time riding lifts between resorts. Don't ruin what makes this place special and unique just for more money. It's true, transportation challenges in BCC and LCC do need to be addressed. More efficient mass transit makes sense, but let's not reinvent the wheel with complicated expensive projects that permanently deface and deform more of this glorious little mountain range in which we are so fortunate to live.	Salt Lake City	04/16/2015
	Any additional access to little cottonwood with damage the canyon. Remove the road and switch to rail only access.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Any mass transit system must include stops at areas used for backcountry ski and hiking access. If a person cannot reach their desired trailhead by transit then they will drive their car. In addition, I am in favor of a reasonable annual fee to be paid for canyon parking areas that provide access to public lands. Even though it would be extremely expensive initially, a rail system that goes up LCC, through a tunnel to BCC, then on to Park City and SLC would be the best long-term solution. It would have to be paired with private vehicle limitations of some sort (i.e. tolls or time-of-day limits). And such a system must include stops at backcountry trailheads.	salt lake city	04/30/2015
	Any transit options need to be studied carefully for environment impact before implementing.	Salt Lake City	04/28/2015
	Any tunnel through the Wasatch mountains is a travesty to nature and an eye sore.	Salt Lake City	03/13/2015
	As a back county skier, I wonder if a stop at White Pine is part of the plan. Also, we sometimes come out of Maybird and other areas and would need ways to cross the tracks safely and without walking parallel to them for long distances. Also, if we are going to spend that much money for a train up the canyon, I definitely believe that there should be a direct line from the airport to the top of the canyon.	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015
	As far as I am concerned, the most important part of the Blueprint is the railcar system up Little Cottonwood Canyon. It has become increasingly unpleasant to recreate up there due to the over use of the highway. A rail system would go a long way toward resolving the problem. However, I would restrict use of the highway, strongly encouraging individuals to use the rail system. It should be the primary option.	salt lake city	04/27/2015
	As I stated earlier, I'm in favor of discouraging automobile traffic and encouraging public transit. Frequent affordable public transit on the existing road, with avalanche sheds, could provide appropriate public access while decreasing private traffic and making the road faster for public transit.	Salt Lake City	04/27/2015
	As is already apparent, just continue to look for the most environmentally friendly way to increase capacity for recreational users, so the masses can get to the mountains (that's why we moved here) without destroying them.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	As noted above, buses and not trains are the best answer. And limiting auto access must be included in the plan.	Salt Lake City	04/07/2015
	As stated, the selection of possibilities to be further investigated, may not adequately consider the importance of future flexibility to deal with uncertain future conditions, nor with the probability that expensive infrastructure creates its own demand, to pay for itself: demand that may not serve the broader hopes for the mountains. These concerns raise questions about standard benefit/cost analysis. The shortcomings of such analysis can be partially alleviated by the use of higher discount rates for future benefits and by sensitivity analysis, but the question encountered will likely show the analysis so fragile that while it can help inform judgement it can not replace good judgement.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Before building tunnels, rail or other extreme engineering we should consider simply improving bus transit. 1) I know that Brighton season passes are a transit pass. Is that true for other ski areas? Could that be expanded to include all "locals" cards? 2) Most days there is no crowding at all in BC or LC canyons. There is predictable severe crowding on certain holidays and on powder days (particularly after a period of dry weather). It seems absurd to build extreme transit projects (rail, tunnels,...) based on peak visitation, particularly since on crowded days the quality of the skiing experience is bad (waiting in lines, crowded slopes, no place to sit at lunch,...) A better idea is to just make the bus system work. I will bet that the "experts" advising on transit have never actually tried to take the bus skiing. Here's how it goes. It's really easy and convenient to get there. You hop on, get a seat and are whisked up to the slopes. It's nearly impossible to get home. Everyone is leaving at the same time, the bus is full, you can't get a seat, and the next bus doesn't show up for ½ hour while you sit around in your itchy wet ski clothes. What needs to happen is, lots of busses need to be waiting at the end of the day and there need to be busses for each resort because otherwise everyone gets on at Brighton and Solitude skiers can't get on the bus at all. When I asked the UTA driver why it isn't managed like that he said it's because the ski resorts pay for the busses. Aha! So apparently what's being proposed in Mountain Accord is that instead of ski resorts paying for transit public taxpayer money is going to build fancy, expensive transit for the benefit of the ski industry. "Mountain rail" is a terrible idea. Let's not do it.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Better buses and headways could solve the problems not a rail.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Building a tunnel from Little to Big Cottonwood Canyon to Park City sounds like an obscure idea that would create a big impact on the environment to build. Additionally it is evasive to the natural landscape creating a ugly scar stealing a wilderness experience. The same view are held for the tram idea. Considering a fee to access Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon can help limit vehicle traffic.	Salt Lake City	03/11/2015
	By adding rail to the cottonwood canyons, and connecting to PC, without removing cars completely, you are adding to the problems you are supposed to be addressing. I see 7-8 of the 14 issues negatively impacted and most others minimally impacted.	Salt Lake City	03/04/2015
	Cannot read the proposed improvements.	Salt Lake City	02/07/2015
	Coming from Chicago, I realize the importance and convenience of efficient public transportation. The problem I have faced here in salt lake is that it is often much faster for me to drive places than it is to wait for the bus or train. This greatly deters me from utilizing the bus or train. I hope one day there would be a train or more frequent bus service between park city and salt lake city, not only for recreational purposes but for workers as well. I also hope the park city paved paths get connected to the salt lake city paths. There is already a paved path that extends to parley's summit. Connecting this path to ones in Salt Lake would be awesome! And provide a way to bike commute (kind of crazy but people would).	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Conceptually I agree on the transportation need between the two canyons and see a possible need to develop the drain tunnel between Alta and Brighton. Not sure how feasible it would be cost wise but a train would be great, assuming it is quick, affordable, and convenient. Buses could work as well if they came every 5 mins and simply shuttled up and down the canyons. Right now, it is incredibly inconvenient to use the bus, especially if you are with kids. Midday it can be an hour wait between buses, even on a weekend. If a bus system is to be effective in LCC it needs to be like the bus system during the Olympics to Snowbasin and the other venues where you hopped right on. I agree with the shuttle system proposed for summer use in Millcreek. I also think cars should be charged in BCC and LCC with an option to buy a yearly pass.	Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
	concerned about the idea of tunnels and changing of landscape, environmentally and economically. Quick fix for Park City: increase more buses from SLC to PC, increase incentives to use. Light rail into PC great idea. Big pkg area already at Quinn's Junction and the old rail bed. But need to expand to base of ski areas.	salt lake city	04/26/2015

	Corridor purposes number 1 and 13 need to be considered top priorities when thinking about transportation in the Cottonwoods. Competitive transportation options and 'traveler experiences' seem absurd. There is no reason we should be compromising water sheds or the natural state of these mountains to enhance travel experiences. An improved bus system with better parking options in the valley and a more frequent schedule seems to be one of the best improvements. Aerial trams and tunnels do not let these mountains maintain their natural state, let's not ruin these beautiful mountains with eye sores like an aerial tram or create big tunnels, because once you start developing and altering nature, it's almost impossible to go backwards.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Costs are extreme	Salt Lake City	03/31/2015
	Current transportation infrastructure is outstanding. Limiting daily traffic, implementing bus-only transportation ala national parks are models that can be explored with minimal costs before talk of trains, tunnels, and additional roadways are needed.	Salt Lake City	04/13/2015
	Currently one HAS to use a car in Big Cottonwood in the summer. Even in the winter, bus service is limited, and not very functional or pleasant ( unless you are 13 and have no other options, that's who rides them) . See above. It would be OK to improve Guardsmans to the point it would be drivable in the Winter (how many tourists have I redirected cause the map... or row... google map... told them there was a road there?), but you need the input of people who live in that area. Turning that road into a small highway doesn't really sound like what we want, either, and of course would have to be straightened and widened and that doesn't sound like it would maintain the area, would it.. Trains, better busses, maybe a third lane ( but then the canyon gets more hammered) but NO TUNNELS OR TRAMS	Salt Lake City	04/26/2015
	Dear Sirs (21 of you) and Madams (2 of you), I am an avid UTA (public transportation) user, in town and when going to the ski areas. How much will it cost the individual to use this new transportation throughout the canyons? As of now I pay \$10.00 a day to be environmentally conscious. Which is why the majority of people drive their car up the canyon. A family of 4 has to pay \$40.00 for a day of skiing just for the UTA Bus! It is mostly tourist, and a few of us locals that use the UTA for the ski areas, not the majority of the local population. If we build all this UTA infrastructure and the locals do not use it because of expense it would be a waste of time, money and energy and the only consequence, and not a good one, would be a burden on the lives of the animals in our mountains. Don't get me wrong, I love public transportation and saving the air, but do YOU take the bus to work everyday, or to the ski area? If YOU DO NOT use it, neither will our community. Suggestion... make the ski bus price \$2.50 the same as in town. That way a family of 4 only needs to pay \$20.00 to ride the bus. Thank you for your time. <i>Jamnie Hogan</i>	salt lake city	04/24/2015
	Don't support interconnecting Big and Little Cottonwood canyon or the Canyons with Park City at all. NO TRAMS, TUNNELS, YEAR ROUND OPENING OF GUARDMAN'S PASS. Better mass transit in canyons is needed including buses, or a rail system. Canyons are already getting crowded on trails and slopes. Commercial development and transit improvement can be done on private property in Summit County.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Eliminate all language regarding a tunnel.	Salt Lake City	02/04/2015
	Encroach as little as possible	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
	Expand the bus services. Rapid transport from downtown. More buses through the day that leave from the valley rather than just the mouth of the canyon. Have the buses stop at trailheads.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Expanding public transportation (i.e. trains/TRAX) to the various SL county canyons and Park City would be excellent. I imagine that would be a huge draw for out-of-towners. This plan would surely set a new precedent for mountain towns throughout the country.	Salt Lake City	02/06/2015
	Express bus service is a great idea but not trains. Passing a gondola from Sandy to Park City is a big NO! This will disrupt too much of the natural wilderness area and this mode of transportation is extremely slow and would serve very few numbers of riders. The gondola idea is a terrible idea. Train service up Parley's Canyon to Park City is a good idea.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Feel there needs to be an environmental impact listing or grading noted on each of the various Transit Mode Descriptions so the public can see which transit mode has the least long term impact.	Salt Lake City	02/25/2015
	First thing, please do not consider a tram. A gondola is an infinitely better experience than a tram. Light rail through LCC would be ideal, but I would like to recommend a light rail line continuing along I215 north to Foothill and continuing to U of U. This would accommodate almost all downtown SLC/university population that normally drive to the mountain.	Salt Lake City	02/10/2015
	For I-80 travel I support express bus with HOVs and for Summit County transit, I prefer BRT.	Salt Lake City	04/15/2015
	From recreational perspective, bike lanes in each of the canyons are a necessity, as well as a multi-use path going up Parley's Canyon from the bottom to the summit. Current plans of having the path just from the golf course to the summit are a good intermediate solution but it requires access through Emigration canyon which essentially doubles the distance and the elevation between the SL valley and the golf course, making it not very practical for everyone but seasoned bicyclists.	Salt Lake City	04/22/2015
	Given its relatively pristine condition, LCC is not an appropriate through-route.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	Glad that widening roads is off the table.	Salt Lake City	02/25/2015
	Going back in time... In the late 1970's the University of Utah added a new department and degree program...Urban Planning. The department was run by Betsy Burns and Morris Johnson. The first class graduating with this new degree was the class of 1980. As a requirement, every senior class was required to draft a comprehensive master plan for a city of the directors choosing. The class of 1980 was a bit headstrong and was determined to chose their own city, which just happened to be Park City, Utah. At the time the Park City Planning Director was Bill Ligety, father of the famous skier Ted, and currently running a highly successful real estate business in Park City. Some have argued that as a result of the insight gained from the planning students, Bill switched to the dark side in order to reap the financial gain from the projected coming hoards and large influx of money. Keep in mind at the time one could purchase a home in old town for 50k and any vision of large capital improvements never mind real estate speculation was not the norm. Anyways, I digress, and apologize for the tangent but it will help frame the context of what I am proposing. As part of the comprehensive plan several transportation solutions were offered including routes from as far away as the airport. Due to the cost of printing many of these concepts never made it into the final printed document (which is located in the Planning Department at the University of Utah). One of the more intriguing ideas was that of a funicular style railway operating in a loop from the mouth of Parleys Canyon, through Park City, to the top of Big Cottonwood and over to Alta and down LCC ultimately returning to the mouth of Parleys Canyon. This was the vision of the planning students nearly forty years ago. The current proposal has the rail portion terminating at Kimball Junction. Why? Why not complete the obvious and make a loop with trains operating in both directions? This would enable some amazing recreation opportunities for all four seasons not just winter. Additionally it would eliminate the need for more chairlifts to connect the ski areas and the ridgeline ski lifts and trams should be excluded because they change the character of the canyons immensely, constitute huge visual impacts and may, during construction, negatively impact both air and water quality in the canyons. I keep hearing the local ski resorts saying that they need to increase their customer base by connecting the ski resorts via lifts and tunnels. When most Utahns do not downhill ski, why are we being asked to fund transportation systems that mostly benefit a private industry that most Utahns do not participate in? I have talked to backcountry skiers in Little Cottonwood Canyon who are visiting from Europe (they also happened to be downhill skiers) and they remarked that they continue to come to Utah for skiing year after year because we have something that is rare in Europe, i.e., a backcountry that is NOT covered by ski lifts going over the ridges. I have visited areas in Europe that have ski lifts going over all of the ridges and always come away feeling that I'm glad that the ridges in the Cottonwood Canyons have, so far, been protected from the intrusion of metal posts, chairs, cables and trams.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	Gondola between Big Cottonwood and Park City seems kind of intense. . . .	Salt Lake City	04/13/2015
	Great idea to have a shuttle in Mill Creek, especially on the weekends. An aerial tram between the Cottonwoods and Park City would be impractical.	Salt Lake City	02/25/2015
	Growth in the central Wasatch is inevitable as is heavier use. As much as I don't want to see an aerial or tunnel linking Park city, Big cottonwood, AND Little cottonwood, I think it is inevitable. The blueprint provides a well thought-out, all inclusive solution that suites a range of views on the matter. While transportation corridors are connected, land and resources are also being protected. It's a win-win.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	Have the transit system include only natural gas powered shuttle buses running up and down Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons year-round every half an hour. Trains, tunnels and over-the-ridgeline ski lifts and trams should be excluded because they change the character of the canyons immensely, constitute huge visual impacts and may, during construction, negatively impact both air and water quality in the canyons. I keep hearing the local ski resorts saying that they need to increase their customer base by connecting the ski resorts via lifts and tunnels. When most Utahns do not downhill ski, why are we being asked to fund transportation systems that mostly benefit a private industry that most Utahns do not participate in? I have talked to backcountry skiers in Little Cottonwood Canyon who are visiting from Europe (they also happened to be downhill skiers) and they remarked that they continue to come to Utah for skiing year after year because we have something that is rare in Europe, i.e., a backcountry that is NOT covered by ski lifts going over the ridges. I have visited areas in Europe that have ski lifts going over all of the ridges and always come away feeling that I'm glad that the ridges in the Cottonwood Canyons have, so far, been protected from the intrusion of metal posts, chairs, cables and trams.	Salt Lake City	02/16/2015
	High speed light rail to down town Park City up Parleys connecting to TRAX. NO interconnect between Park City and Cottonwoods. Bus service up Cottonwoods maximized and close Cottonwoods to private traffic on high volume days.	Salt Lake City	02/24/2015
	How would increasing bus service only meet the avalanche purpose? This does not make sense. I see it meeting 5, 6, 7, and 10. It also seems cheapest, fastest, and easiest to implement.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	I agree that congestion in the canyons is a problem, as it has been for 20+ years on big ski days. I also agree that finding a way to get people out of their cars is a step in the right direction. I am not convinced that either of these goals are the real driving force behind the transportation plan and thus these are not addressed adequately. It is ridiculous to put in a transportation system for the purpose of "traveler experience." Our canyons are not an amusement park ride and putting money into a project that potentially compromises the water and land in those canyons for the sake of tourist dollars does not equal out. There is already bus service up the canyons. Who uses it? How could that be improved? Would anyone use rapid bus service? Opening Guardsman encroaches on backcountry access. Not ideal. Including and gondola or aerial tram under transportation is a farce. These are not methods of moving people along necessary routes to home or work, these are methods to make the Wasatch more alluring to visitors at the benefit of large companies that own the ski resorts. Where is the local benefit?	Salt Lake City	03/18/2015
	I am against most planned improvements and ski-links. The skiers already have enough land.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	I am completely against all the proposition regarding rail systems or aerial trams or gondola.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	I am encouraged that disincentives to the use of private vehicles are being considered, in conjunction with improved public transportation; however, the tunnel concept seems like pie in the sky planning, especially since existing public transportation has not been fully or effectively utilized and so much other road and highway infrastructure in Utah is in dire need of basic maintenance. While I find the light rail concept interesting from a traffic reduction point of view, a tunnel from the cottonwoods to the PC area would take the longest time to implement, and cost a lot of money when there are better low-cost alternatives. The light rail concept might be achievable within the cottonwoods themselves, and I see advantages to all users if it is run by the public for the public, and takes into consideration all users, not just customers of the ski resorts. I am an avid backcountry skier, and any such light rail system would have to include rail terminals at key backcountry trail heads in order to get my support. I am skeptical that this would even be considered in a cottonwood canyon light rail plan, especially given that there are already problems with the existing public transportation planning in regard to incentivizing reduction in private vehicle traffic from backcountry users. In particular, the reduction and/or elimination of UTA bus routes between the Mill Creek, Big and Little Cottonwood canyon park and ride lots. It is common for backcountry skiers to access terrain from Big Cottonwood Canyon and exit out Mill creek, likewise similar scenarios between Big and Little Cottonwood canyons. Rather than driving two vehicles (leaving one at the access point and another at the exit point), it is much more desirable to be able to leave, for example, a single vehicle at the Mill Creek lot, then taking the UTA bus up BCC to access terrain, thus eliminating all vehicle traffic both between the base of these canyons as well as up them. I have communicated this to UTA numerous times over the years (so have many other backcountry users) and nothing has come of it, so my concerns that light rail up the canyons would potentially exclude backcountry access even further is not without cause. The concept of a gondola system linking the PC and cottonwoods I find ridiculous as a public transportation option and I absolutely do not support it as it would be owned and operated by the private ski areas and thus only benefit paying customers of the resorts rather than the general public. The ski industry has already tried this ruse twice now, and it has been solidly rejected by the public. I do not think the gondola concept deserves any time or space place on the mountain accord agenda.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I am extremely skeptical of the proposed mountain light rail and the tunnel that would link Little Cottonwood Canyon to Brighton and Park City. This seems like a billion dollar pipe dream that will never come to fruition. More and year round bus transit up the canyons seems like a much more reasonable and attainable alternative.	Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
	I am for reducing traffic and pollution in LC and BC but see no reason to connect these canyons with PC. All PC traffic and transportation should be kept in the Parley's Canyon corridor.	Salt Lake City	04/14/2015
	I am in favor of a carefully-placed light rail system.	Salt Lake City	04/14/2015

	<p>I am OK with the proposals for bus or train to Park City. However, the proposals for the Cottonwood Canyons are not well thought out. The first effort should be a 5 year pilot study in which low impact transportation options are thoroughly vetted and assessed. This would be cheaper and would cause less impact on the environment. My idea is as follows: 1. Dedicated, frequent buses to specific ski areas (for example buses just to Alta and just to Snowbird). 2. Incentives for bus ridership - continue with bus passes through season passes and other incentives, make more convenient parking available and increase transit options along the Wasatch Blvd corridor to make it easier to take the buses. 3. Disincentive driving up the Canyons - paid parking. 4. Consider options for one way traffic. The goal for these gorgeous canyons should not be to get as many people up as possible. This will not protect the environment. The goal should be to get a sustainable number of people up the canyons with as little vehicle impact as possible. It is irresponsible to propose a massive train and tunnel system without trying low impact, inexpensive options first. I also feel tunnels to Park City will overload usership of the Cottonwood Canyons to the detriment of the environment in these regions. I do not feel one of the standards by which transportation options are judged should be alternate egress from the canyons. The canyons are a natural environment with potential hazards. Our job, as humans, is NOT to recreate the environment in a way that is safe and convenient for us. We need to respect the hazards in the Cottonwood Canyons by having a responsible transit plan, not a plan which overloads the canyons and tunnels through mountains. I STRONGLY disagree with the proposed transit plans for the Cottonwood Canyons. You should try a low impact, low cost plan based on buses before even considering additional lanes, trains and tunnels in this beautiful environment. I support enhanced transit options along the east bench (Wasatch Blvd) and to Park City and within Park City.</p>	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	<p>I am opposed to all fixed inter-canyon transport options, such as ski lifts and gondolas. I believe traffic in the canyon is already far too heavy and that the best option is to invest heavily in bus services, including expanded nighttime and Sunday service.</p>	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	<p>I am very concerned about the proposed tunnels for the purpose of providing a speedier evacuation ability or to connect the resorts. All of us who use the canyon, understand the risk of road closure due to weather or avalanche potential. The Cottonwood Canyons are fragile and we do not need to find ways to help more people access them for the financial gain of a minority. I also do not believe that most people want to ski several resorts at the same time. It feels like a PR strategy for the ski resorts that looks inviting on paper, but in reality would not be utilized that often. I am in favor of a mass transit system that excludes trains and utilizes a sufficient bus system that replaces cars and can better track the number of people in the canyon in general or at the ski resorts specifically. A train system would mar the already fragile ecosystem and be an eyesore. I would be in favor of limiting the # of people allowed in the canyons on any given day.</p>	Salt Lake City	04/13/2015
	<p>I believe a tunneling system would most benefit the transit and traffic of the area. More public transit would be good, however regarding the building of light rail, trams, or gondolas are not how I would approach the scenario.</p>	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	<p>I believe that the Cottonwoods Canyon cannot take the increase in recreational users that a mass transit system would allow without affecting negatively the environment and the watershed or even the experience that recreational users would have, either inbounds or in the backcountry. The cost is the elephant in the room. I don't think it is in proportion with the economical return that we can expect, because, again, the resorts are very limited in their growth no matter what.</p>	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	<p>I can't remember the last time the canyons had to be evacuated due to massive avalanches. Safety is important but not having multiple evacuation routes in the canyons hasn't really been an issue, aside from the inconvenience of being stuck when an avalanche covers the road. The cynic in me thinks that these purposes were included to make an interconnect between canyons and possibly the park city area more palatable then just saying outright that the resorts really want it to make more money and letting the public decide on that merit alone.</p>	Salt Lake City	03/26/2015
	<p>I completely support greater transit options and disincentives to single-occupancy automobile use. While I do want light rail transit (LRT) up Little Cottonwood Canyon to the Park City area, I am a little uneasy about tunnel connectors between Alta, Big Cottonwood Canyon and Park City. I completely support bus rapid transit (BRT) up Little Cottonwood Canyon to the Park City area without tunnel connectors.</p>	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	<p>I definitely think there is a need to address the transportation problems we have in the Cottonwood Canyons. I am not 100% convinced though that the means proposed in the blueprint are the best for Utah as a whole. I think connecting the mountains first and analyzing the overall movement of people with less infrastructure might be the more environmentally friendly approach.</p>	Salt Lake City	02/04/2015
	<p>I do not like the tunnel idea -too much environmental impact, rapid bus service up LCC sounds great. We also need bike lanes.</p>	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	<p>I do support preservation of these lands. I do not feel that building transit would preserve the land. This would be harmful for the wildlife and ecosystems. I also have concerns about how it would affect our water supply. I would support more buses being added on the current roads. I would also support a toll fee to increase use of public transportation.</p>	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	<p>I do think that something needs to be done regarding reducing congestion in the canyon. I'm worried about the construction of these alternatives and how they could affect water, wildlife and access to hiking areas.</p>	Salt Lake City	03/01/2015
	<p>I don't know what the exclusive guideway is.</p>	Salt Lake City	04/26/2015
	<p>I favor optimizing bus service to all the ski resorts. I am opposed to a light rail system going up Little Cottonwood Canyon and I am strongly opposed to a tunnel system between Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons. I would favor a long gondola up Little Cottonwood Canyon. This would be a terrific tourist experience and would decrease auto traffic in the Canyon. A Gondola might work in Big Cottonwood Canyon also, although I recognize that it would have to be even longer. The easiest way to connect the Park City areas with Big Cottonwood Canyon would be to improve Guardsman Pass and keep it open in the winter.</p>	Salt Lake City	03/11/2015
	<p>I feel that the proposed actions are poorly thought out. Increased bus service with increased car parking very near the canyon mouth and with added restrictions on private cars in the canyon would work. Example, no private cars in the canyons on the weekends before 10am. Buses connect parking areas on timely schedule. Buses stop only once at each resort before 10am. Also buses run in the summer as well and accommodate stops at all access points at least once an hour. Avalanche sheds are long over due. Parking fees at all trail heads. Long over due. It is unfortunate that LCC is a "dead end" when it comes to emergency evacuation. A tram would not help here either.</p>	salt lake city	03/17/2015
	<p>I find it disappointing that it use to be easier to catch a bus from Cottonwood Heights up to the ski resorts in the late 90's than it is now. Limited stops and service has made me stop using public transportation to go snowboarding up LCC.</p>	Salt Lake City	02/04/2015
	<p>I fully support optimizing year-round Bus Rapid Transit for Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon. With plenty of parking at the mouth of the canyon. 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). 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. I am in full support of a year-round bus shuttle system for Mill Creek Canyon. 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. 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>	Salt Lake City	03/10/2015
	<p>I generally support any efforts to increase public transportation - especially in the Cottonwood Canyons. Proposals to utilize aerial trams don't seem viable to me. BRT from the airport to PC seems like a no brainer. I didn't see it mentioned in the linked document, but for locals the UTAs is not a viable option. It is expensive and simply takes too long.</p>	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	<p>I guess I'm okay -except I don't love the idea of building a rail system up Little Cottonwood Canyon. But again, hopefully adequate mitigation to construction damage can occur. And yes, a rail system to Park City is definitely a positive attribute--since it already is developed beyond recognition--i.e. freeway and multi-lane highway--so why not parallel them with a rail system.</p>	Salt Lake City	02/15/2015
	<p>I have never skied at more than one resort in a day and no one I know has either. Each resort has so much terrain to ski, you don't get bored and want to go some where else. People I've talked to are an Alta fan and main ski Alta or a Solitude fan and mail ski Solitude. While it sounds neat to be able to ski all seven resorts in a day, its a novel idea that people may do once but never on a regular basis. Connecting Big and Little Cottonwood via a tunnel is not valuable. However, shutting down the canyons to single or two occupancy vehicles is a good idea. Switching to natural gas buses or a light rail system in each canyon an excellent idea. anyone</p>	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015
	<p>I know this is a difficult and sensitive portion of this proposal and the future on the Wasatch mtns. but I feel that this proposal really missed the mark in this area. The proposal to put a train up the canyons is a bid absurd. It would be incredibly expensive, very invasive to the natural environment, water shed and overall beauty of the natural environment putting this in, it's constant use and especially tunneling through and destroying parts of the mountains. But besides all that, this drastic proposal is given without having any attempt to use the travel resources that are already in place...i.e. the roads. Currently the only buses going up the canyon go directly to the resorts, and are very spread out in their schedule. Why set up an efficient, frequent bus system that would have many stops going up the canyon. People would use it if was reliable and stopped frequently in the places they want to visit. I honestly cannot see ANY justification to install a train without first attempting to use this resource. On another note, though not mentioned directly in this proposal, is the One Wasatch idea. This is even more absurd of an idea than a train. That would cause such a scar to the Wasatch back country, that I cringe thinking about this actually happening. Yes, it may create a few jobs during one summer when it is constructed, and then a few part-time, minimum wage lifies running it during the season, but that economic impact is so minimal and also directly targeted to the Park City tourists, with very little, if any benefit to the local population. Even in your own report, you say that the overwhelming majority of the use in these canyons is the local people. Why would we want to ruin it to cater to the desires of the Park City tourist trap. I will fight both of these ideas with pure passion. During the Ski Link debate, I was involved and even visited all of our congressional representatives in Washington D.C. to discuss the idea and share the views of the overwhelming majority of the people of the area who do not agree with these proposals.</p>	Salt Lake City	03/06/2015
	<p>I like most of the purposes. I don't recall hearing of people getting trapped in BCC or LCC, and so I don't know how big of a deal the emergency evacuation routes need to be. This is the mountains people, and we can't control everything. I think if we can provide protection for the road from avalanches, we probably don't need a separate emergency evacuation route.</p>	Salt Lake City	03/17/2015
	<p>I like the following ideas on the Transportation proposed actions: Transit incentives and automobile disincentives including parking/pricing strategies. Year-round local bus service in Big Cottonwood Canyon. Fast transit service from the airport to the Park City area via I-80. Improved transit service on US 40 and I-80 between Quinn's Junction and Kimball Junction. Improved transit connections in Summit County. Shuttle service in Mill Creek Canyon. High capacity transit connections in the eastern Salt Lake Valley. Safety and access improvements for bicyclists and pedestrians. I do not understand the "Bus Rapid Transit" what is that? The photo looks train-like. I DO NOT support aerial, mountain light rail. And I extremely oppose a tunnel.</p>	Salt Lake City	02/24/2015
	<p>I like the idea of rail connecting the Salt Lake Valley to Park City and the Cottonwood Canyons. I am opposed to any tunneling that has been presented and believe Guardsman pass should be considered as a viable option. Additionally, Millcreek Canyon does not appear to be in any of the planning. That canyon has tremendous pressure from hikers, bikers, and evening use of the picnic areas. The road is very unsafe for all these users and at a minimum needs a designated bike lane.</p>	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
	<p>I liked that goals were listed and the alternatives matched to the goals. That seems a very sensible way to approach a complicated situation.</p>	Salt Lake City	04/20/2015
	<p>I love the idea of a Rail from the University TRAX line to Park City via I-80.</p>	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	<p>I love the identified transportation alternatives proposed. I implore decision makers to make it all happen. Yes it comes at a cost and the public too should be open to investing in these proposed improvements.</p>	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	<p>I marked "Neutral" on this because I agree with about half of the ideas. The ideas that I think would be very helpful are the Fast Bus from the Airport to Park City (Because it's a huge destination, and then we wouldn't have to put a train up Parley's), second is the shuttle system at Millcreek (Then again, it depends on what the pay plan would be for the shuttle, also where in the world it would pick up) BUT, I think that's a great idea because Millcreek is such a small fun canyon. I think shuttles would be very helpful. My qualms are with the tunnel in Little Cottonwood to Big Cottonwood. Within the Recreational Opportunity Spectrum, you are covering some big ground with that connection. You are enabling the "assumed" wanting social condition - but it sounds like it will prove to be detrimental to environmental and (some) managerial conditions. The tunnel sounds like a cash grab, and more opportunities for money making at the expense of quality recreational experience. Quantity is NOT quality. Not only that, connecting the two canyons in the matter of a tunnel sounds "cool", "fun" and "fresh", but eventually it will become the muddled traffic jam, over-polluting mess that you were trying to avoid. Because of the proximity of the mountains, people love going there (as shown by the numbers) BUT, when you have that sort of flood gate open, of people being able to go between the canyons, I promise you that you will be receiving more vehicles and people than you can imagine, than the blueprint could have imagined, and then you'll run into problems. My proposal is, don't change anything about the connectivity of Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon. You can still initiate certain mitigation inside the canyons, but once you connect them its like splitting at atom - imminent doom.</p>	Salt Lake City	03/09/2015
	<p>I oppose any form of aerial transportation to accommodate increased traffic in the Wasatch. Those needs can be met with the other, less intrusive forms of transportation.</p>	Salt Lake City	04/22/2015
	<p>I put well, only if the idea of a rail system is completely banished. I already put my views on it in the previous boxes. With regards to the 1-80 corridor, I am in favor of a rail system up there. I believe the area works well for it. I think it will make it so people recreate in Park City more, and I do love the idea of that rail system going up to the Park City Mountain Resort.</p>	Salt Lake City	03/12/2015

	<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. Providing copious parking near the mouths of the canyon would be a critical component of this. 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). 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. Incentivize ridership by making the bus fee free or only a nominal price. The bus system would need to have both a Snowbird-servicing bus and multiple Alta express buses. Current and future UDOT plans to add passing lanes on hwy 210 for private vehicles should be focused on improving bus transit systems. Snowsheds and/or bridges over side paths can/should be added for increased avalanche mitigation for the highway. I fully support optimizing year-round Bus Rapid Transit for Big Cottonwood Canyon. Again, with copious parking at the mouth of the canyon. 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. Tunnel connections would create more defacto resort sidecountryside terrain, effectively increasing the resorts' footprints. 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). 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. I am in full support of a year-round bus shuttle system for Mill Creek Canyon. 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. The rationale provided for abandoning the Parley's rail transit - that was favored in the Transit 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>	Salt Lake City	03/09/2015
	I support an improved bus system over a rail system based on the existing infrastructure in place with the roads already.	Salt Lake City	03/06/2015
	I think adding tunnels or connections from park city to alta will cause additional problems, such as increased traffic in the canyons. I am a supporter of closing the canyons to automobile traffic other than a shuttle or light rail. Obviously additional stops would need to be added to facilitate mtm biking, backcountry skiing, snowshoeing, etc.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	I think canyon traffic should use something similar to Zion canyon to reduce impact on the environment. I propose restricting canyon vehicles to a FREE shuttle, to incentivize use. This could be a combination of express shuttles to the resorts and in the summer there can be more frequent stops. Fees for the shuttle can be taken directly from a ski ticket purchase. For those who are backcountry skiers, climbers, ect. . . Who may want to be in the canyon during off hours of the shuttle, they will need to purchase either a yearly use pass or monthly pass in order to drive up the canyon and park a car in the canyon. Otherwise it should be restricted to the shuttles. A shuttle up millcreek is also not a good idea because it would be difficult with dogs and it is the only canyon that allows them. A shuttle system would work much better in the cottonwood canyons. If there needs to be a connection between park city and the other resorts, I favor a solution. That does NOT involve a gondola or other ski lift.	salt lake city	05/01/2015
	I think it's a travesty that a train is being suggested for Little Cottonwood Canyon and not for Parley's Canyon, which has 7 day per week, 24 hour per day, 6 lanes of traffic going constantly. It seems like a far more obvious place to invest the significant expense of a train would be there, which would benefit far more people during far more hours than serving LCC on the handful of powder weekend days per year when the traffic is truly problematic. Or, if that is indeed the major problem needing to be solved, why not build parking garages, charge a toll for cars driving up and make the buses free? I fail to see how increasing bus use fails to meet the other 13 corridor purposes but the train meets them? I would need to see some data to be convinced here that this is truly the case.	Salt Lake City	02/18/2015
	I think light rail is a very good idea. Tunnels seem totally ridiculous though.	Salt Lake City	03/05/2015
	I think the cable way system would provide for the most scenic and safest form of transportation up the canyon. Stops can be made along the way for people to get out and explore. Large spans of area can be covered without the need to build towers and structures. The views from the cable way would be unbeatable and provide a tourist attraction of its own. It could chis-cross the streams to get views of the entire canyon. It could be similar to a rainforest tour but in the mountains of the Wasatch	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	I think the focus should be on improving the existing bus service, not on building fancy new infrastructure	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015
	I think the need for expanded parking near the mouth of all the canyons is critical if we are expecting people to use mass transit up our canyons. If the parking issue is not addressed, I believe people won't use any of the mass transit options. (just look at how fast the parking lot is full at the mouth of Big Cottonwood during ski season. Anytime after 9:00 AM, it's full.) I also am in favor of some type of disincentive for people to drive up the canyon. This can be accomplished by 1. Toll Booth (similar to mill creek). 2. charge for parking at the ski resort lots. 3. Reduce parking space/options up the canyon. (prohibit parking on the highway shoulder. . . if there is a designated bike lane, there shouldn't be parking of cars in this lane anyway.) Finally, the people always assume the traffic issue is only bad in the ski season. Actually, there is more daily traffic in the summer and fall. Therefore, the mass transit options are really needed year round, not just during ski season. I have lived up Big Cottonwood canyon since 1982. I cannot tell you how the traffic number, noise, pollution, and over all danger of driving in our canyons has become. Between the increased cars, bikers, and runners and the way no one is separated, it's becoming dangerous and decreases the experience for everyone.	salt lake city	04/29/2015
	I think the transit options, like trains and trams, to connect Big & Little Cottonwood Canyons and BCC and Park City cannot be built with negatively impacting the natural ecosystem to a high degree. Use of these trains or trams to connect these canyons will continue to harm the ecosystem over time and diminish any gains in any other parts of the blueprint. Other than these intrusive, unnecessary trains, the plan looks solid.	salt lake city	05/01/2015
	I think there should be light rail along the Foothill/Wasatch Blvd corridor, all the way to LCC. Also light rail up LCC, and probably BCC as well. Put a gatehouse on the roads up the two canyons and charge cars \$5-10 each. Use this to defray the cost of rail and offer it free to users to encourage use.	Salt Lake City	04/28/2015
	I think transportation is the biggest issue in our canyons. I like the idea of light rail. I've often thought that reducing car capacity and increasing public transit and at the same time increasing safety for cyclists and hikers is the way to go.	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
	I think transportation issues could be resolved without further development, by requiring mandatory bus use on high-traffic days.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I thought a "no action" option had to be included within the proposal? While I know this must be included once the Forest Service begins the NEPA process, I still believe there are less costly and impactful options that need to be considered or adopted for a time prior to the creation of a tram, tunnel, etc. The construction of any of these proposed transportation types will ultimately create serious, permanent impacts to a canyon that caters to skiers/snowboarders, a possibly dying industry as climate change continues. The use of disincentives is a great place to start, but I think shutting down the road to any private vehicles must be considered and tested prior to an impact that will affect the canyon and future generations. Increasing bus routes should be part of the proposal because cost will be minimal and benefits could be great.	Salt Lake City	03/13/2015
	I very strongly oppose the option of a train. This could possibly destroy much more of the environment than is indicated in the plan as a whole new corridor would have to be provided through Little Cottonwood Canyon while still retaining road service. The cost would be astronomical and the usage would primarily be for less than six months of the year. A dedicated bus rapid transit service within Little Cottonwood Canyon would deal with the car congestion on the road. I don't see any advantages with connecting Alta with Park City, and I fear that this project could severely impact the watershed. The canyons provide an enormous source of water for the Salt Lake valley.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I would favor the BRT. It would allow greater access with less need for disruption of a fragile environment. I also like the idea of a rapid from the airport to Park City. This could be a real plus for the area.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I would love to have nothing but light rail to access BCC and LCC. Get the cars out except for residents and service/emergency vehicles.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	If at all, maintain the existing road (Guardman's Pass) for year round use. That has to be easier than building and more tunnels and a tram.	Salt Lake City	03/02/2015
	If the focus is on stimulating the economy while moving people and protecting the environment, then the logical choice is trains or light rail systems. The I-80 corridor is an ideal place for mass transit. People coming to visit the valley should be able to travel during their vacation without every having to drive a vehicle. This should start with a connection from either the Sugar House Street Car or a University Connection up Parley's. This would lessen the vehicle emissions in the valley as well. Park City already has a solid transportation system from Kimball Junction to town, why not expand on the already existing infrastructure. This would be a novel way for people visiting to travel. This should be looked at more closely. I have heard that people are wary of taking out lanes on I-80 because it is an already established transportation corridor. But a train is much more sustainable over the long run. Not only that, but creating more traffic on I-80 would pressure residents to use the to be established train system.	Salt Lake City	03/20/2015
	If there is going to be a train up LCC, where will the additional parking lots go at the base of the canyon? Will there be a fee to park in addition to then taking the train?	Salt Lake City	02/12/2015
	If there is going to be a train up LCC, where will the additional parking lots go at the base of the canyon? Will there be a fee to park in addition to then taking the train? Finally, I do not think it is necessary to connect the cottonwoods to park city. It seems like it would only increase the potential "commuting" traffic through an otherwise "recreational" area.	Salt Lake City	02/12/2015
	If you're gonna have public transit, you must make it convenient (see above comment). As someone who would prefer to use public transit to access the ski resorts, I found the times of operation of the UTA busses so painfully inconvenient that I had to take my car into and out of the canyon everyday to get to work or to return from work. You're only gonna convince car-dependent visitors to use mass-transit if it is more convenient (and cheaper!) than taking their own vehicle.	salt lake city	03/04/2015
	I'm concerned about taxpayers paying for rail or tunnels, and very concerned as a rock climber about the affect on roadside bouldering and crag access.	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015
	I'm glad you're going to take more time on this and seek additional input.	Salt Lake City	03/13/2015
	I'm of the opinion that rail is a good option, AS LONG AS, individual vehicles are prohibited or significantly reduced (excepting emergency and service vehicles). I'd particularly be in favor of rail connecting Salt Lake and Summit counties via the I-80 corridor in Parley's Canyon. There are many opportunities beyond Park City that would benefit by not being reliant on a personal vehicle (Union Pacific Rail trail, Jordanelle Trail, Middle Provo River, Mirror Lake Highway and Uintas) Mill Creek, severely needs a ban on individual vehicles, much like Zion. And as a canyon visitor of many decades I've seen no signs of the fees being put to use; because of this I'm weary of proposals for fees in the other tri-canyons. More buses: I don't know anyone who would take additional buses that doesn't already utilize buses, although any summertime alternative to using my vehicle to access the tri-canyons is a positive step forward. Rail along the foothill corridor (Foothill/Wasatch Blvd) would be a huge incentive for me to use the existing eastwest buses and forgo my personal vehicle altogether.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	I'm very concerned that potential transportation solutions will negatively impact existing climbing areas, especially in Little Cottonwood Canyon. Please work with the Salt Lake Climber's Alliance to identify climbing areas. There are boulders both by the road and the south side trail in LCC.	Salt Lake City	03/17/2015
	I'm worried about the details of both the Tram up from Big Cottonwood to Park City. Details are everything, and it could be horrific or it could be great. I am utterly unsure what it would end up in reality. Could ruin Millcreek, could be amazing. As to the train/rail up LCC, see above comments. thanks, Amy	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	I'm worried about the environmental impact of a train. I'm also worried about what specific routes a train would take and at what points tunnels would enter and exit. I guess I think protected bus and traffic lanes is the best course of action.	Salt Lake City	04/28/2015
	Improve the transit situation up and down Little Cottonwood Canyons but do not add the user pressure of connecting these canyons to the Park City side.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Improving mass transit up the Cottonwood Canyons from the Valley has obvious positive environmental benefits, particularly in the long term. Is it a critical need to connect Park City to the Cottonwoods? No. This benefits ski tourists staying in Park City (and those providing their lodging), but any harm that may come to the watershed and mountain ecosystem by creating those transportation corridors adversely affects year-round residents (as well as the tourism industry).	Salt Lake City	03/02/2015
	IN LCC. On days where the Road/parking is Maxed out. SO IS the skiing. a natural cap. Something to Create unique, attractive "traveler experience" to increase tourism, and move MORE people, is NOT necessary. a simple system to get people, not cars, up the canyon is Great. and we certainly DO NOT need something to get people from Alta to Brighton To Park City. we already have something called I 80 and Parley Canyon to get to those resorts.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015

	In my opinion, I think the proposed transportation concept D would be the best plan to build for the future of the canyons. An additional rail route up and down Big Cottonwood Canyon should also be considered. The volume of personal automobiles now allowed to access Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons has strained the road system to its limit. A European model for access comprised of electric trains connecting to existing transit systems in the Salt Lake Valley and the Wasatch Back would serve the future of the area far better than another bus system, susceptible to delays from ever increasing automobile traffic, and also contributing additional pollution in the canyons from exhaust fumes. In the future, all personal transport in the Cottonwood canyons could be transitioned to this electric rail transport, protecting the canyons from the numerous machines which are now constantly running in these areas, creating both noise and air pollution. If the Mountain Accord Transportation Concepts are the vision for the future, it is time to consider capital investments in solutions which will benefit generations of Utah residents and world visitors, such as Concept D. An extended bus system is not a visionary plan to protect the canyons. It is a 5 to 10 year solution.	salt lake city	05/01/2015
	In order for Mountain Accord's transportation plans to succeed, there also needs to be significant investments in transit service in Salt Lake County, Summit County, Wasatch County, and elsewhere in Utah. If we fail to provide sufficient transit service to reach the mouths of canyons, users will be forced to drive to park and rides, and after discovering that they are full, they will be forced to keep driving up the canyon. In order for the system to be successful, it needs to get the majority of canyon users to out of their cars for the entirety of their trips.	Salt Lake City	03/09/2015
	Incentives to reduce individuals driving with a reliable and user friendly transit system that people trust is key.	salt lake city	04/11/2015
	Increasing public transit options along existing routes is great, but any extension beyond that is poor planning and a waste of resources.	Salt Lake City	02/10/2015
	intended are good	Salt Lake City	04/23/2015
	It is definitely good to improve public transit options for all the canyons and discourage individual car use. People will only opt for public transit, though, if it's convenient and affordable. It needs to be made this way. I'm not opposed to parking fees to discourage driving, but only if it's coupled with better access via public transit. I think the tunnel scenario to connect the cottonwoods to park city is a reasonable compromise. I am definitely opposed to a ski-link gondola or external connection: a tunnel, if done well, could present the wilderness of the upper cottonwoods while allowing people a chance to travel through there. Better bike lanes would also be great, to encourage more people to ride up canyon rather than drive without fear of traffic.	Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
	It will be difficult to go from automobile accessible ski resorts to bus only, but it is the right decision to minimize impact on the canyons. Will there be parking lots or other areas to stage the bus system base for access to visitors and locals? I didn't see this addressed.	Salt Lake City	04/26/2015
	It would seem rail is far too expensive. I support busses and expansion of Guardsman. If road widening is implemented, it should be exclusively for bus rapid transit. No to gondola or train. Honestly, I think part of the solution is to make it harder to get in, so that only those capable to get in on foot/bike/ski are the ones rewarded to enjoy it. Cars are the problem more than people.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	Its not necessary. Nor do not create a illusion that there is. It will do more environmental harm than good. Greed...	Salt Lake City	02/04/2015
	I've already stated my position re trains in the canyons. However, train service up Parleys linking SLC and PC would be a great idea. This would help not only out-of-towners but local commuters as well.	Salt Lake City	04/16/2015
	Keep bus (BRT and/or LB) in the mix for Little Cottonwood as bus allows increased routing flexibility and frequency of smaller units conveying passengers. Typically, infrequent service reduces passenger use.	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
	Keep mass transit and busses out of Millcreek Canyon!!!	Salt Lake City	03/26/2015
	Leave the Wasatch the way it is	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	Let me be clear...Skilink, Interconnect and similar methodologies of transporting people via ski-lift or gondola between several resorts should not be considered as part of this accord. They have far too great an impact on the environment to warrant what we would lose in exchange. We live in a desert. Snow is not guaranteed. Why build devices that may lie rusting in years to come from lack of use. Interconnect is nonsensical except to those seeking to obtain a profit at our expense. Skilink, Interconnect and similar plans to connect via aerial transportation are bad visually and environmentally...don't tear apart the land we love to overdevelop it.	Salt Lake City	02/06/2015
	Light rail and bus seem to be viable solutions. Light Rail via existing tunnels to connect the canyons would be good as well, but we need to keep our ridge lines and not have more lifts/trams.	Salt Lake City	02/24/2015
	Light rail is a waste. How can UTA even suggest they will have the ridership to support light rail (is this public information, where can I find it)? Does this take into consideration that the tourism industry will be non-existent in 2040 due to climate change?	Salt Lake City	04/28/2015
	Light Rail Transit in Little Cottonwood Canyon is really the only option we should be seriously considering. The benefits from this approach are clearly better than the other alternatives in all of the listed corridor purposes. It will protect the environment and the watershed from automobile overuse and reduce congestion all while safely and effectively connecting the major resorts.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	Light Rail up Little Cottonwood or Big is for the benefit of Snowbird and Alta - not the community at large.	Salt Lake City	03/22/2015
	Light-rails on the State Roads need to be pushed for further discussion! The biggest bite would stem from a rail from the University TRAX line to Park City via I-80. In addition to a BRT guideway in LCC, combinations of incentives for transit use and disincentives to auto use need to be considered. Even with a well working and attractive BRT in effect, people need to be enticed to want to share their transiting with others on a bus or shuttle. The general population has learned that personal transportation is the most time effective and convenient way of moving around, and a BRT will nullify how "easy" the drive to and from the canyon actually is, so for those who have never used public transit or have aversions to using it for an array of reasons need to be rewarded for using the BRT. Over time, personal auto use should and ought to become disincentivized.	Salt Lake City	02/23/2015
	Like a Swiss watch. It will work if it runs like a Swiss watch. ... but no so inflexible that you "cant get there from here" ... As in trailhead. Personally, I like the tunnel idea. It is expensive, but it creates a truly world class mountain experience.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Little Cottonwood Park City is not a "corridor". No transportation is needed there. Otherwise, I like the idea of shuttle busses and expanded UTA service. Increase hotel taxes or something - have the tourists pay for that.	Salt Lake City	02/06/2015
	LOmit Ski Resorts and lift to their present. NO MORE LIFTS ARE NECESSARY	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Love the idea of a mountain rail in LCC!	Salt Lake City	02/09/2015
	Mass transit, as used in our national parks, makes sense. But it is irresponsible to widen existing roads or attempt to make room for rail systems. Aerial trams just further scar natural landscapes. Making it possible to "just pass through" our canyons and ignoring their value as destinations is unconscionable. So my support of mass transit and the detectable thought of aerial or rail transport puts me at a "neutral"...which pretty much nullifies a number of these questions where there are both good and ugly aspects.	Salt Lake City	04/23/2015
	More forward thinking and practical transportation solutions including forgetting the senseless tram idea and instead increasing a fast rail option along the I-80 corridor and mountain rail in BCC and LCC without the use of expensive tunnels or at least limit tunnels. LLC rails system to connect over to Park City area. Do not construct new roads over to Park City side out of any canyons and do not improve guardsman pass for cars! Instead find a rail solution along I-80 and up and over LCC and out and back in rail service in BCC and prevent private vehicles from using guardsman pass all together. Limit this road to a shuttle system, no cars but connected by rail! Improve bike access and safety on all existing roads including guardsman. Ariel Trams are a slow unsightly way to move people.	Salt Lake City	04/19/2015
	More mass transit	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	More shuttle buses and closed roads to traffic would be most beneficial. Building an expensive rail system destroys the land and costs too much to benefit anyone. Look to Zion NP for an example of how to shuttling right.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Nearly all of the proposals are very very poor suggestions in my mind. I like the BRT suggestion up little cottonwood and up to PC (from the airport). I am highly against any LRT or aerial connections and I am ADAMANTLY against any tunnel system. I cannot stress how strongly I oppose these transportation options (esp the tunnel).	Salt Lake City	02/04/2015
	Need to better understand all alternatives, costs, sources of funding, ROI.	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
	needs to happen - and if it doesn't happen before Cottonwood Heights plans & buys the quarry at the bottom of Big Cottonwood, there will be no room for a hub or parking.	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
	No connections should be made to create connections between Alta, Big Cottonwood Canyon and Park City. No tunnels!!! No trains! Only bus/cars on roads that already exist.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	No more aerial transportation please.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	No one doubts the necessity for a solution but none of these plans are without flaws. A better organized ability to get from the valley to resorts would be great. The traffic and filled lots at the bottom are atrocious. However, given the small size of our mountains, I am against any permanent development, such as light rail and gondolas. Certainly no tunnels.	Salt Lake City	03/30/2015
	No train through a tunnel to Park City. People can drive or take mass transit, if they need to ski in multiple areas. Make fast buses to Park City!	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	No train up LCC! NO TUNNELS! NO INTERCONNECTS! All of these would drive a stake through the heart of the Wasatch. A decent, affordable bus system that goes where people want to go, when they want to go, is the only transportation alternative that makes sense for the landscape - and the only one that would actually improve the watershed rather than degrading it.	Salt Lake City	04/04/2015
	NO TRAINS IN THE COTTONWOODS!! NO TUNNELS!! NO INTERCONNECT!! Express busses, though less glamorous make more sense. The only people that a PC/Cottonwoods connection benefits are ski resort owners; they are a useless marketing gimmick.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	NO TRAM. NO TUNNELS or interconnect of any kind. We should be preserving the character that has made us world famous! NO Train up LCC. Agree with a BRT solution (with Snow Sheds) for Big and Little Cottonwood canyons. Agree with BRT/Rail solution for SR 224 and 228. Agree with trail system improvements. A BRT solution for LCC (with snow sheds) will be the most economic, most reliable, and will serve needs of users and ski resorts. Eliminate single-occupancy vehicle use in BCC/LCC from Dec 15 Thru March 15. Buses and HOV use only.	Salt Lake City	03/02/2015
	Not in favor of any aerial trams.	SALT LAKE CITY	02/11/2015
	Of the four proposals, Option D needs more fleshing out as it will likely be the most flexible and least burdensome to taxpayers. A rail system in LCC seems like a very over-engineered solution, and needlessly expensive for local taxpayers. The traffic problems up LCC are primarily limited to a handful of days in the year, when there is fresh snow and avalanche danger is high. Addition of snow shelters will help alleviate delays and expansion of the base facilities at the resorts will allow more out of town visitors to be at the resorts and not traveling from the metro SLC area. A rapid bus system is a flexible solution that can be implemented when needed and can transport larger number of skiers in a continuous fashion vs a train. In addition, outside of these peak travel times in the winter, it does not seem likely that a train will see much use the rest of the year. Bus transit between the canyons through a tunnel system needs much more study on the environmental impact to the watershed quality. In addition, this primarily serves to move skiers from PC to LCC and BCC (is that what Vail and Deer Valley really want rather than keeping their skiers in PC)? What is the percentage of visitors traveling from PC to the SLC area during ski season contributing to congestion and is it significant? Most of the traffic congestion in the canyons is primarily from local rather than out of town travellers I cannot support a tram between Park City and BCC. This is a poor transportation solution for rapidly moving people and a scar on the landscape in spring summer and fall. One issue that has not been presented with either bus or LRT up LCC and BCC are the need for increased park and ride facilities at the bases of the canyons. Incentives and	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015
	Park City does not need to be connected to LCC in any way. Regarding transport up and down LCC, increase the buses, build parking and encourage carpooling.	salt lake city	05/01/2015
	People just don't leave their cars unless they have to. I have little faith in this making a big impact.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	Please address how the disputed areas will be handled instead of leaving them open for discussion - i.e. Grizzly Gulch. Please provide more content on where you want to put lifts and how many access roads will be needed to maintain the lifts. Also provide details as to where those roads would be placed. This report is vague at best, barely mentioning aerial transport. While progress has been made with this accord, it lacks depth and detail that is needed to garner support. Additionally - would a train be added while keeping the existing road open or would the road be shut down? That needs to be addressed. A train isn't a bad idea if the road itself is shut down, or access to the canyons is limited by shuttle. But to have both the road packed with cars and a train crusing up and down the canyon, that seems to be a very poorly planned idea. Additionally, please convince us that all of this is necessary for an industry that is steadily declining and more people are exiting the sport of skiing than entering into it. Also, is all of this necessary with the snow we have been receiving in recent years? We haven't exactly been having stellar winters. I do not see any of this addressed in the study. I do not support this plan in its current state.	Salt Lake City	02/16/2015
	Please do not make any changes. The crowds are out of control already and you are looking to INCREASE capacity? Is anyone with a gram of intelligence left in government today?	Salt lake city	03/15/2015
	Please include in the transportation options up Little and Big Cottonwood canyons a preference for zero-emission vehicles (like electric cars) and give preferential treatment to zero-emission individual transportation up the canyons. This would also include quick-charge stations at the bottom of the canyons. This removes noise and exhaust. Polluting cars and diesel should be discouraged from heading up the canyons. A diesel-powered vehicles can pollute and long stretch of "air" for minutes at a time making it unpleasant and unhealthy for "clean" visitors of the canyons. Regarding light rail, the tracks should be kept next to the road in the lower part of Little Cottonwood Canyon to not use more land from the beautiful area in the middle of the canyon, the stream and the current Little Cottonwood Trail and the old granite quarry.	Salt Lake City	04/26/2015
	Please look at alternate transportation resources: not car only. The plan does not adequately outline alternative transportation.	Salt Lake City	02/06/2015
	Please see the detailed comments provided by the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance, which represents my feedback for purposes of this comment box.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Please use the least invasive forms of transportation (buses instead of fixed rail lines), and protect the ridge lines by not building trams or gondolas over them.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015

	Please, no trains or tunnels. They will forever change the character of the Wasatch in a very negative way.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Providing mass transit will crowd our roads making road cycling less enjoyable, and also increase traffic on our wilderness trails leading to further degradation of our natural resources and recreational areas. We already have issues with people using graffiti in the mountains, not packing out everything the pack in, etc. so increasing the traffic in these areas will only increase the degradation.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Purpose #3 in LCC needs attention. I don't support any kind of UDOT avalanche mitigation policies in LCC. It is a steep canyon that receives substantial snowfall; avalanches are going to happen. Delays are going to occur. We should accept these situations as part of living in this kind of environment, rather than trying to engineer our way around or above the existing and future avalanche hazards.	Salt Lake City	04/14/2015
	Same as above: * What about optimizing rapid transit and private shuttle systems up BCC/LCC. * Possibly reconfigure road to minimize avalanche hazards and improve bus transit/shuttles from valley transportation hubs. Use disincentives for driving by limiting parking, charge for parking and charge for a variety of permits to drive on canyon roads. * There needs to be much more data to determine what the best ROI is for taxpayers. It is very hard to believe that trains and tunnels up LCC to BCC to PC benefit more total users, improves the economy and reduces more air pollution than using the money to improve the Provo to SLC to Ogden corridors so people can commute more efficiently, be more productive and reduce related pollution. Provo to SLC. * There needs to be more data to compare various transportation options as well. Using a corridor up Parleys to the Wasatch Back seem much more logical from a cost, environment, changed canyon character, water damage, than trans/tunnels in LCC. * Compare the ROI on the above options to a re-configuring of the LCC road to support an optimized rapid transit system. * Provide lots of parking at business hubs near the mouths of the canyon to connect with optimized rapid transit systems.	Salt Lake City	03/02/2015
	Same basic position as Wasatch Backcountry Alliance (WBA), Winter Wildlands Alliance (WWA) and Save Our Canyons (SOC).	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Same issues as above. Light rail and trains in the canyons and service through to the Park City area would benefit ski resorts at too high of an expense. It seems that the bus option is deprecated but it shouldn't be. Perhaps private cars should be limited instead.	Salt Lake City	03/25/2015
	See above	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	See above comments re: Little Cottonwood Canyon.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	See above for my comment on the UTA plans. I spent a couple hours researching it with them and have 44 years of UTA experience to inform about how they actually come through.	Salt Lake City	03/17/2015
	See above. Railways up Big/Little will be of benefit. Tunnels connecting those and on to PC will promote sight seer traffic and destroy wilderness experience for all users.	Salt Lake City	02/06/2015
	see above, need separate bike paths mass transit needs to be more appealing than the comfort of one's car	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	see first statement	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	See my comments above	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
	See my comments in previous sections. I support alternatives to a rail system because it is a terrible idea and will ruin little cottonwood and a lot of magnificent mountain terrain. Buses are fine and possibly improving the existing route up big cottonwood over guardsmen pass into heber and park city, maybe make it navigable year round. If you must do a rail perhaps due to some corporate expansion pressure please put it in parleys since it has the most traffic.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	seems reasonable provided that real environmental protections for the area are maintained (eg, the normal permitting processes are not skipped)	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015
	Several of the alternatives - namely trams to Park City, shouldn't be considered part of transportation improvements. They are like ski area expansion.	Salt Lake City	04/27/2015
	Some better than othersThe c and d proposal does not.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Some ideas are excellent, like transit from the airport to Park City, but others are less sustainable/environmentally-friendly like the tunnel.	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
	Stick with the buses. Give people assentives to ride them.	Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
	Still sounds vague but better public transportation is needed. At least it needs to be utilized better than it is now. Tolls? Better advertisement? More parking at the park and rides.	Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
	suggesting ways to cause further destruction in these canyons is not appropriate. We have the ability to decrease traffic, pollution, and impact on the canyons with buses. No need to make a rail system. It would truly destroy these canyons and make a lot of money for a chosen few. Not appropriate.	Salt Lake City	03/04/2015
	Surface transit will always be problematic in BCC and LCC, sometimes even Parleys.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Terrible idea: Alternatives Proposed to Advance for Further Consideration A. Light rail transit (LRT) in exclusive guideway up Little Cottonwood Canyon to the Park City area, including tunnel connections between Alta, Big Cottonwood Canyon and Park City. B. Bus rapid transit (BRT) in exclusive guideway up Little Cottonwood Canyon to the Park City area including tunnel connections between Alta, Big Cottonwood Canyon and Park City. C. Same as above but with aerial transportation (such as a gondola or tram) in the segment between Big Cottonwood Canyon and Park City. D. Transportation system management alternatives, which are combinations of incentives for transit use and disincentives to auto use, without adding new transit guideways or expanding roadways. Also any development that increases traffic unnecessarily into the Cottonwood Canyons is unnecessary and counterproductive to the initiatives of the Accord. Park City development should be completely a separate issue from Cottonwoods Development. Inter connectivity will only create problems where non exist currently with land development pressure to ever increase in decades to come.	Salt Lake City	04/17/2015
	The 13 purposes are contradictory. Those aimed at increasing canyon usage violate those purposes aimed at protecting the watershed and limiting development. By meeting all 13 purposes you create a positive feedback loop that feeds the ski industry like a vein growing to feed a tumor. What is needed is a negative feedback loop that puts a natural limit on canyon usage, keeping it at a sustainable level. The present system is self-limiting. I go up one or other of the canyons nearly every weekend year-round. Rarely do I experience problems. When the weather's bad or the resorts are busy or a trailhead is full, you learn to avoid that particular area. The concept is that each canyon has an existing transport capacity...which acts as a natural limit to usage...which is a good thing if your real purpose is to protect the mountains and watersheds from degradation. Alternatives proposed:	Salt Lake City	02/10/2015
	The actual outcomes are all represented well. I agree that we need to engage these issues. The document does a good job of evaluating the costs and benefits of each proposed transportation solution. But I still do not agree with several of the options. Certainly a combination of tax and bussing/ carpooling is the solution but where these different lines start and end is my concern. I do not think a tax line up the canyon will be helpful, it will alter the canyon in a huge way. In terms of reducing emissions these lines still run on coal fueled energy so there is contention among that issue as well.	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015
	The blueprint assumes a direct connection between BCC and LCC and PC. This would fundamentally alter the character of BCC and LCC. No transportation between these areas should be considered other than via existing highways (though I support modifying those roadways to accommodate public transport and, if environmentally practicable, mass transit). Light rail up and down Parleys to Park City is acceptable. I doubt very much that it can be implemented in LCC responsibly. No Interconnect or anything like it--this idea has been floated for forty years, and every time it gets rejected, the ski industry, like a persistent toddler, comes back and asks again. I am cynical that this entire process is just another attempt to do so. If it is a serious attempt to develop a plan for the future, it needs to provide a final NO for connecting the ski resorts in the Front and the Back directly, whether by lift, gondola, tunnel, or road.	Salt Lake City	04/28/2015
	The concept of train or bus tunnels or gondola routes from the Cottonwood Canyons to Park City are not transportation improvements, they are real estate plays and tourism gimmicks. Increased year-round bus service, and strongly discouraging auto traffic up those canyons through usage fees, reduced parking availability and parking fees should be emphasized. Any transit method that better connects the airport to Park City area is fine, since that area is just a suburb of Salt Lake anyway and needs better transit for all the daily commuters.	Salt Lake City	04/08/2015
	The Cottonwood Canyons could be managed better with improved roads, bike lanes, and improved parking. Utilizing the UTA and shuttles is a great way to get individuals up the canyons to the ski-resorts, but for families and spontaneous mountain users, public transportation just won't do. We are a "spoiled" and selfish community, resistant to change.	Salt Lake City	03/11/2015
	The economic viability of our recreational opportunities in Big and Little CW Canyon is tied to the ability to move people to and from the resort/recreation areas. Much thought needs to be given to the fact that traffic and parking are a problem because the transit system is not adequate and is a miserable experience. For instance, if I want to take the bus to Alta, which costs less and is more environmentally friendly, it not only takes 2-3 times the amount of time to get there, it is a physically miserable experience (tight spaces, poor ventilation, uncomfortable ride, etc.). I would rather pay more and arrive at my destination feeling ready to recreate. Additionally, penalizing persons for making a choice to transit in comfort is the kind of thing dictatorships do. Don't charge people for parking or use of the canyon. Solve these problems, not through pain, but through good ideas and effective solutions. Advice: make the experience pleasant, worth the time and money, and the problem solves itself!	Salt Lake City	03/10/2015
	The idea of a shuttle in Millcreek sounds great on the surface. I have had trouble finding parking on busy days. Some of those days have made me crazy with how people try to create parking spaces and ruining the shoulders of the road. I don't think that a shuttle will necessarily work. Dogs shouldn't be allowed on the shuttle (fighting or wet stinky dogs come from Dog Lake would detract from the experience). I like the improved public transportation in all canyons and areas. The next step would be to increase taxes in the counties affected and decrease the cost of riding public transport. I would be more inclined to take public transport (and possibly get rid of a car) if it was cheaper to use so I could make up for the inconvenience of making it from my house to a transit hub. As it works now, I have to drive 10-15 minutes to get to a ski bus or tax station to get close to where I want to go. By the time I get there I just figure I might as well go the rest of the way with my car, it will be quicker and more convenient. An example would be soccer games at Rio Tinto stadium. When I calculated the cost, gas and \$5 to park near the stadium is cheaper and faster than stopping to take tax with my wife and two kids.	Salt Lake City	03/15/2015
	The idea of rail and tunnels is a complete waste of money. Better bus service and more park and ride lots would better serve the public and mitigate impact in the canyons.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	The idea of trains, tunnels and aerial tramways is just bizarre since it would be so expensive. Just ridiculous. This has to be some kind of smokescreen to get some lesser compromise like a toll or parking fees. Parking fees and tolls are fine, but what is needed is a good bus system up the canyon. UTA is corrupt and inept. The current system is a fixed schedule (when there is more traffic, there need to be more buses, when there is less traffic, less buses). Yes, there should be a reliable timeframe to get up and down the canyon but not necessarily schedules. Make a smart system (use cameras, tracking, traveler requested stops,...) Make it not just catered to resort employees time schedules. One nice thing is having a season pass good for the buses, but this should be extended to anyone with a pass.	Salt Lake City	04/28/2015
	The impact of a light rail or tram up BCC or LCC would have drastic impact on the beauty of these canyons. We are not europe and do not need to be. We have a very special and unique ecosystem and recreational playground and need to protect it as such. While alternatives and increased bus services and perhaps carpool incentive needed in LCC.	Salt Lake City	03/02/2015
	The Little Cottonwood Canyon evaluation should consider an alternative that would introduce congestion pricing and dramatically increase bus service, while reducing parking options in the Canyon. This alternative would not require any new road construction. Bus service would grow dramatically under this option. Private vehicles would be subject to a fee at the entrance to the canyon. This fee would be set at a level that would convince most users to leave their cars in the valley. During the busiest times of the day and the year, those prices could be increased to further incentivize bus use. Finally, resort base facility and lodging should only be permitted if 75 percent of the land base of the new development is located on an existing parking facility. That will reduce parking in the canyons and push people towards bus use.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	The main deficiency in the Transportation Alternatives section of the Blueprint is the failure to declare that any contemplated transportation action must, as a precondition, not degrade to any degree the ecological and environmental integrity of the Central Wasatch, including the travel corridors. The statement of corridor purposes includes the preservation of water resources, but omits all other environmental concerns, including wildlife resources and canyon air quality. A second flaw found in this section is the decision to frame the transportation question in terms of a LCC / PC corridor, effectively "begging" the critical question. No such corridor currently exists for motorized transport, and whether such a corridor should be created should be subservient to ecological and environmental integrity.	Salt Lake City	04/02/2015
	The Mountain Accord outcome I would like to see would focus on conservation of the land. Protecting our watershed and changes that would amount to a net reduction of development in the Central Wasatch. Land swaps that would concentrate development at the base of resorts in trade for minimizing private land in the backcountry seem to make sense both economically and environmentally. A Shuttle system involving buses or vans would be able to meet the varied recreational needs in the canyons. Trains are not conducive to multiple trailhead stops and are not as flexible as buses or vans for changing needs both over time and season. Plus the environmental cost of building rail in the canyon seems overwhelming for such a small area. I don't support further connectivity for the resorts. There is no good way for this to be accomplished and the benefit would have nothing to do with those of us who live here. It is all for helping a declining industry. I would also favor fees such as we have in Millcreek Canyon. It makes sense that those that use the canyons for recreation should help in the maintenance of those facilities that we enjoy. Money collected should be earmarked for improvement and maintenance of those canyons.	Salt Lake City	04/27/2015
	The number of cars are already limited by parking, lifts available and hotels. People already choose to use the bus when it's crowded. Improve the buses. We feel any rail/train development in the mountains would degrade what we have now.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015

	The number one priority should be to connect Salt Lake to Park City via Train. The fact that the only transportation we have between the two cities is a bus that runs twice in the morning and twice at night is pathetic. I use the bus every day to commute from SLC To PC for work. it's great, but it doesn't solve the issue for tourists and people looking to recreate at times other than 5:59AM, 7:56AM in the morning. The second step is to reduce car traffic in the cottonwood canyons. A train would be ideal. A gondola would suffice. But more buses while still allowing cars is not the answer. You have to either incentivize people to take public transit or make it mandatory.	SALT LAKE CITY	02/10/2015
	The only option I support is D, increasing public transit and providing a disincentive for auto use WITHOUT the development of any new roadway or aerial tram.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	The only option that is viable without further degradation of the existing environment is BRT.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	The only problem that the blueprint might solve is canyon congestion. This could be accomplished with the construction of snow sheds over the road. All other proposals will be destructive to the watershed and environment.	Salt Lake City	02/25/2015
	The only thing that should be done is keep Guardsmans pass open through the winter. This allows people from Park City Cottonwood canyons (and vice versa) to have a much easier and environmentally stressuous route of travel	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	The plans for a light rail going up little cottonwood canyon excites me. It's a tough decision where to build and how much to build. My suggestion is to start with small projects with plans to expand as demand and funds allow. For example, maybe just start with a light rail that goes from a "park and ride" at the mouth of the canyon to Alta or Brighton ski resorts. Then as ridership increases, as demand and funds increase, connect the rail to existing UTA light rail lines. Then as further demand and funds increase, extend the rail into Park City with the option of allowing Summit county to become a UTA serviced county along with Salt Lake, Davis, Utah, Weber, Box Elder and Toole Counties. I think step by step construction planned with the entire project in mind would be most affordable and would effective.	Salt Lake City	02/09/2015
	The plans laid out call for expanding the size of the ski resorts, but don't address any of the infrastructure problems facing people traveling to the resorts. A plan that doesn't call for increasing the number of lanes or improving the public transportation system, is only making a bad problem worse.	Salt Lake City	04/26/2015
	The plans seem to meet the purposes as listed. However, I don't see how these can be considered without a cost/benefit analysis. A tunnel between PC and BCC sounds great, but who will be using it? Are there enough tourists to support it? I live in SLC and would still use one of the Parley's options to travel to PC. If there is enough economic value that private funds will pay for it, then I would support it (with the environmental caveats). For public funding, I remain skeptical.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	The proposal for Big Cottonwood Canyon does not appear to be at all different from the local skibus service other than providing the same service during the summer. While I understand that a regular bus is the only real option for Big Cottonwood Canyon, specific proposals to increase ridership (and decrease congestion in BCC) should be included in the Blueprint of the Mountain Accord. Specific proposals should include: -a special traffic signal outside of the BBC park-and-ride lot (controlled by bus drivers) that would allow ski buses to turn left out of the parking lot into and onto the highway without waiting for traffic. -Ski buses with improved skisnowboard securing equipment on the outside of the buses that will both protect the skis and allow for speedier entry/exit of the ski buses (so that skier don't have to haul their equipment into the cramped and uncomfortable buses). -Possibly the purchase of newer, better ventilated, more comfortable ski buses that would enhance the rider experience -reduced fares for riders to incentivize ski bus use/disincentives driving. -new bus shelters in the park and ride lots and at Brighton/Sollitude so that waiting for the ski buses is more comfortable, less cold in freezing weather. -increased frequency of buses to encourage and incentivize use and reduce waiting times. -The Mountain Accord should specify the costs associated with such improvements to the BCC ski bus system, and explain that the ski bus should be subsidized at a higher rate than normal UTA bus services (by tax payers, the ski industry, skiers, and BBC drivers) because of the unusual amount of congestions in the Cottonwood Canyons (relative to other two-lane highway in the region).	Salt Lake City	02/04/2015
	The proposal to move forward with either a tunnel connecting the Cottonwood Canyons to Park City or a gondola both seem a little absurd and undermine the notion of environmental protection. It seems like a purely economical move in terms of consolidating resorts and limiting backcountry access (Vail Resorts expanding from two resorts in Park City into a third in BCC). A much easier way to increase tourism revenue in Utah would be to change the liquor laws as opposed to drilling a hole through a mountain or building a gondola.	salt lake city	04/30/2015
	The proposed alternative to build a train up Little Cottonwood Canyon is an absurd overreach. A cog railroad up this pristine canyon would cost BILLIONS of dollars, serving a very select subpopulation of the community, forever ruining the unique character of the canyon. This alternative is nothing but hubris, a marketing ploy for the downhill ski industry. If the ski resorts want to guarantee their future in the Wasatch they should continue to provide great skiing at reasonable prices, not force an ill-conceived attempt to Europeanize our mountains. The Accord needs to quit touting Switzerland as an ideal model. Sure the Alps are home to some great places, but they are not pristine, don't offer wilderness characteristics, and are over run with development. The wildlife, the scenic ridges, the unspoiled public land is what makes the Wasatch a place to preserve, something the Alps have forever lost. I suggest the Accord focus on practical useable transportation solutions such as providing improved year-round bus service up the canyons. The resorts need establish self directed shuttle services providing buses or vans dedicated to shuttling employees up and down the canyons, thereby eliminating employee single occupancy vehicles clogging the canyons. Avalanche sheds are easy solutions to provide protection from avalanches and can be used in conjunction with a vibrant bus system to realistically solve transportation issues in the canyons. Running a train up Little Cottonwood would forever ruin the irreplaceable character of the canyon. Unrealistic, pie in the sky including drilling a tunnel to Big Cottonwood Canyon, proposals such a cog railroad muddle the real issues of promoting affordable, easily transportation options.	Salt Lake City	04/28/2015
	The proposed tunnel and/or Light Rail or Bus Rapid Transit is attractive, but the funding will be a major obstacle. I just don't see federal funds becoming available for any transit proposals unless there is a major change in the makeup of Congress. The objectives stated of making transit more available and attractive are appealing. And I think some of this should be achieved by charging all SOV's a fee to parking in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons (and maybe MillCreek as well- and do away with the entrance station. This would have to be accomplished with parking passes.	salt lake city	02/23/2015
	The purpose seems mostly to be to get more people into the canyons. The other listed purposes are attempts at mitigation of the damage that will do.	Salt lake City	05/01/2015
	The recommendations are still based on the bias towards automobile as the preferred mode of transportation. And towards the bias that all the resorts should be interconnected. I believe the Mountain Accord should be used as a vehicle to challenge the assumptions of individual cars being able to access the canyons when people want access. Instead there should be an effort to challenge the prevailing norms and instigate more aggressive debate about when and how can we move people out of individual vehicles and towards shared transportation. As with the National Parks, requiring access via public transpiration that is easy, safe, frequent, and reliable. Buses, rail, and other multimodal options should all be considered - but drawing the line that the days of individual cars needs to end. And, transportation should be designed around protecting the uniqueness of a multiple set of smaller private resorts vs. making the Wasatch into a unified mega-resort. Changing that attitude would simplify the requirements of transportation and remove the need for gondolas, tunnels, etc. The simplicity and innocence of the Canyons is what makes the Wasatch different from many other mountain areas - summer and winter. Don't sacrifice a good thing so the Wasatch can become another development clone.	Salt Lake City	04/13/2015
	The snowshed protected road is a good idea and should be cost effective. Costs on all projects above and beyond should be closely evaluated with public input.	SALT LAKE CITY	02/15/2015
	The transportation options should be considered in light of keeping the family auto as an alternative. It is the primary mode of transportation and public transportation should be an enhancement. Accommodation and improved alternatives should be the driver, not disincentives and imposition by government agencies.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	there is a limit to the number of people who can use the canyons with out degradation and so the goal of improved trasportation focusing on impact of transportation such as parking leads to impacts that destroy other values such as solitude environmental quality etc.	salt lake city	04/30/2015
	There is a reasonable, practicable, and environmentally sound solution that is not currently presented in any of the Transportation Alternatives, which I would like to propose: A tunnel should be built linking Park City with the top of Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cotton Wood Canyon. However, rail should not be built in Little Cotton Wood Canyon, neither BRT or any sort of expansion of the road bed, since the Canyon is too narrow and too environmentally sensitive. Instead, an Express Bus connecting SLC and Park City by way of I-80/Parley's Canyon should continue through the tunnel, connecting to Brighton in Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon. As demand for transit increases, the Express Bus should eventually be upgraded to a BRT in the I-80 Corridor, and eventually, rail through the I-80 Corridor and through the tunnel to Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon. This solution would provide transit/rail access to the Cottonwood Canyon ski resorts without increasing construction in either of the Cottonwood Canyons, and would focus development in the Parley's Canyon Corridor, which is the least environmentally sensitive canyon in the Central Wasatch. Furthermore, the rail line should follow the I-80 corridor all the way from downtown Salt Lake City, possible from the Airport, instead of being a continuation of the University TRAX line. As the Alternatives point out, a continuation of the University TRAX line would make travel to Park City far too slow.	Salt Lake City	04/13/2015
	There is little need to connect the Cottonwood Canyons with each other and with Park City. This will only create environmental degradation at the top of the watershed and introduce eyesores where the beauty of the natural mountains exists today. Furthermore, it will degrade the back country experience in the proposed corridors. I don't support Ski Link, I don't support One Wasatch, and I don't support any commercial scheme to connect the canyons. There are some places where commercialism should be constrained and the Wasatch is one of those places. What if we keep on building and promoting until the watershed is degraded? A lot of people depend on that water.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	There is no need to connect Park City to the Wasatch Front. Light rail would ruin the canyons. How can we consider light rail before increasing the bus services? Why is that not option off the table?	salt lake city	02/28/2015
	There is no way to add a rail system and not negatively impact the environment. That said, we should put limitations on car traffic through the canyon. As an engineer who has studied light rail and as a citizen who has witnessed UTA's incredible incompetence and irresponsibility in installing a system that will never be self sustaining, I can tell you that rail systems are not the answer.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	There should be more discussion of what the trade off between trains or buses and discouraging cars. Why not replace cars with some kind of public transportation? If a train is proposed, why does it not replace vehicles altogether. There seems to be no innovative thinking in the transportation discussion. We are totally opposed to any interconnect between Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons or between Park City and either of the Cottonwood Canyons.	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015
	This is an area where I agree with the stated objectives of Mountain Accord, but some of the options under consideration are certainly MUCH more desirable than others. For example, I would like to see further study regarding the impact of a tunnel between the Cottonwood Canyons and Park City before I could get behind such action.	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
	This is driven by the ski industry.	Salt Lake City	02/12/2015
	This is no accord at all. The proposed developments would spell the death of backcountry skiing in the Wasatch and would usher in a new era of big-money development and environmental degradation. The current transportation system in the Cottonwood Canyons limits traffic to the resorts - a desirable outcome so as to limit the human impact on the environment and to ensure the canyons are not transformed into a theme-park-style zoo of people and commercial interests. As a long-time backcountry skier and hiker in the Wasatch, I'm saddened and worried about these plans, and I hope the interests of a few wealthy developers will no be able to squander taxpayer dollars on their profit-driven projects.	Salt Lake City	02/28/2015
	This is not a "critical" transportation need and this question presents a false narrative.	Salt Lake City	04/14/2015
	This is the worst.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	This whole process needs to be more open to the public. You've developed your Blueprint with all the agencies involved. These are all agencies who benefit financially thru revenue or a larger tax base. what are the goals of the public who use these canyons, what do they want. Where is the private citizen on these boards?	Salt lake city	03/11/2015
	Those ideas are horrible.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Three key trunk rail lines are required to make this really work: (1) between the SLC Intl. Airport, downtown SLC, and Park City, (2) along the eastern side of Salt Lake Valley [from the University of Utah to Little Cottonwood Canyon (LCC)], and (3) as proposed, up LCC through a tunnel to the top of Big Cottonwood Canyon (BCC) and then through another tunnel to Park City. In particular, a rail system between the SLC Airport, downtown SLC, and Park City the absolutely critical backbone to address commuter, resort, special event (e.g. Sundance), and recreational traffic.	Salt Lake City	03/15/2015
	Toll roads is the only answer.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Transit to Park City should be improved.	Salt Lake City	02/06/2015
	Transportation changes are expensive, but if we don't think 'Big', there will be little impact to a situation that is already problematic. I've seen how it works in the Alps. We should be thinking along those lines. Please make sure we service the entire area, (e.g. trailheads), not just the resorts.	Salt Lake City	04/14/2015
	Transportation in the Wasatch is fine.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Transportation is a big issue that needs to be tackled. It's hard to envision a rail service to the mountains or expecting people to take a bus when they are so use to driving their own automobiles. Some of the mountain areas are already so congested unless the transportation issue is addressed it can become a huge obstacle to the Mountain Accord's success. Unless automobiles are prohibited beyond a certain point it will be difficult to get people to shuttle in and out.	Salt Lake City	03/04/2015
	Transportation links between Big & Little Cottonwood Canyons No links to Park City near term. Possible solution 20 years down the road	Salt Lake City	03/01/2015

Transportation needs to address the top priorities. Transportation isn't the top priority. Maybe there needs to be limits on how many people use the mountains. Maybe reservations or alternate day use. The idea of a tunnel through the mountain should be scrapped. Consider each canyon and their needs separately not as a group.	Salt Lake City	04/26/2015
Transportation plan appears overambitious, does not address costs / funding, and includes some very disruptive options. A simple bus-based transit system is likely to meet the real needs for decades to come and is much more feasible. Although expensive near the ridge crossing, a simple upgrade of Guardsman Pass to a year-around road would be much more cost effective than some options in the blueprint.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
Transportation should proposals should seek to reduce automobile traffic and emissions in the canyons. More buses, avalanche sheds, tolls, incentives for car pooling and low emission vehicles should be considered. Trains and tunnels would be extremely damaging to the environment and so expensive as to not likely be feasible.	SALT LAKE CITY	02/12/2015
Try disallowing or making it prohibitive to access the canyons in anything but a shuttle - and create a good shuttle system to make it attractive to leave the car behind.	SALT LAKE CITY	02/04/2015
Tunneling doesn't appeal as a viable option to connect our canyons, especially with our frail ecosystem. Our needs for better transportation should appeal to locals rather than tourists.	salt lake city	04/05/2015
Tunnels and aerial tramways? Rediculous! Why do we constantly strive to make the convenience for humans our top priority. What impacts will trains, tramways and tunnels have on the wildlife that make the canyons their home and enhance the wilderness experience for humans. All of these plans claim to seek to protect the canyons yet all of the details involve development to allow overusage. Land does not have to be developed to have value.	Salt Lake City	04/27/2015
Tunnels are expensive and provide little additional access.	Salt Lake City	02/10/2015
Tunnels seem to be a better alternative than trams or bigger roads.	Salt Lake City	02/21/2015
Tunnels through miles of Mountains doesn't make any sense. We don't need that to attract people from all over the world to come here, we already have the greatest snow on earth and Seven great resorts to ski it at.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
Use trains. Do not connect the resorts.	Salt Lake City	04/27/2015
UT	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
UTA and chronies love expensive long-term projects with bonuses attached to softball milestones. By the way, their scheme allows cars to continue to clog the highway and foul the air. Buy a continuous stream of dedicated buses to either Alta or Snowbird in LCC and either Brighton OR Solitude in BCC. Buy a fleet of smaller shuttles that stop at eight nodes along each canyon road so backcountry skiers, hikers and bikers can take 2-4 hour treks and know that they can get down without hitchhiking.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
We desperately need transit in the canyons. I was at Alta skiing on sunday and I noticed that everywhere I look I see parkinglots. They are so unsightly and such a waste of precious land! I would much rather park below the canyon, or leave my car at home and jump on Trax. I've even rather see a few lodges and facilities than parking. Also on Sunday I got stuck in a traffic jam because somebody drove off the road. Luckily their car didn't go all the way down to the creek and it looked like the driver was okay, but that wouldn't have happened if that driver were required to take a train up and down the canyon. I've been on a mountain train in southern France, and since then I've always wondered why we don't build them. I'd glad to see that we've come to our senses (maybe).	Salt Lake City	02/09/2015
We do NOT need transportation between Park City and the Wasatch Front ski resorts, especially a ski lift, gondola, or tram! I've skied at world class resorts, and nobody is going to waste the day riding between ski resorts! Every resort in Utah has adequate terrain for a full day of skiing. The only purpose in connecting the resorts would be marketing for the ski resorts to claim the biggest area to ski. Finally, we do NOT need MORE and MORE and MORE tourists coming to Utah to ski! We have enough who come already, and our good snow quality will keep bringing them back, not marketing.	Salt Lake City	03/15/2015
We don't need more tunnels and chairlifts. Make every one going up the canyon pay a fee - it works in Millcreek.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
We need alternatives to personal vehicles in our canyons to prevent further damage to our sensitive canyon environments	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
We need better transportation from the valley "to" the mountains and not just from a giant parking lot at the base of the mountains into the mountains.	Salt Lake City	04/08/2015
We need mass transit. We need frequent buses natural gas or electric buses up and down Parley's Canyon to summit, pinebrook, jeremy, kimball and PC. The commuters and skiers should have frequent and affordable mass transit. There should be park and rides along the way. No trams or gondolas or tunnels from west to east should be built. Need public frequent transit by bus up and down the cottonwood canyons. Guardsman's pass should not be open in winter.	Salt Lake city	04/30/2015
We need to think of environmental impact for the long term future when considering transportation improvements	Salt Lake City	04/01/2015
We need TRAX along I-215 on the east bench in a bad way. I didn't see any discussion about this but we would also benefit from a safe bike corridor on the same route. It's time to divide Wasatch drive in to a car and bike/jogger area. Right now, there are decent sized shoulders on either side of the road but cars drive by at 60 miles per hour. Why not get rid of the shoulder on one side and make a real protected bike/jogger area. With a wall.	Salt Lake City	03/07/2015
We so need alternative transportation for these areas. Not only will it provide less congestion, it will be must safer and in many cases, will be faster.	Salt Lake City	03/04/2015
What type of train tracks will be used? An elevated monorail would be preferred, and just run up and down the canyon. NO TUNNELING to Park City.	Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
when I hear the word corridor I think Parley's Canyon, we do not need another Parley's Canyon, it was destroyed by the "corridor" that it was made into. If we've sacrificed one, let not sacrifice another, rather make improvement in the corridor we have. Just because Europe has hundreds of acres of connected resorts doesn't mean we need or want this. Exploring each canyon for what it is a unique thing that we love. Why change it?	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
When the Mountain Accord process was initially proposed I was enthusiastic and optimistic. I fell in love with the Cottonwood Canyons in the early eighties and the affair remains strong. Yet over the last three decades I have seen the impact of a dramatic increase in users despite the efforts of the Forest Service, Town of Alta, Friends of Alta and many others to mitigate said impact. Clearly something needs to be done. My comments address the following: Overview - the unique nature of the three primary core Wasatch areas of Park City, Big Cottonwood Canyon, Little Cottonwood Canyon Transportation in the Canyons Transfer of Private Lands to Public Entities Transfer of Public Lands to Private Entities Water Issues Cost Overview - The three main areas (PC, BCC, LCC) of the core Wasatch each have unique characteristics that offer both locals and visitors distinct and special experiences. We are not Europe nor should we try to be. We are Utah; let's celebrate and preserve the special characteristics of each of the three areas. The mountain accord as proposed would destroy the individual character of each of the three areas; the combination of ready access via rail line and increased developable space in the base areas would create a much more homogenous experience across the zones. Additionally it appears to me that what began as a transportation plan has been hijacked by development interests as a real estate development plan. I am in favor of a sensible transportation plan. I am opposed to a plan that opens the door for significant additional development in the Cottonwood Canyons and has the additional unfortunate consequence of diluting the unique experience offered by each zone. Transportation in the Canyon - A rail interconnect is a bad idea. As described above it will result in a much more homogenous experience across the three areas. It also would take a long time to come to fruition and would be extremely expensive. Fortunately there are better solutions. Note again that a rail interconnect is extremely expensive. The cost is measured in billions of dollars and it will likely take decades to plan, approve and build. The problem exists now and needs to be resolved. Adding a dedicated bus lane in LCC would cost millions not billions and could be completed in years, not decades. (Note: A billion is one thousand times greater than a million. This dramatically lower price tag should appeal to our congressional delegation that claims to be fiscally conservative.) Transfer of Private Lands to Public Entities - The idea of preserving lands from future development is appealing. It would be a relief to be assured that the frizzily Gulch Area and the Emma through Flaggstaff Ridge in LCC would be safe from development pressures in perpetuity. Unfortunately transferring private lands to public entities would not create this assurance. Large parts of the existing ski terrain in the Cottonwood Canyons is on permitted public land. The political pressure to develop these areas would not cease as a result of the mountain accord and future Utah congressional delegations will likely find themselves pressured by the existing resorts and other developers to open up these public lands to additional development. The only way to assure these lands remain safe from development pressures is to have title in the properties pass to a not for profit entity like the Utah Land Trust. Otherwise the transfer will be a development delaying tactic and nothing more. Transfer of Public Lands to Private Entities - Alta has retained its unique character over the past several decades through the dedicated efforts of the Alta town office, Friends of Alta, and the broad community of people who have come to love Alta for its relatively wild and undeveloped nature. Yet much is changing. We have seen Vail resorts take control of the Canyons ski area and take ownership of Park City Ski Area. We have seen Deer Valley acquire Solitude, Vail, along with other ski area operators, has figured out the formula to dramatically enhance shareholder returns by creating comprehensive base areas with a full range of services including lodging, dining, shopping and entertainment. The land swap as envisioned which would pass title of much of the land in the Alta base area to the Alta Ski Lift company would be an economic bonanza for the shareholders of the Alta Ski Lift company. It would also make the Alta lift company far more valuable to an acquirer like Vail Resorts who need developable land in the base area to build it out according to their model. This would come at the expense of the broad public who owns the area, through governmental entities, right now. I have no idea what the Alta Ski Lift company plans to do and count many of the individuals managing the resort as friends. However I do not think it is appropriate to provide an economic bonanza to a private entity at taxpayers expense. Additionally such a transfer would allow development space at the Alta base for development and acceleration of the homogenization of the three core Wasatch areas which I oppose. Water Issues - I am not sure what the political process was that resulted in	Salt Lake City	03/07/2015
Why is this idea of transportation so critical that we need to degrade our land in order for mass amounts of people to get into the canyons?	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
Why the expense and disruption of a huge rail system? We do need expanded rail and quality public transportation options throughout the Greater Salt Lake. But what's wrong with improving bus service to and from the park and rides and making the park and rides have parking garages and allowing us to be able to use routine, easily available bus traffic? Spend the millions/billions expanding the rail network in Salt Lake so I can take a train from the airport to the base of the Cottonwood Canyons and hop on a high speed bus with internet links, or take the train all the way to Park City—but don't try and bust any more of the mountain up with a train tunnel or tracks. Why not institute a situation similar to what goes on in Zion National Park? If you have a private residence you can drive, if not—you take the bus.	Salt Lake City	04/27/2015
Would not care to see the train connection go through to park city. Also, the ski resorts should have some participation in the cost of the train or tram. Do not put the burden back onto Utah property tax payers.	salt lake city	03/08/2015
Year round bus service would off set as much as any of these plans.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
Yes, measures to ease traffic and parking congestion in both canyons are necessary. Buses are much preferred over light rail. NO TUNNELS!	Salt Lake City	03/14/2015
You can get in and out of the canyon just fine now. I have never had a problem getting to where I ski.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
Busses: with my Alta pass, the ski bus is free. However, I've only ridden once this season because it is so inconvenient. More buses, more frequently, and more direct (Alta express, nonstop, from 6200S to Gold Miners). Train: would the rail take the place of the road up LCC? Would this prohibit cyclists from riding on the road? What about stops at the various trail heads and climbing areas? It's becoming increasingly hard to call things seasonal with writers like the last few. I much prefer tunnels to aerials in the upper cottonwoods.	Salt Lake City	02/15/2015
I agree with the intended outcomes and the options that are no longer being considered.	Salt Lake City	03/15/2015
It has to be light rail	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
Leave it alone. This is a biospy much more about money than it is about helping the wasatch.	Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
NO NEED FOR TRAIN!!! 1 - years of construction and pollution run off into our water. 2 - expensive, I don't want my tax dollars paying for a train no one will use. 3 - How the hell do you expect people to actually RIDE the train??? If cars are still aloud in the canyon... what is the point of a train? If there are no strong incentives to make people take the train, no one will. If someone has the option to drive they will, especially with all their gear, their extra gear they keep inside the car, the kids who just got their cars, the parents with the 5 little kids where they have to carry all their stuff for them?? my vote - shuttle system during peak hours and no cars aloud in canyon (except home owners)	salt lake city	03/16/2015
Provides good alternatives and modern ideas.	Salt Lake City	02/11/2015
Since when has someone wanted to go from Park City to Alta? Oh that's right, never.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
I believe creating a tunnel between the cottonwoods and park city would harm the character of the back country and be a negative environmentally.	Salt Lake City - Salt Lake	03/11/2015
All of the transportation improvements appear to be directed toward increasing or maintaining the number of people entering the canyons and mountains on a daily basis. There are already too many people impacting the central Wasatch mountains and their impact needs to be reduced. Therefore, transportation improvements should limit the number of people allowed to be in the central Wasatch on a daily basis. It is important to remember that recreation is a privilege and not a right.	Salt Lake City (East Millcreek Township)	05/01/2015
needs for more details. I do not want to see interconnecting ski lifts between resorts built. That is a horrendous idea... Tunnels between resorts would be a much better transportation solution. Tunnels with a lane for high speed natural gas or electric powered buses to shuttle people between resorts would be a much better transportation solution. A Train up Li cottonwood seems very expensive and un-necessary if a high speed bus lane could be placed more efficiently	Salt Lake City (native)	05/02/2015
Again expanding rail transit to pocket neighborhoods like 9th and 9th, sugarhouse and liberty wells would greatly impact the ease of living and transit use for those of us living in the valley.	Salt Lake City (Sugarhouse)	02/04/2015
An enhanced bus system would be much more effective and easier to regulate in terms of the actual transpiration necessity that could be in flux based on the days of the week.	Salt Lake City / Alta	03/12/2015
Dedicated Buses in each canyon making only trips up and down the canyons all day.	Salt Lake City use mostly Little Cottonwood Canyon	05/01/2015

	Too early to tell. The current traffic study (performed by UDOT?) does an excellent job of highlighting traffic problems and causes, the suggestions seem very reasonable, but it would be helpful to see the numbers game on this, what are the theoretical capacity of people per XX on these proposed solutions? If this is published, it is difficult to identify where. The mountain accord is clearly focused on the people transfer and transit to the mountains, but Salt Lake...and Utah County need to also be an integral part of transportation change proposals. Utah is not conducive to public transit because of the nature of the system, the population, the cost and the mentality... a large community focus on cultural change needs to take place, and needs to be driven at city centers too in order to make the effort to reduce SOV trips in the canyon, otherwise the entire valley will be driving to a park 'n ride at the base of the canyon and the parking problem will be relocated and the air quality will still be an issue. If you are stating that this is not a Salt Lake Valley problem and just a tourism problem, then your focus is avoiding the local population who should be the entire point.	Salt Lake City, 84105	02/12/2015
	I am opposed to all tram or aerial connections between the Cottonwoods and Park City. Light rail connections between the Cottonwoods and Park City would have the least environmental and air quality impact. I support using light rail and or bus only transport up both Cottonwoods to preserve the quality of our mountains. Homeowners in each canyon would be permitted 2 vehicles to have in the canyons with an additional user fee to offset road maintenance.	Salt Lake City, Emigration Canyon	02/09/2015
	Transportation - I support more transportation options along the Wasatch Front, coupled with incentives to use them. A few of the proposed options stick out to me as the best because they would have a big impact at a reasonable cost - shuttle service up Millcreek - year round local bus service in BCC - fast transit from the airport to Park City - high capacity transit in eastern SL Valley. A few options seem unreasonable expensive and designed mostly to serve the needs of the ski resorts. While I agree that we need to find solutions to the traffic in the canyons, I think there are much smarter ways to use our resources than building a tunnel. I think we should increase the capacity of the existing transit routes we have before spending money to build new ones - by running more frequent buses up existing routes, optimizing service to encourage people to use them, and potentially keeping Guardsman pass open in the winter to provide access from Park City to Big Cottonwood. Although this option was cut in the most recent version of the plan, I think it's a relatively low-cost and low-impact way to increase access and should be reconsidered.	Salt Lake City, UT	04/26/2015
	I think that increasing year-round access via Guardsman road would increase traffic up LCC rather than decrease traffic problems. I find a gondola from Park City to the Cottonwoods to be unnecessary and would obscure the wilderness aesthetic of the Wasatch - both for resort users and backcountry users. I would like to see an analysis of the environmental impact of widening the road in LCC - either for buses or light rail. I feel that the cost (and potentially environmental effects) of a light rail running up LCC would probably outweigh its benefits - would the cost be low enough to encourage usership, and would the cost of driving up the canyon increase (from free)?	Salt Lake City, UT	03/17/2015
	Interconnecting the upper Cottonwoods in any fashion, I believe, is a mistake. There is great value in deciding which portion of the wilderness to invest your time in and connecting the Cottonwoods will ensure that no part of the Wasatch is more than 20 minutes away. This availability is unnecessary and will result in "feeding frenzies" where people will pass from one location to the next as conditions change from hour to hour. Each portion of the Wasatch holds 2-3 separate ski resorts (PC, BCC, LCC) and the idea that providing transportation between any two of these is necessary for any person recreating in the Wasatch is ridiculous. Improving the existing corridors is necessary for planning and population growth but connecting all ski resorts for the purpose of connecting all ski resorts will ruin the unique properties of each separate ski area.	Salt Lake City, UT	03/06/2015
	See previous answers regarding rail and aerial transit, connection BCC and LCC, etc.	Salt Lake City, UT	02/24/2015
	The purposes and needs are a good start, but I question the emphasis on Little Cottonwood Canyon alone. These needs are comprehensive throughout the Wasatch front AND back, and a comprehensive system upgrade is needed to really address them. A railroad up Little Cottonwood Canyon is the least of our problems.	Salt Lake City, UT	04/24/2015
	Emphasize express bus systems. No trains.	Salt Lake City, UT 84121	04/30/2015
	Rapid transit buses seems to make the most sense and incentives for car pooling!	Salt Lake City, Utah	02/25/2015
	This is the most ludicrous part of the whole plan. Tunnels? Light rail? As a Native American, this kind of thing is pure desecration. But that's something most folks don't seem to understand. A mountain left alone in its purest form is one that is sublime and holy. So it does have a spiritual dimension that will most likely be pushed aside, as has been the case in this country for a long time. What is so hard about understanding these aspects and taking the high road, instead of repeating history. Let's take what ideology would allow people to further trash these mtns. by relying on the religious ideology of the Bible, a book that is selfishly concerned with individual aspirations of making it to heaven. I see next to nothing of teachings that elevate ideals of taking care of the earth. Instead it's the same old song of develop now, since the world will someday be destroyed any way. Truly pathetic.	Salt Lake City, Utah	05/01/2015
	I read the "idealized system" reports on transportation and the mountain rail up Little Cottonwood seemed to lose support from those voting. It seems that this is the opportunity to address the possibilities really coming up with the best solutions to the transportation problems we face. I know we all love our cars and the freedom they offer, but somehow the environment and preservation of these magnificent resources needs to come first.	Salt Lake County (Canyon Rim Area)	04/28/2015
	The negatives of buses only longterm in LC, BC are well pointed out. But they could surely be improved short term. It is not a good incentive for me to have it take 2x longer and have 3rd world conditions in the restrooms. Transit hubs at kimball junction and I-40 for summit county access with less cars would be great.	Salt Lake city/Taylorville	05/01/2015
	I don't want to see a tunnel built or gondola. I think the transportation in little and big cottonwood canyons need to terminate at the top with only non motorized travel access to Park City.	SaltLakeCity	03/13/2015
	**** I support the designated bus lanes on I-80 to Park City from the airport, Sandy and SLC downtown. **** I support the alternative of a tram system up and down the cotton wood canyons. **** I also support a tram system interconnecting Park City and the Cotton Wood Canyons.	Sandy	04/30/2015
	1. Not sure how a train up LCC will protect watershed. Seems like a train running alongside the creek could cause many more problems than NOT having a train. 2. Competitive transit??? How much is it going to cost to take the train??? It costs \$9 now for a UTA bus round trip in the canyon. How much more will the train cost? How would it EVER be economical or "competitive" than driving your own car??? 5. How will your plan reduce auto use? you clearly state that you are not restricting any road access. The train will cost too much. 6. Again, you are not reducing the number of cars up the canyon, so how can you reduce emissions? 7. You will not be reducing parking at other points along the canyon road, i.e. trailheads for hiking, snowshoeing, climbing/bouldering. I assume the train is not stopping at these points...because it would take too long to ever get up the canyon then. 9 & 10. With a train up LCC you will be destroying the mountain bike Quarry trail. I do NOT want to bike or hike along side the train. that will NOT create an "attractive traveler experience"...or a safe one. Your Option A cites "Light Rail Transit". It is my understanding that this will not be Light Rail. Light rail will never be able to ascend the steep grades of LCC. Light rail is not an accurate description. Option C. The gondola or tram is the first good idea I've seen on this page. How does Park City feel about this idea? Are they willing to pitch in for the costs? Option H. Seriously, a gondola from Sandy up LCC???? What are you guys smoking???	Sandy	03/02/2015
	A billion dollar train up LCC solves some of the LCC problems, but cutting tunnels through to Park City, when the I-15 interstate highway currently exists appears impractical. The disincentives to driving would need to be massive.	Sandy	03/12/2015
	A simplified solution would make more sense. Widen the road by one lane going up the canyon. Use electric buses to reduce emissions and increase the amount of bus options on heavy snow days.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	A train up Little Cottonwood is not the answer! An improved shuttle bus system with better parking options would be a much better plan.	sandy	04/07/2015
	Adding light rail or more lanes to canyons would damage the canyons and waste money. It would be much easier to add more buses and restrict traffic. Much like what is done in Zion National Park. People that currently do not want to ride the bus also do not want to ride a train. Do not ruin the canyon to put in an outdated mode of transportation.	Sandy	04/19/2015
	again designed with the premise that the PRIVATE ski resorts on PUBLIC lands are the number 1 consideration; and that the public should pay for their gain.	Sandy	04/04/2015
	Again, the outcomes are in the interests of the visitors, NOT the locals.	Sandy	03/15/2015
	Any idea involving a multibillion dollar train up LCC without exhausting all other options is just a government gift to a private resort without any regard to citizens that are affected.	Sandy	03/06/2015
	As a long-time resident (1980s) and backcountry user and father of three, I generally think the facilities at the resorts are more than adequate and would not like to see further resort expansion. I drove for Canyon Transport up and down LCC and BCC for almost a decade. I applaud the concept of an avalanche shed light rail up LCC, Accessing Solitude and Brighton and on to PC. Such a line would have to have rider triggered stops at climbing areas, backcountry trailheads and backcountry exit points. The amount of traffic and lack of parking is getting pronounced. Even before I was a professional and still driving for canyon, it was difficult and risky to estimate the amount of time needed to exit LCC to catch an afternoon flight. Traffic caused by storms and powder chasing skiers or late in the day spring avy risk foiled many families attempts to ski in the day and catch an evening flight home. This is a big deal for a 4 to 5 day family ski trip. The visitors that I drove for I think about 8 seasons had little interest in an on site interconnection between resorts, but they greatly valued getting a few hours of skiing in on arrival and departure days. I think ease of movement between resorts and from resorts to the valley could be a more successful marketing pitch for the resorts than more lifts and more terrain. In lieu of a train I would approve of a bus/commercial vehicle only approach like Zion NP to be tried in BCC and LCC. But you would have to be able to stop and be picked up at multiple spots. Such a system should also connect at the same point so that trips that started in LCC or BCC could use the transit to be picked up in BCC or Millcreek respectively and returned to the same starting point. The future of the central Wasatch should not be determined by developers and resort owners. The attraction is the accessibility from the airport or as a local, the steep terrain, snow, and quality of the environment. Focus should be on getting people in and out with less drama and traffic and preserving the existing amount of terrain for wild skiing. I don't have much of a quarrel with the solitude and Brighton identified expansions, but do oppose any alpa or snowbird expansions in Salt Lake County or Utah and Wasatch counties.	Sandy	02/10/2015
	as above.	sandy	03/01/2015
	as said above the canyons are going to be busier as more people utilize them for years to come. But congested or not it's a easy price to pay for what they provide. Keep them how they are and if someone doesnt want to fit in traffic heading up to the resort well than they can sit home. The answer is not adding lanes, trains etc although a financial benefit for the resort area for those who appreciate a quiet peaceful drive these options will ruin what the canyons and the feeling they provide.	sandy	03/16/2015
	Buses serve the same transportation issues.	Sandy	04/24/2015
	Do not allow any Aerial Trams or Gondolas across ridgelines or mountain public recreation areas. It will take away form the scenic beauty of the mountains for hikers, BC Skiers and all users.	Sandy	02/12/2015
	Don't widen the road or put rail up the canyons.	Sandy	03/16/2015
	Every time I scroll in this feedback from my check marks get moved around so I feel they may not be valid but my comments on LCC transportation are mine.	Sandy	03/05/2015
	Express rail service to Park City should be an alternative. If it stops too many times it will not work.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	For reasons previously stated, the MA transportation plan is a predetermined conclusion that fits the economic goal of County and adjacent municipalities as a revenue generating agenda. It also fits the goal of UTA to increase their domain at significant taxpayer (Utahans), expense! There are other areas of Utah/Wasatch Front that need attention far more than Snowbird and Alta need a train! When the transportation sub committee prefers, after all their discussions, evaluations, the use of express, low emission buses, a responsible executive committee would listen! Instead, the MA executive committee has followed their predetermined agenda of a train! They are willing to trade a little extra property at the top of the canyon for the damage they will cause with a train in the entire canyon and adjacent communities! The MA/UTA train agenda is a sham and a subsidy to the ski resorts that every other business owner in Utah would love to have!! Additional feedback - EXPRESS, LOW EMISSION BUSES, ONE LANE EXPANDED ROAD< (two lanes up and one down in the AM, reversed in the afternoon!) No tunnel! If resorts are to be connected, the ski resorts should do it with trams and not by making LCC a major transportation corridor!	Sandy	04/16/2015
	From what I can see, rail traffic is the foregone conclusion in your blueprint. There isn't discussion of the technical and cost implications of putting a cogwheel railroad up Big or Little Cottonwood Canyons. Traditional light rail can't run on the grades required. Your blue print seems to dismiss, out of hand, using currently available methods, specifically preferred bus transportation. Whoever authored the discussion of why the bus options didn't meet the 14 general purposes was prejudicially written. To say that bus options would meet only one of the 14 general purposes seems wrong to me. My impression is that light rail is being pushed by somebody. I'd like more open discussion of how this became the preferred plan by the Mountain Accord organization. This needs cost analysis, environmental impact analysis, and canyon resident impact analysis.	Sandy	03/06/2015
	Given the choice, people will continue to use cars. If light rail is the only option, the air will improve much more than if cars continue to be allowed in the canyons.	Sandy	04/30/2015
	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 haven. 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.	Sandy	03/11/2015
	Hardly any mention of cycling. Need to address cycling.	Sandy	04/30/2015

	Here is my idea: use the Snowbird Tennis club area or the plaza on Highland and 94th South as a nice "landing pad and shuttle launch" for clean air shuttles that go up the canyons. These can be nice coffee shop and hang out areas for people to park and take quiet, roomy shuttles that go directly to the lifts of the resorts or trailheads up both canyons. Gondola type transport seems more viable between the resorts over the passes, but please...NO extra lanes or trains going up our canyons. They would destroy our trails--some of the few natural trails. As it is already there is no where to park when hiking. Wouldn't it be great to ride a bike or drive to a cute and quaint little village, and be able to easily board a shuttle to take you anywhere up the canyon without the hassle of parking then schlepping all your gear? I say put the expense in a nice town square center, shuttles and bike lanes and over the pass gondola AND save our trails, wildlife, sanity, neighborhood feel of our precious canyons.	sandy	03/03/2015
	How about having a meeting where real questions are answered- live	Sandy	02/12/2015
	I am cautiously optimistic about some of the transportation proposals, but what exactly is envisioned with "high capacity transit", and what are the costs to the Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons? I am not in support of improving or adding connections between Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon and the Wasatch Back via tunnels, trams, or gondolas. Keeping these canyons distinct and accessible only from the SLC canyon mouths will preserve their character and the watershed value much more than a connection through them.	SANDY	04/29/2015
	I am glad to see some "over the Wasatch" transit options being discussed.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	I am in favor of the train from Kimball Jct to Park City. But as far as Little Cottonwood Canyon goes, NO TRAINS AND NO TUNNELS!	Sandy	03/12/2015
	I am strongly opposed to making Little Cottonwood Canyon a major transit to Park City. The bottom of Little Cottonwood Canyon is very narrow and installing additional lanes and/or a rail line up the canyon would dramatically change the nature and current available uses of the canyon.	Sandy	03/14/2015
	I appreciate the networking of the various resorts through tram systems. The light rail idea up the canyons will reduce POV emissions.	Sandy	03/12/2015
	I cannot support any plan that might build a train up a pristine and delicate canyon. That would destroy natural resources... Not preserve them.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	I do not agree that there is a need to link all the resorts together. I believe that this could increase the transportation issue that we currently have and clog some of the resorts. Most people would want to stay in the Park City area but ski Alta and Snowbird. With the current system the crowd is much more spread out.	Sandy	02/17/2015
	I don't believe in expanding the ski resorts and making them more accessible to have them and other cities make money off our beautiful canyons.	Sandy	04/19/2015
	I don't think all this is needed. The bus service is good.	Sandy	04/24/2015
	I don't want to see transportation Little Cottonwood extended. I believe that would change the feel of the canyon for good. I am also concerned about any new connections between Park City and the Cottonwood Canyons. I think a high-speed rail connection through Parley's to the base of BCC and LCC makes a lot more sense and will have a lot less impact on the environment. I am in favor of high-speed rail up BCC and LCC, though. I just don't want to see it continue past Alta or Brighton.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	I feel that bus systems make more sense in most scenarios. They are cheaper to institute and they are much easier to make versatile. To create seasonal bus stops for the summer and winter will be easier to adjust. Most of the dispersed recreational stops will not stay the same for summer and winter.	sandy	02/23/2015
	I have always thought a rail system in the canyons would provide a much more "responsible" means to get up to the resort areas. Living in the valley my entire life, I have witnessed the snake of cars on powder days continue to grow farther down canyon. This has often dissuaded me to go skiing and seek other activities on the weekends. I think i train would make a lot of sense. One suggestion i would have would be to expand the rail system down Wasatch Boulevard, eventually onto Foothill Boulevard. Mass transit is one thing the Wasatch Front could really benefit from if implemented properly. If this train system was put into the canyons, would it run year round? How many stops would there be? These are things i would like to know.	Sandy	02/17/2015
	I like the proposals in order to meet the increased yearly transportation pressure. It will be needed. One concern I have, is the existing historical Little Cottonwood Canyon trail. It is important to everybody that uses this trail as a recreation outlet, that it remains intact. Both in its route and its rugged nature. There isn't an explicit explanation of any impact to this trail. Will any information be released about this? Will the blueprint speak to the impact on existing areas that will be used as parking lots or areas for the new transportation ideas?	Sandy	02/12/2015
	I much favor the tunnel option, but it's not clear if that is just for the transit/guideway system, or if it is also for cars. It is important to have transit up LCC, and it's important that there is another way out of the Alta/Snowbird areas.	Sandy	04/18/2015
	I resent that Little Cottonwood Canyon is going to be turned more into nothing more than a transportation corridor. It should be protected. We need a system like Zion's National Park with more buses for Little Cottonwood Canyon. That should be the solution with more parking outside the canyon possibly in Salt Lake or lower Sandy. I want more buses, and no more digging into the canyon. The canyon is small, and should be preserved. Not to mention the water supply. We cannot endanger the watershed for the greed of UTA and ski resort owners. Extra lanes or a train would be a huge footprint in a little canyon, not to mention it would cut out recreational needs of Utah residents. Since cars will not be limited it is just more of packing the canyon full. The new transportation will be too expensive to ride, and will not help the residents. The maintenance would be a burden on taxpayers as well. It seems that the major transit system only benefits UTA and the owners of the ski resorts. Mountain Accord is catering to them and wealthy tourists. Taxpayers do not want to pay so the rich can gain more wealth. I do not want to pay for that as a tax payer, and I do not want the money taken from education as an educator.	Sandy	04/30/2015
	I support doing something but am very concerned about any transportation option that impacts watershed and environment, flora and fauna. Environmental protection has to lead the way NOT a vision of a smaller European resort or Mayor Dolan's "Sandy as Base Camp". The best alternatives will be unglamorous. Mass Transit is the way, initially more shuttles to the mouth of the canyons and more frequent LNG buses and more parking. Rather than spending a billion dollars on a beautiful "train", spend it on clean mass transport in and around the valley, and up the canyons. Getting TO the canyons is good; but getting THROUGH the canyons is NOT GOOD.	Sandy	04/14/2015
	I think a gondola system up LCC from Sandy would be great!	Sandy	03/14/2015
	I think emphasis on cleaner buses and improved rail connectivity, especially between Park City and SLC is essential to sustained growth and easing the traffic problems.	Sandy	04/30/2015
	I understand the need for evacuation in case of avalanche, but that's part of being in a wild and rugged area. Little Cottonwood may just have to stay isolated. I'm encourage by suggesting a rail line up Little Cottonwood, but am worried about construction impact. I need more info to really get on board. Because of the kind of client that ski vacations in the Park City area, I'm uncertain that they will make enough use of buses, although I personally would love to see it be a success.	Sandy	03/16/2015
	I vote for added buses but no tunneling through the mountain. I mean really? Why on earth would be destroy these timeline sections of the wasatch just so the resorts can make more money?	Sandy	05/01/2015
	Identify other corridors, don't focus on the cottonwood canyons.	Sandy	02/24/2015
	I'm concerned that the term evacuation route is used to justify unnecessary development. I am not aware of any scenarios where people have had to evacuate the Wasatch front/back in large numbers, ever. Its not really about evacuation routes, its about development. Evacuation routes are a selling point and potential benefit. We already have multiple access points connecting the front and back for emergency purposes. Guardsman pass needs to be improved, with expanded parking access near the top, middle.	sandy	04/01/2015
	I'm not too enthralled with digging a transit tunnel between the Canyons...and where does the money come for that anyway?	Sandy	04/30/2015
	I'm undecided because I don't know the final plan. I think the proposals are an honest attempt to do the right thing and I don't see any special interest being served to the disadvantage of the majority of stakeholders.	Sandy	03/05/2015
	In my opinion, connecting the ski areas would have a huge beneficial impact on the area.	Sandy	03/12/2015
	It depends on your definition of transportation (intended outcomes). Is it good for the area. Probably not all of it.	Sandy	04/30/2015
	It is hard to read the material and come away with more than a vague notion of what is planned. I think it is time for a rail system and if not a fully snow shedded-avalanche protected route up LCC, over to BCC and through to the wasatch back. such a system would only be good to me if it stopped at all BC trailheads. In the short term, parking at trailheads in BCC are pretty limited and are just a mess in the winter now. I thin kin places the shoulders on the uphill side should be built up to increase the spaces for parking, maybe channeling the water through drainpipe underneath.	Sandy	04/20/2015
	It will over populate the mountain	Sandy	05/01/2015
	Its fine as it is now, all we could use is a way to get people to the mountains without pollution, which can use some of the ideas you guys have, without connecting the resorts and getting rid of Prime Wasatch Back country.	Sandy	02/05/2015
	Lack of parking is the primary factor limiting the ski areas ability to sell more lift tickets and is also becoming (and will increasingly be) a limiting factor for dispersed recreation in the Cottonwood Canyons. According to UDOT's figures, 7,000 vehicles travel Little Cottonwood on an average day in the winter--this exceeds the capacity of the road and is environmentally unsustainable. Mass transit must replace private automobiles as the primary means of transportation in Little Cottonwood. A further issues is the avalanche hazard in Little Cottonwood. Snowsheds, while having significant adverse visual impact, are probably necessary.	Sandy	02/26/2015
	Mt. Accord has not evaluated smaller options to the supposed problems. The problems are not huge. The can be solved by small, inexpensive, incremental changes to traffic patterns with spending billions and damaging our canyons	Sandy	02/25/2015
	My general comments about these "transportation corridors" are that I see no need for connections between LCC, BCC, and Park City (except for the existing Guardsman Pass Rd.). In my opinion the claims about reducing traffic congestion along with supposed improvement in air quality and the added convenience to recreational users who may want to travel between Summit County and Cottonwood Canyon areas are way overstated and would only serve a very small population, most of whom are upper economic percentile, out-of-state visitors. And, even for such visitors, I claim the marginal value to them to be able to conveniently cross the SLC/Park City ridge line would be very minimal. I doubt a family staying at the Park City resorts would have much incentive to spend 1 to 2 hours a day traveling to a Cottonwood resort when they can enjoy the resorts at their doorstep. I recall that even the pro-development Ski Link's own transportation studies showed low demand for snow sports users to travel between the counties. LITTLE COTTONWOOD CANYON I DO NOT BELIEVE that LCC should even be called a "transportation corridor" other than for the purposes of getting skiers between the Salt Lake Valley and Snowbird and Alta and getting users to and from the trailheads for back-country skiing, hiking, climbing, mountain biking, and other dispersed sports. I think that connecting LCC to BCC should not even be in consideration. I STRONGLY OPPOSE transit connection from LCC to BCC. NO TUNNEL UNDER TWIN LAKES PASS!!! I DO BELIEVE improvements must be made to reduce auto traffic and parking congestion in LCC and that strong traffic management methods will be needed to incentivize users. I would even accept use fees or other perhaps less economically based controls. How about a program that allows people to volunteer for some canyon related improvement work in exchange for allowing access to the canyons for those who could not afford or wish not to pay a usage fee? I think there has even been discussion of making the "BCC/LCC corridor" a commuting alternative for Summit County residents. That's RIDICULOUS in my opinion! BIG COTTONWOOD CANYON I DO NOT BELIEVE that BCC should even be called a "transportation corridor" other than for the purposes of getting skiers between the Salt Lake Valley and Solitude and Brighton and getting users to and from the trailheads for dispersed sports. I think that connecting BCC to LCC and BCC to Park City (except via Guardsman Pass) should not even be in consideration. I STRONGLY OPPOSE transit connections from BCC to LCC and BCC to Park City. I DO BELIEVE improvements must be made to reduce auto traffic and parking congestion in BCC and that strong traffic management methods will be needed to incentivize users. MILLCREEK CANYON I DO BELIEVE that some kind of transit, e.g., a shuttle bus system, should be implemented in Millcreek Canyon. I support additional and expanded parking areas, and I also support continuing or even increasing the fee system. I have read Millcreek Canyon studies that considered limiting the number of users, e.g., based upon available parking spots. Although I would not be happy about that, I think some sort of capacity control could be instituted in a way that would be fair. Put on your thinking caps people! PARLEYS CANYON AND I-80 CORRIDOR In my opinion this canyon has the greatest potential for increased and improved transit service, and I agree with the MA proposal that local bus (not BRT or rail transit) is the best way. Better connections on the Salt Lake and Summit County ends are, of course, necessary, perhaps even including BRT on Foothill Drive which could also be part of a BRT service that continues South for Salt Lake County commuters.	Sandy	05/02/2015
	No connections from Alta to Park City...ever!	Sandy	03/16/2015
	No extra lanes or trains up Little Cottonwood canyon. Only more buses, and a more flexible bus schedule.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	No extra lanes or trains up Little Cottonwood Canyon. Only more buses, and a more flexible bus schedule, like Zion's.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	NO LANES NO TRAINS!!!!!!	Sandy	04/29/2015
	No train up either Cottonwood Canyon. Yes to BRT and road expansion in and between the Cottonwoods and increased bus service. No to any direct connections between the Cottonwoods and Park City (including opening Guardsman to wintertime use). No aerial transportation. Yes to a train from the University line to Park City. There are lots of commuters going both ways on this route, and this is the obvious place for a train. Better bus service along the I-80 corridor also makes good sense.	Sandy	03/10/2015
	No trains and no lanes up Little cottonwood canyon.	Sandy	03/03/2015
	NO TRAINS OR LANES UP LITTLE COTTONWOOD CANYON	Sandy	04/29/2015
	No trains or tunnels in the canyons or foothills	Sandy	03/12/2015
	not sure if a train needs to go between Alta and Park City	sandy	02/16/2015
	once again, public transportation is the answer to our problem...in what form that takes is the billion dollar question.	Sandy	04/06/2015
	People already dont use the bus I dont see why they would use this new thing that is more expensive.	sandy	03/05/2015
	Plan D addresses it the best.	Sandy	02/13/2015

	Please preserve Littlewood Canyon! No extra traffic lanes & No trains up our canyon!	Sandy	03/14/2015
	Please see my above comment. Some type of parking structure and shuttle/bus service along with a toll both would be alternatives to evaluate. Trax going up Ft Union and 9400 so would not be used by the people accessing the canyons. Too much of a hassle and those roads do not have a traffic problem.	Sandy	03/11/2015
	Problems are over stated. Problems only occur on a handful of days/year. And if more people could access the ski areas they would over run existing terrain. What assumptions are made regarding the canyon's sustainable capacity? The concept of creating a "transportation corridor" seems to be want of the business community, not the general public - it is definitely not a "need".	sandy	05/01/2015
	Putting in a train system of widening the roadways would cause MAJOR damage to the canyons. Plus, in canyons like Big Cottonwood, there isn't any room to expand without blowing out entire sides of the mountain or moving the river! Leave the mountains alone!	Sandy	03/15/2015
	Rail and other fixed rail systems are a bad idea. Please get real and focus on realistic solutions such as bus or shuttle systems.	Sandy	03/08/2015
	Regarding the transportation alternatives, it appears that the committee may have rail bias and may have hastily removed the best solution, a high speed aerial gondola. It's hard to believe a 20 to 40 seat detachable gondola system cannot achieve sufficient speed to provide acceptable transit times. The benefits of an aerial gondola over a new at grade rail line include far lower environmental impact to place pads for towers versus rail bed grading, lower capital and operational cost, improved traveler experience, and an aerial gondola does not impose another at grade subdividing of the open space which would be an unacceptable environmental impact. There is insufficient information in this Proposal to allow accurate comment, but unless a new rail system is placed on the existing road bed, the amount of additional environmental damage and cost would be unacceptable. Also, it's not clear how such a rail system could meet the goals of safely providing recreational access in inclement weather while avalanche mitigation is underway.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	See above	Sandy	02/16/2015
	See previous comment against light rail.	Sandy	03/17/2015
	see previous comment.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	suitable accommodations have not been put in place for cyclists	sandy	05/01/2015
	The biggest problem with mound the cord is proposed transportation solution it's way too expensive. Why not start with something that's less ambitious and she probably just as effective. I suggest the following 1. don't put a train read any bus lanes up Little Cottonwood Canyon the estimated cost is way out of line with any benefit to the public additional angel train going to put little Cottonwood Canyon will destroy the beauty and will detract from the quality of the outdoor/mountain experience don't make little Cottonwood Canyon look like a mini party's canyon 2. And more buses and parking. The only way to preserve the beauty of the canyon and protect environment is to provide additional buses and parking facilities. Encourage rideshare. The parking must be based away from the mouth of the canyon's. Provide more parking at 6200 as well as 9400 S. and 20th E.	Sandy	04/30/2015
	The cost and environmental impact of a train up LCC would far outweigh any perceived benefits. It would increase the use of LCC, which is already at capacity as far as trails and human use during the summer. If I wanted to walk on a city sidewalk (as far as number of people), I'd do that.	Sandy	04/13/2015
	The 'critical' transportation needs deserve a fairer consideration. Before drastic measures and major sacrifices of natural beauty are made we should try the simple next steps to what we have already done. UTA transportation efforts in Little Cottonwood Canyon have been minimal because they can not get riders except for the couple dozen powder days each winter. These are predictable and could be planned for as well as more reliable and consistent bus service the rest of the 340 days of the year.	Sandy	02/13/2015
	The ideal transportation system limits the amount of traffic that can access the Wasatch Mountains. As population and tourism increases the amount of traffic into the Wasatch Mountains should remain the same in order to preserve the wilderness and watershed. The alternatives proposed above all include an increase in the amount of traffic into the Wasatch Mountains.	Sandy	05/02/2015
	The MA's Transportation-Purposes-and-Alternatives-F document outlines 14 purposes of the transportation proposal. It is worth noting that the goals outlined here are not equally important, and the list is incomplete. In particular, "3. reducing avalanche-related risks and delay" and "4. providing new evacuation options from the canyons" are only relevant a few days of the year, typically <5% of the year. Also, "9. Create unique, attractive traveler experience" is not a need, but rather a want that was designed around arguing for a train. Similarly "14. protect and enhance community character" is not a need that I look for in a transportation proposal. Finally, what about goals such as "15. A financially tenable solution" and "16. Feasibility of implementing the proposed transportation plans" and "17. A solution that can be implemented quickly". These are all important goals of a transportation plan in my view and they are fulfilled by increasing bus capacity but not a train and tunnel solution. That said, in my view the bus still accomplishes 9/14 goals (1,2,5-7, 10-13), while the train likely accomplishes 4/14 (4,6,11), and possibly 3 more (9-10,12). I am not sure if either proposal meets item 8, as there is not enough information. Regarding the other items, I feel that the answer is either No (7,13) for the train/tunnel or there is not enough information to evaluate whether the train/tunnel proposal fulfills the need (1-3,14). Adding a train and tunnel appears to be a much riskier and far costlier proposal than increasing bus capacity during peak usage times.	Sandy	04/30/2015
	The need for high capacity or high speed has not been demonstrated. It appears to be a want, a cool toy for the rich but not more. Opportunity costs upon the regional system needs to be a need unaccounted for.	Sandy	02/18/2015
	The only transportation options I'm in support of is LRT and BRT. Tunneling would be too destructive to the watershed in the immediate term. Long term it might be ok, but I don't think its probable to go that route. If you can connect PC with the cottonwoods via Parleys canyon and the existing LRT system, then it would be the best of all worlds. Transit from the airport to PC would be interesting.	SANDY	02/23/2015
	The proposal will inflict enormous costs on the Canyon in order to address a traffic congestion problem that really only occurs on a few, particularly busy ski days each year.	Sandy	04/29/2015
	The reality is, public transit is seen as a something for other people to use so there are fewer cars on the road when "I" am going to be driving. As for rail, get Vail or some other private enterprise to fund and build it as the ski areas will be the primary beneficiaries.	Sandy	03/15/2015
	The Tunnel from Brighton to Alta is a good idea if Ski Resorts pay for it	Sandy	04/13/2015
	To eliminate most of the options except for a train especially without environmental study being done seems backwards. The purposes have been designed and manipulated to come to only one conclusion which is the train. This suggests either flawed thinking or purposeful hidden agendas	Sandy	03/13/2015
	Train is the best option.	Sandy	04/13/2015
	Train system seems to be already decide or heavy favorite. I don't think we really have looked at alternatives.	Sandy	02/23/2015
	Transportation alternatives in Little Cottonwood canyon such as a train or express bus route could be beneficial, but the impact of them leaves a lot of details out. In the early 1990s the train was a need for direct service to Alta. Building a train up the canyon(s) would only benefit the construction companies involved. Parking at the base of the canyons with a reliable bus schedule up is the least expensive approach at this point. We owe it to the accord to try this before abandoning it for the more expensive and environmentally intrusive alternatives.	Sandy	04/29/2015
	Use existing roads. Expand Parking at 6200 South. Promote ride sharing by charging a toll and charge for parking for vehicles with fewer than 3 occupants. My friends with children do not want to take a train.	sandy	04/20/2015
	We do not need to expand transportation in the canyons - leave as is. You will pay	Sandy	04/30/2015
	We don't need a unique travelers experience to bring more visitors to our Canyons. It has always been the snow that brings skiers and boarders here. My friends with children do not want to ride the train. It is too difficult for families. Reduce the number of cars on the road with a toll and parking fees for vehicles with fewer than 3 occupants. Provide more buses and places to park away from the mouth of both Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. We don't need additional bus lanes. Consider bus only traffic during the peak periods	Sandy	04/20/2015
	We have not yet exhausted all that could be done in the suggested "D" alternative. I realize that there is a problem, but it IS NOT TIME YET to add new transit guide ways (trains and tunnels) up the canyons. "D" is the best of those proposed.	Sandy	02/26/2015
	We probably have no choice but to move towards an "Alps-like" setup...trains.	Sandy	04/16/2015
	We should walk before we run. Improve bus service to the top of LCC before considering other options. As an employee of Alta the over all consensus with other employees talked for direct service to Alta. Building a train up the canyon(s) would only benefit the construction companies involved. Parking at the base of the canyons with a reliable bus schedule up is the least expensive approach at this point. We owe it to the accord to try this before abandoning it for the more expensive and environmentally intrusive alternatives.	Sandy	04/27/2015
	We strongly object to both the process and substantive conclusions of the Mountain Accord deal. These comments represent only a few of the many important issues that this proposal raises, in part because of the difficulty of getting good information about what is actually being proposed (and the true cost to taxpayers of that proposal) and because of the shortness of the timeline for public comment. The report fails to adequately consider alternatives or adequately explain why some alternatives are being excluded from further consideration. The report fails to adequately consider alternatives or adequately explain why some alternatives are being excluded from further consideration. For example, one of the most obvious solutions for managing traffic in Little Cottonwood Canyon is increasing bus service in mixed traffic up Little Cottonwood Canyon. This alternative, however, like many others has gotten short shrift in Mountain Accord's analysis. Specifically, the Transportation Purposes and Alternatives Report available on the Mountain Accord website proposes to drop this alternative from further consideration based wholly on a conclusory assertion, with no accompanying analysis or facts, that this alternative succeeds only in "reducing avalanche-related risk and delay" and would "fail to meet the other 13 purposes." No explanation is given as to why this option would not "reduce auto use and congestion in Little Cottonwood Canyon," "reduce vehicle emissions in the Cottonwood Canyons to improve air quality," "reduce parking impacts on environment, safety, and economy," "support land use goals for reduced sprawl and concentrated development," "improve access and connections for pedestrians and bicyclists," "protect or enhance the natural and scenic resources of the Cottonwood Canyons," "protect and enhance community character" or any of the other articulated goals for the plan. It defies logic to assume that more frequent and better timed bus service, coordinated with bus service schedules throughout the valley, would not decrease auto use, vehicle emissions, and parking demands in Little Cottonwood Canyon. This failure to grapple fairly with the issues at hand suggests a rigged, agenda-driven analysis rather than a careful, fair consideration of potential alternatives. Moreover, one wonders how the proposed approach "protects watershed health, water supply, and water quality" better than increased busing, given that the regulated proposal requires providing increased water for culinary purposes to Alta and increased water (in unquantified amounts) for snowmaking at the resorts. Additionally, while Alternative D, Transportation system management alternatives—which "are combinations of incentives for transit use and disincentives to auto use, without adding new transit guideways or expanding roadways"—is mentioned as an alternative that will continue to be considered, the Report evinces very little actual consideration of this alternative. It seems that a deal has already been struck between the existing players (who do not represent all relevant stakeholders) and that other alternatives are falling by the wayside without careful study. There seems to be little actual data in the report, so it seems unlikely that any alternative has received enough consideration to be eliminated from consideration at this stage. The report also fails to prioritize the many listed goals in any meaningful way and assumes that increased tourism in the Canyons is an unmitigated good. No sense of relative priority is given and the report fails to explain, for example, why creating a unique "traveler experience" in the canyon should be given equal weight with reducing congestion and parking demands. Relatedly, the report also assumes that increasing tourism in the Canyons is an unqualified good without any explanation for why that is so. The proposed deal will sacrifice Little Cottonwood Canyon by transforming it into a transportation corridor and will destroy much of its natural environment, appeal, and beauty. It would be one thing to build a rail line if there were no existing road, as such infrastructure might be necessary to allow Utahns to access and enjoy the canyons. However, doubling up on infrastructure in the canyon unnecessarily destroys the natural environment and beauty of the Canyon. Doubling up on infrastructure will likely stress the natural environment and may threaten existing species, wildlife corridors, watersheds, and other natural conditions. The proposed deal represents an elitist plan for the Canyons that will benefit only a small number of Utahns at potentially tremendous cost both to average recreational users and taxpayers. One of the primary focuses of the deal is to preserve "backcountry areas for dispersed recreation," a goal which benefits a vanishingly small percentage of Utah residents. Only about 7% of Utahns ski and the number that have the time, training, and resources to backcountry ski is much smaller. Yet, in order to benefit the admittedly small ("dispersed") number of people who can take advantage of backcountry skiing, the proposal sacrifices the beauty enjoyment of the lower	Sandy	04/29/2015
	You are overstating the problem in an effort to get support for systems that are a far overreach and are destructive to the canyon. Emphasize busses with your proposed transit hubs in existing commercial areas and not in or at the mouth of the canyons.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	You have got to be kidding. You want to spend a billion dollars on a TRAIN? And carve out big chunks of our beautiful, majestic mountains? Are you nuts?	Sandy	04/14/2015
	Again please reconsider the proposed plan to make it more practical for families with snowboarders	Sandy	05/01/2015
	I am hesitant about implementing a train system because of all of the construction required. However, if tunnels are going to be built anyways I suppose a train would become more Eco-friendly, be faster, require fewer resources, and potentially be a lot safer than buses.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	Every choice includes the linking of the resorts using LCC and BCC as access corridors. Especially LCC is a fragile ecosystem. It makes not sense to insult it with the load you are proposing.	Sandy (Salt Lake County)	04/16/2015
	The Mountain Accord transportation solutions attempt to solve a problem that only exists 4-5 months out of the year and may not even scale sufficiently during peak periods to ameliorate traffic issues. If the train uses a rack and cog system that slows it down measurably, what is the practical throughput? The existing transportation infrastructure (buses) is not fully utilized, cheap, and very scalable. Incentivizing desired behaviors through convenience (carrot) and fees (stick) seems like a better approach for all concerned.	Sandy (Wasatch Resort, LCC)	03/17/2015
	really need more thought on possible transportation in the canyons this is a very complex problem and as just one example of that every part of the valley has different issues as to making it work	sandy ut	04/30/2015
	Please see above comments.	Sandy,	03/10/2015

	I don't think putting a train into LCC is the answer to our transportation problem. It think that it is invasive to the environment & that space is problem to adding this light rail. I have taken the train to the Mer de France & the train to the Jungfrau station & there is no automobiles allowed. I think the cost of the train is high & doesn't solve the pollution or congestion problem. We think that we need to compete w/Europe, but we have such a small amount of acreage that I think that tunneling, adding rail is a little too much for the size of the region. I recommend strict bus usage (clean diesel) & no cars allowed unless you live in the canyon, which would require bus transportation every 15 minutes & added stops to access popular recreational areas.	Sandy, UT	04/26/2015
	In the short range LRT or a gondola would help the cause immediately.	Sandy, UT	03/26/2015
	The blueprint may help preserve Parley's Canyon but not Little Cottonwood Canyon.	Sandy, UT	04/17/2015
	They are incomplete. None of these actually address the problem of restricting vehicles in the canyons.	Sandy, UT	02/23/2015
	We will have to pay for parking, pay for ski resort workers to move up and down the canyon to their jobs, will we get cut off to these beautiful mountains. Is anyone looking at for public interest? This proposal will impact the public financially, and take our canyons away from us.	Sandy, UT	02/28/2015
	While many of the transportation needs are valid, there are a few that are likely unneeded. "Provide new evacuation options from both Cottonwood Canyons." This need is not well supported based on previous plans and studies from the Wasatch Canyons. Further, implementing it would likely cause a large environmental impact that might be impossible to mitigate. "Create unique, attractive "traveler experience." to increase tourist and resident visitation." Transportation development should not be built to be an attraction for its own sake. The Wasatch Mountain in their wild state is the attraction that people are coming to see. This "need" in counter to many of the other needs and goals in the Mountain Accord. The most important needs for any transportation improvement are protecting watershed health, water supply, and water quality as well as protecting the natural resources of the Wasatch Mountains. A important need that is missing, is ensuring that any transportation solution is socially just. Residents and visitors with lower socioeconomic resources should not be prevented from accessing the natural and recreational resources of the Wasatch Mountains.	Sandy, UT	05/01/2015
	Just a reversible bus lane and increased buses and eutectic avalanche shed in critical locations Make cars pay a large fee.	Sandy, Utah	04/27/2015
	The least impactful alternatives that can provide transportation should be moved forward for more discussion and planning. Certainly shuttle/bus or light rail up the canyons is preferable to the projected traffic and parking snarls. If canyons must be connected, then underground is preferable to any kind of tram of above ground crisscrossing the mountains.	Sandy, Utah	03/03/2015
	Little Cottonwood Canyon is called "Little" for a very important reason - it's very narrow, has a stream running through it, homes along the south side of the road and the Vauts on the north. (1) A rail system on the North side of the road would interfere with mountain enthusiasts who frequently rock climb and cause tremendous environmental disruption during build phase. (2) If the rail system were to be built on the south side of the road, many homes would be impacted and this isn't mentioned in the Blueprint. (3) Each option includes a tunnel from Alta to Big Cottonwood Canyon to Park City, which seems to be the driving force in any of the transportation alternatives. Is this really for Little Cottonwood or is it to broaden accessibility ski resorts. Why damage a small pristine canyon to bring more traffic through the canyon to access Park City and Big Cottonwood? Bus ridership up Little Cottonwood Canyon isn't at capacity and the buses normally cease after the ski season. The photos in the Blueprint are all during ski season, which is a specific problem that doesn't support an expensive and destructive transportation solution one that will surely negatively impact the peaceful and natural environment of the small canyon.	Sandy/Little Cottonwood Canyon	03/14/2015
	More busses only up canyons. Use I80 for rail to Park City/Heber along I80	sandy/unincorporated SL county	05/01/2015
	I don't like the idea of any "fees" or "parking/pricing strategies" for the Wasatch. You should not have to pay a dime to access public land in the Wasatch. The good thing about having access to the Wasatch Mountains is that it is FREE recreation. I never use Mill Creek just because they charge you at the entrance. I think the tunnel idea is crazy, too expensive and too much engineering (plus were in an earthquake prone area). I think the tunnel concept in the plan distracts from an otherwise mostly good plan, the tunnels are ridiculous and should be completely taken out. I don't want my taxes to pay for tunnels and I don't want to see that much construction in the Wasatch. I do like the idea of a light rail system/train route up the canyons and to Park City though. I would prefer light rail over bus or any tram/rail connections of the canyons. I would support a light rail system to Park City and up the canyons. I think that should be the focus for the transportation portion.	Saratoga Springs	04/30/2015
	Please see my other comment	Saratoga Springs	04/25/2015
	I have no idea how you can rebuild the transportation corridors without massive disruption to both the watershed and the existing traffic. Maybe in the long run it will be worth it? That is, if winter still exists in the long run.	Seattle, WA (formerly SLC, UT)	02/05/2015
	Whatever system is adopted would need to address the smaller stops needed by dispersed recreationists. Specific stops in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons are named in Cottonwood Canyon Scenario comments above. UMA supports disincentives to private vehicle use, such as Trailhead Parking fees / permits. However, early morning starts (down patrol) should remain possible. It would be unfeasible to run public transit earlier than about 6 am, so private vehicle options should exist for early starts and late finishes.	SLC	04/30/2015
	Adding extra lanes for HOV and buses would appear to be the most feasible solution.	SLC	04/30/2015
	Agree there should be more mass transit opportunities for the Cottonwoods, but do not agree with with tunnels connecting the cottonwoods and the wasatch back	SLC	04/27/2015
	Any transportation analysis(NEPA) needs to be conducted with the Forest Service as a co-lead with the FTA. See comments in first section. How and where are people going to park in and around 9400 south to use these proposed transportation systems? The current Park and Ride lots are inadequate around the current Trax system as well as in the mouths of Little & Big Cottonwood Canyons. Where are people going to park to access the proposed transportation systems?	SLC	05/01/2015
	as above	slc	04/12/2015
	Expanded public transportation the the Wasatch Back is very important.... Considerations of rail and tunnels in the cottonwood canyons are damaging to the goal of maintaining the environment. Buses may be more acceptable -- most wise would be to consider limiting access to the canyons.	slc	04/28/2015
	I am no clearer on a preferred alternative after many meetings and discussions. I think improvement in the bus system is the best proposal since a train would have a larger environmental impact. Improvement in the highway would be a good start with more lanes that could be changed to uphill or downhill only. The congestion can be severe but is centered around powder days and holidays. I would be hesitant to permanently change the environment and feel in the canyons for less than 10% of the year.	SLC	04/28/2015
	I appreciate and support the effort to enhance connectivity in and around Park City. I also support better transit options from SLC to Park City, particularly trax and bus service from downtown SLC to PC. I do not, however, support trams, trains, tunnels, or roads (options A-D) that connect the out of state tourists staying in PC to the Cottonwoods. Why is it necessary to permanently destroy ridge lines that we locals enjoy daily so as to convenience out of states for their brief visits? Why not invest in extensive National Park Service style shuttles that rapidly move people without the permanency of fixed infrastructure? Let's give people the option of vast bus offerings that have flexibility to adopt instead of fixed rail that is more expensive, inflexible, and permanent. I support the goals as outlined. I would like to alleviate traffic in the Cottonwoods from SL while improving access. The conclusions outlined are severely flawed as drafted. For example, you make the ridiculous claim that option F would fail to meet 13 goals. First, the current ski bus options from SLC are insufficient and inconvenient and do not accurately measure the potential support for increased local bus service. If busses came more than once an hour, then more people would use the bus rather than drive cars. Second, Traffic is only a concern on winter weekends and some summer weekends and holidays. Drive up to Alta on a random weekday and you won't see traffic. Buses are more nimble to respond to public demand and do not irreparably alter the canyon. Rail and gondolas are fixed, inflexible to public demand, expensive, and will be empty most days of the year. However, the rail and tram lines will be fixtures despite their lack of use and will decimate the solitude of the mountains in those areas. Besides, the canyon currently cannot support cars and trains because vehicles would still be necessary to take supplies and equipment. As such, the canyon access would need to expand for a rail line. More busses could use existing roads without lane expansion. Why not think outside the box- charge for parking on weekends or promote reduced bus fare as part of your lift pass? Why not include a bus pass with your season pass? Let's focus on being practical and actually moving locals in a flexible and cost effective way. Option F could address goals 5-7. Additionally, more busses would service more of the canyon. Would light rail have stops at each hiking or snowshoeing trailhead? Unlikely. Busses could stop at more places without needing full stops and provide more options for hikers, pedestrians, & cyclists. All told, option F would address goals 8, 10, & 12 better than options A-D. Let's focus on lodging in the valley and Park City with extensive bus and shuttle service to ski resorts and snowshoe routes on winter weekends. There is no need for fixed rail 200+ days a year or a ski link type tram that would forever alter view lines and ridge tops and eventually spur development along the route. Let's be practically first and not immediately jump at the glamorous project that is expensive and obtusive. Who would most use the expensive tram? Not locals. In conclusion, options A-D are expensive, time consuming, and designed only with the tourist in mind-- locals and future generations be damned. On a side note, why is goal 9 even a consideration at the same level as environmental concerns? Again, I see a focus on pimping our mountains to tourists at the expense of our future generations of utahns. Ultimately, it seems that the purpose here is to copy the Switzerland model. However, Switzerland has mountain farming and grazing, massive deforestation, and minuscule public land. The villages may be carless but you can take gondolas and elevators to every peak. The Wasatch once was overgrazed and deforested but 100+ years later it has public land, wilderness, and unspoiled land. Let's not return to the devastation of the past.	SLC	05/01/2015
	I disagree with the concept of a LCC/PC corridor. These are two separate areas with no current connection. An aerial tram would be horrible, and a tunnel would increase traffic, not decrease it.	slc	03/02/2015
	I don't think an aerial tram is part of the solution. I would vote for improvements to the Guardsman road. The train between Park City and the Cottonwoods would be a boondoggle.	SLC	03/18/2015
	I support rail service or BRT to Park City from SLC airport, & intermediate stops, up I-80, corridor.	SLC	04/14/2015
	I think parties involved are delusional. One Wasatch is a horrible idea, and would forever destroy what little we have left of the wasatch backcountry - the environmental impacts of such a grand plan is something you cannot predict and the little unspoilt beauty of the wasatch will forever be gone so some silly marketing ploy. The train is just plain unnecessary, expensive and is really only on the table because the ski resorts are obsessed with the connectivity of the resorts. (aka - why isn't a train up and down the canyon on the table? why is the only train on the table one that connects everything?). I think an improved bus system would be a small step that would create huge impacts on the traffic that LCC get on FOUR days out of the year - (it's not as big of a problem as I feel you make it out to be compared to the traffic on 1-15 during rush hour EVERY SINGLE day - get some perspective). You're also using tax payers dollars to fund something that directly benefits the resorts. Skiing is so expensive that the tax payers who are funding this "solution" won't even be able to use it - and that seems unfair. The bus runs only once an hour, and there is no parking even if you do want to take it. Running a bus up the canyon every 10 minutes with a big parking garage would be a good solution to get people to carpool. In addition, there should be at least VIP parking for those who do carpool, or paid parking for those who don't. People would think a lot more before driving up the canyon by themselves. It's not always possible to carpool, but I think if you provided a better bus option, people (self included) would be way more inclined to taking taking the bus.	SLC	03/16/2015
	I think that there should not be a connection from little cottonwood to park city. Though there should be a Light Rail from bottom of little cottonwood and big cottonwood as well.	SLC	03/08/2015
	LCC purposes #13 and 14 need to be moved closer to the top of the list. Purposes heavily prioritize getting more people to ski areas over preservation of natural character.	SLC	02/07/2015
	Monorail would be still unsightly, but preferable to a railroad bed being laid.	slc	02/05/2015
	More people, transport systems(rail lines/gondola towers/transportation centers) and transportation vehicles (buses/trains/cars) = more environmental impact.	SLC	02/04/2015
	No provisions/implications for reducing car/big game animal collisions that usually result in either the death of the animal or humans, and usually results in the expensive damage to vehicles.	SLC	03/12/2015
	No trains.	SLC	04/18/2015
	NO TUNNELS AND TRAINS	SLC	03/13/2015
	Parley's canyon has become an increasingly traveled and dangerous corridor. I am in favor of options that will make it a safer and more efficient travel corridor.	SLC	04/26/2015
	Rails and tunnels may serve their purpose in the Alps, but not here. Mountain Accord reps should not be using Europe as an example which should be replicated here. A much better alternative is to improve the existing roads up the canyons, and to improve bus service. A logical place for a train seems to be over Parley's.	SLC	02/26/2015
	Restrict access to vehicles with more than one passenger. Increase frequency of bus the bus trips but reduce the size of the bus used.	SLC	04/30/2015
	SEE ABOVE COMMENTS	SLC	05/02/2015
	see above. Trying for a big expensive project will hurt mass transit around the valley due to the past cannibalization of service to pay for projects. A lawsuit would probably stop the tunnel/cog for 20 years. A better wider roadway would be possible in less than 5 years with round the year bus service and wider bicycle lanes.	SLC	05/02/2015

	Ski resorts could build better parking areas on their own for their guests which would free up the roads and cause less congestion at the tops of the canyons. The city in which the ski resorts reside could provide consistent and reliable busing up and down the canyon to try and eliminate part of the congestion from individual vehicles. This busing need to be attempted BEFORE adding new lanes. The state of Utah was just awarded a very low grade for their transportation upkeep and safety which means we should be spending any money we have in fixing the already present roads, trains, bridges etc. Where would the millions of dollars come from to make these changes? Hopefully not out of money that already has places it needs to be used to make existing transportation safe.	SLC	04/30/2015
	The only thing I see that could be better is the connection between trax lines and canyon routes, currently to get to any of the ski bus lines you must be on the blue trax line. This requires transfers which add unnecessary delay. I don't believe that this new plan addresses this shortcoming. The current 990 and 960 should leave from a trax stop that is covered by all three trax lines and front runner, such as the 5400 south IHC hospital stop which covers all four lines. This would make it much more accessible for anyone coming south bound or from the south west line to only make one transfer instead of 2 to get to any of the cottonwood resorts.	slc	03/17/2015
	The tram is a bad idea. The radio tower in the area is already too much development for that area. Please do not allow this to move forward. A light rail up LCC could be a good solution if parking at the base was secure, free with plenty of it. I have to admit I don't go up that canyon because of the amount of traffic. Light rail would be nice if it had stops along the way at popular biking/hiking/backcountry access locations. I'd OK with even removing the road so that there is only a train if enough stops could be created and the impact to the watershed during construction could be kept to near zero pollution.	SLC	02/13/2015
	very much in favor of buses or rail in and out of the canyons - and there should be a limit on how many cars can pass through - just like parking lots get filled up downtown, the people working at the entrance of the canyon should be able to say no more cars allowed to go up, you'll have to use the bus instead, when the peak is reached.	SLC	03/02/2015
	Why does there need to be a link between the Front and the Back. Keeping separate with the only link through Parley's in the winter and adding Guardsman in the summer. I also think there was little discussion of American Fork and Provo Canyon.	SLC	03/16/2015
	Yes to buses and transit corridors. No to wildly expensive trains. Double no to tunnels that connect Park City, Big and Little.	SLC	03/14/2015
	I oppose development of a "mountain-rail" system because of ecological and financial considerations. In general, I would like to see park-and-ride bus service revamped and greatly expanded. This is a potentially affordable and eco-friendly alternative that could greatly enhance recreational experience for locals and tourists in the affected area.	SLC, UT	04/17/2015
	I live in Little Cottonwood Canyon and I am very happy to see these community and government groups recognizing the need for strategic planning for transportation in this canyon. Some times of the day, especially when it's snowing, it's very very slow to get anywhere in a car or bus, which can be both frustrating and unsafe. Thank you for taking the time to put together this proposal and some smart alternatives to alleviate the road congestion and closures. Thank you	Snowbird	03/12/2015
	LRT Sandy-Alta LRT Sandy-BCC LRT Airport-Park City	Snowbird	04/30/2015
	With ever increasing use of the canyons changes need to be made.	Snowbird	04/29/2015
	Would like to see rail	snowbird, ut	03/08/2015
	Agree with exploring options B, D, E, F & G. Disagree with Light Rail and Aerial Trams connecting reports.	snowbird, ut	05/01/2015
	Expand the use of buses up the Cottonwood canyons to preserve the environment and as well as the watershed. Charge tolls for vehicles, to limit use of automobiles.	south jordan	04/26/2015
	I am a climber, and have climbed in Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons for 25 years. It is very important to me that these recreation options remain completely open as they are now or even be improved.	South Jordan	04/28/2015
	I like the thought of more light rail. I do not support connection between the Cottonwood Canyons and Park City for the reason I stated in the question above.	South Jordan	05/01/2015
	Leave it alone! We don't want trains going up and down our canyons! What the crap?!	South Jordan	02/08/2015
	rail lines with unique economic hubs could transform the all areas involved into unique destinations for locals and tourism combined. Having other options besides auto is important. With regards to transportation up the canyons, they would need to be unique and affordable to get people to use these other options. travel time can be overcome if it is comfortable travel combined with the "fun" of the experience and the destinations the lines travel to. If the benefits of the experience were sold it could really transform our economic industry.	South Jordan	02/04/2015
	Same as above	SOUTH JORDAN	04/30/2015
	Transportation is currently based on the combustion engine. If you're the visionaries you flatter yourselves with, think 50 years ahead, Leap-frog this time of gasoline consumption. Embrace a transportation system based on the "clean" future (e.g. driverless vehicles). Build in a structure that will make these technologies a reality - until then - preserve. GET OUT OF YOUR THINKING RUT!	South Jordan	04/30/2015
	I think it is crucial for the Salt Lake Valley in general to have a direct connection between the airport, downtown amenities, and the ski resorts. I would LOVE to see the day when visitors could easily be at the resorts within an hour of landing... or 2 hours if they decided to stop off and have dinner downtown.	South Lake Tahoe, CA	02/14/2015
	I do not support further road or train rail construction in the canyon. Severely limit traffic (personal vehicles) up the canyon by charging a toll and then paying for parking. Dramatically enhance bus service with alternative fuel buses, increased frequency, direct Alta or Snowbird, easy access place skis on outside of bus.	South Salt Lake	05/01/2015
	After reading I do not know what is truly meant by "corridor" for the light rail system. Right next to the existing road is not an option in many instances, so how much of the canyon will truly be impacted? I would prefer to see a reduction or elimination in passenger car traffic and an enhanced bus system utilizing the existing infrastructure.	South Salt Lake, UT	03/05/2015
	I feel this will only inundate our mountains with sound and air pollution. I feel that a train up to Park City would be beneficial, but we should not put a train up Big and Little Cottonwood. Nor should we connect those canyons with the other canyons by train. It would destroy the peace that we have in the mountains. Let's keep our wilderness wilderness.	South Weber	02/05/2015
	Rail is a good proposal, provided the cost for a family is close to or comparable with the cost of driving! Who is going to cover the cost of a system? Bus service does in our opinion not improve the bad weather problems.	St. George, UT	03/09/2015
	Nice work! Good detail, and evidence of thorough analysis of options.	summit county	02/28/2015
	Don't cave in to the nay-sayers! We MUST have a better plan (out side the box of what the rest of this country does) for our transportation. Linking the resorts by rail is a must. Don't let our I-80 become a replica of the Bay Area's I-80 or Denver's I-70, where a Friday or Sunday resort "commute" just isn't tolerated (so many in SF or Denver feel they must drive "up" on Thursday or "return home" so early Sunday it impacts one's ski day). If we don't add rail up I-80 and create a new Hwy 224 corridor transportation mode (maybe dramatically increased bus service can manage the latter) we will replicate what the Bay Area and Denver have, for sure.	Sun Peak area of Park City	03/11/2015
	The use of high speed aerial tramways (See Leitner Group) up both Cottonwood canyons is the best choice to preserve them. I grew up in both of those Canyons and over that entire Mountain range and I see developers controlling their future and I'm losing hope that the natural beauty will remain for my grandchildren to enjoy other than in pictures of how it use to be.	Syracuse	05/02/2015
	Again why have we narrow options on some corridors, without any traffic and people volumes to justify? Or quantified environmental impacts? Also what lead to all our efforts being focused on Little Cottonwood and Parley's only being considered as an express bus option? Why is Big Cottonwood only being looked at for local bus service, when it has higher volumes of traffic than Little Cottonwood?	Taylorville	03/17/2015
	More information is needed in terms of cost and environmental impact in regards to the bus and light rail options.	Taylorville	04/29/2015
	Again, these transportation options are ski-resort centric, trying to tie together small populations of tourists in cramped ski resort towns. Light rail becomes infeasible only when there is an insistence on connecting all three canyons directly. If the paradigm is to put the tourists in the Salt Lake valley and have transit up the canyons, the tourists gain access to all three areas without having to connect them in cramped mountain areas. They also share transportation routes with locals. If the plan becomes local-centric, then the tourist flow solves itself.	Vancouver, BC	05/01/2015
	I think the only way you are going to get people out of their cars and onto transit is by providing speedier transit service which would mean light or heavy rail. I think this should be developed in conjunction with other transportation issues like the increasing amount of traffic running from Provo to Ogden on the backside of the Wasatch, as well as the increasing traffic between the Wasatch Front and the Uintan Basin. Designing a heavy rail service that used the existing rail and trail right of ways between Provo and Ogden would provide great alternative transit between those points. You could then connect to that service using light rail from Salt Lake City via Parley's Canyon and running along the Highway 224 right of way into Park City and then out to Quinn's Junction. You could also run a light rail system up Little Cottonwood to Alta/Snowbird over to Brighton/Solitude and then down Guardsman Pass to Park City where it would connect to the other light rail system. Having multiple service may need some tax subsidies in the first decade of operation, but it's a system that we could easily grow into. Plus it would change the nature of development from sprawl to more transit and city oriented development that used less land and cost less as it would fill in around areas with infrastructure in place. For tourists, this would allow them to move up and down the Wasatch Bank and Front without the need of a car, which would probably attract a great deal more tourists especially from Europe and Asia use to this kind of travel.	Wanship	02/23/2015
	While increased transportation is necessary to lower the car traffic, it should be specific to the canyons rather than considering the Wasatch as one area. Each distinct area needs its own type of transportation.	Washington, D.C.	05/01/2015
	During the summer the transit connection from Park City to the Cottonwood Canyons will completely change situation. The canyons are currently accessible to locals and visitors from Salt Lake County and from Summit and Wasatch Counties via the more challenging Guardsman Pass and Snake Creek Canyons roads. Salt Lake County is currently known as a nice place to live because of its access to mountain. The transit plan will make access from Summit County easier than Salt Lake County resulting in a loss of value to Salt Lake County. During the winter the impact will be similar. The net result of this change is a benefit to the portion of the population with higher incomes who live or visit Summit County having better access to the population in Salt Lake County with lower incomes who have enjoyed access to "our mountains" for more than 100 years now being overrun with those who have money. I do not agree with easier access via trains or cars from Summit County to the Cottonwood Canyons. I am not as bothered with chair lift access from Summit County to the Cottonwood Canyons because this will bring a small volume of people with inconvenient access which is self limiting.	West Jordan	04/30/2015
	Go for the Light Rail Transit. Say What? Go for it. All the alternatives are stop gap, finger in the dike, half-ass, temporary solutions that delay the inevitable. Go all the way! Get it right the first time. Raise my taxes to do it. .... only no bonuses for the UTA executives. They need to be like the New England Patriots, "Do your job". PS. Forget aerial transportation. If you like rides go to Lagoon! Minimize the human footprint.	West Jordan	02/05/2015
	How about you promote the current transportation that little people use and make it better!	west jordan	03/27/2015
	I'm for eco friendly busses in little cottonwood and no expansion of roads.	West Jordan	03/15/2015
	Promote the actual current bus lines now and add additional parking at the bottom of the canyon. Add more pick up times instead of only few here and there.	west jordan	03/14/2015
	The light rail in LCC would have to be avalanche-proof!	West Jordan	04/30/2015
	Trip frequency should accommodate multiple times in the day for access, not just in the beginning and end of the day. This for work access but also for public recreation access. Otherwise people will still drive their cars.	WEST JORDAN	05/01/2015
	No trains, tunnels, resort expansion!	west Jordan	05/01/2015
	I find it hard to understand why we need a direct, year-round connection from the Wasatch front to the Wasatch back (other than Parley's canyon). Most of the alternatives will take LONGER to get to Park City than they do today.	West Jordan, UT	02/04/2015
	It seems to me that the assumption is that all people who want access are vehicle operators. I have seen little discussion of public transportation options for the working class or the environmentally concerned individual who chooses not to operate an independent vehicle.	West Jordan, Utah	04/26/2015
	Improve the bus transportation. That is all!!!	West Jordan0	03/13/2015
	The plans to include light rail service to canyon destinations for recreation is a big plus in the proposed blue print. light rail is the smartest way to meet the growing traffic to canyon destinations.	West Valley City	02/12/2015
	Further development of our light rail system in the city could prove to be an efficient improvement. Imagining a network of train stations and train tracks winding through the mountains seems as if it would degrade the aesthetic value of nature and fail to address that living things in the region have intrinsic value.	West Valley City	03/13/2015
	I am opposed to any aerial tram/fancy chairlift connecting the Cottonwoods and/or connecting Park City with the Cottonwood Canyons.	West Valley City	02/17/2015
	I hope that someone is listening. If the transportation improves in way of public/mass transit for the Canyons, I believe that MANY of us who enjoy the recreation opportunities will use those. Currently they are not very predictable and are only usable during the ski season. I am very much in favor of improving both pedestrian and bicycle access, but that should be done responsibly, and steps need to be taken to ensure the safety of both motorized and non-motorized vehicles. There are also needs to be existent to prevent unsafe non-motorized traffic. I am happy to share the road with cyclists, but they need to be responsible and ACCOUNTABLE to share in the responsibility for safety as well.	West Valley City	04/30/2015
	Why funnel traffic up either of the Cottonwoods to access the Park City area. I am against that. Really how beneficial would be access from Brighton to Alta, punched through the mountain? Some gain, but at what cost. For me, too much. You can choose, Big or Little.	West Valley City	05/02/2015
	see above comments	Weston, MA	02/24/2015

	If the idea is commuter service from Park City the rail line ought to focus on the I-80 corridor. That at least serves a year-round transportation need. but rail is still prohibitively expensive. It was \$58 million/mile for the Airport Trax extension. Expecting Park City commuters to triple the distance of the trip to go through the tunnels to Alta, then to Sandy, when the destination is either the University or Downtown is just baffling. It won't work. The train is just plain stupid. It's a billion dollar solution to a 50 cent traffic problem that the ski resorts need to solve themselves. This whole thing sounds like a welfare program for consultants. A privately funded parking garage at the gravel quarry on Wasatch Blvd and frequent bus service is the solution. UTAs level of service is terrible, and without a park and ride lot, nobody is going to make 3 or 4 transfers in ski boots to ride the bus from home.	Woodland	02/09/2015
	light rail or commuter rail is by far the best alternative	Woodland	04/29/2015
		Woodridge IL 60517	04/30/2015
<b>Please provide any additional feedback on the alternatives. Are there alternatives that would meet the purposes better than others? Should we consider additional alternatives?</b>			
	A highly dedicated bus system, similar to the BRT but without the tunnel, would move the parking down into areas better able to handle it. I'm not talking about the existing Salt Lake transit bus, but something similar to what Breckenridge has done for their valley level parking. Connecting the resorts should not be a priority. The number one priority should be preserving the reasons that people visit the resorts in the first place.	Albuquerque	03/04/2015
	Tunnels and gondolas are good.	Alpine	02/08/2015
	Do not expand access to the canyons.	Alpine, Ut	04/30/2015
	Anything that can be done to reduce the number of transportation vehicles and get them out of sight is good. The absolute (probably too expensive) ideal would be an underground rail system. Short of that I view trains better than buses. The necessity is to reduce auto traffic to only those purposes that can only be accomplished by autos.	Alpine, Utah	03/15/2015
	A tunnel from LCC to BCC and on to Park City would very much alter the character of Little Cottonwood Canyon and Alta. A dedicated rapid bus lane would help ease the traffic and pollution concerns without damaging what is special about LCC.	Alta	03/04/2015
	Billions of Dollars on tunnels and railway lines! Money that will never be recoverable over a 100 year timeframe. How does that create a sustainably vibrant economy? Just congestion charges, LCC roads. The existing mass transit system in the Salt Lake Valley is under-utilized and below capacity. Resources are needed to increase ridership of the existing system and reduce SOVs. Additional express bus service is needed in the Salt Lake Valley. An example of this is the need for express bus service from downtown Salt Lake City to Cottonwood Heights via 700 East and the Van Winkle Expressway. Consideration should be given to the construction of a "belt route" rail line along the east and south sides of the Salt Lake Valley. Such a rail line would connect the University of Utah to the Blue TRAX line in Sandy. Considerations should be given to lowering fares to encourage ridership on UTA buses and rail lines. Save Our Canyons believes that the greatest public benefit would be achieved by focusing investment on mass-transit in the Salt Lake Valley. Cottonwood Canyons and Mill Creek Canyon. Save Our Canyons believes the best method to implement mass transit, while preserving the wilderness character and natural habitat of these canyons, is to implement a reliable, affordable, and efficient shuttle system using vans and buses. This shuttle system would be operational year round, but would have higher capacity during peak use periods. For the resort transit hubs would also be used as boarding stations for the shuttle system. The shuttle system would be designed to provide service for all canyon visitors: resort skiers, dispersed users, hikers, resort employees, summer season visitors, and others. Current congestion problems in the Cottonwood Canyons are largely associated with ski resort operations, most notably on weekends and holidays. The shuttle system would provide express shuttle service to each ski resort from park and ride lots/transit hubs to winter trailheads. Similarly, in summer, shuttles would provide hikers express service from park and ride/transit hubs to trailheads. The proposed shuttle system is NOT a traditional multi-stop bus service. The proposed shuttle system is one that conveniently transports individuals from park and ride lots and transit hubs to mountain locations with "express" service. The shuttles would have a limited number of stops, and in many instances would provide nonstop transit service (most notably to ski resorts). A key feature of the shuttle system would be short transfer times at park and ride lots/transit hubs and at mountain locations for return service back to the park and ride lots/transit hubs. Shuttles will need to be able to meet peak demand. The success of this system is dependent on convenience and short wait times for users. Low fares need to be a part of the system to encourage use. A shuttle system using vans and buses has the benefit of being highly flexible. The shuttle system could easily (and cheaply) be modified as demands change in the future. There needs to be an evaluation as to whether this shuttle system is publicly or privately operated (or a combination of both). There should also be an evaluation of the feasibility of a system of vans for "home to mountain" service that would augment the shuttle service described above. Such a home to mountain system would resemble an airport limousine service, with scheduled pick up and return times. The vehicles used in the shuttle system would be vehicles appropriate for mountain travel, including travel through inclement weather. Ideally, these vehicles would utilize clean fuel systems (e.g. natural gas) to minimize impacts to air quality. Coupled with the shuttle system, there should be consideration to implement "congestion pricing" for private vehicles in the Cottonwood Canyons. Congestion pricing is a market based approach to reducing congestion. Congestion pricing is utilized in power marketing, where users pay a higher price for power during "on-peak" hours. There are also many examples of congestion pricing in transportation. The adjustable rates for use of the HOV lanes on I-15 is an example of congestion pricing. Congestion pricing is being used in the European cities of London, Stockholm and Milan to reduce traffic. In these cities, private vehicles must pay a fee to enter the "high-use" area of city center during peak congestion periods. These systems have been successful in reducing traffic. Congestion pricing in the Cottonwood Canyons could be implemented during peak traffic periods to reduce the number of private vehicles during peak use periods. Private vehicles would be required to pay a "congestion fee" to drive up the Cottonwood Canyons during said peak periods. Initially, this congestion fee may only be collected on weekends and holidays during the winter season (consistent	Alta	05/01/2015
	I am concerned about the LCC plan for a railroad. Far better to have a high speed tram or large gondolas that can run 24/7 with no avalanche concerns, little environmental impact and little impact to Alta and Snowbird homeowners. Or higher capacity green buses for Hwy 210 with a large parking lot at the base to accommodate cars and perhaps a light rail station. The train idea is vastly more complicated and expensive than other viable alternatives	Alta	02/10/2015
	I am not sure that the goals of economic benefit for the Town of Alta will be realized by a transit system.	Alta	05/01/2015
	Part of the problem is that the listed purposes do not embody the need to maintain the remote nature of Little Cottonwood Canyon. The lack of development and the remoteness within 8 miles of the valley is what makes this beautiful place unique. I sit on my deck and look at Hellgate Cliff a couple of hundred yards away. It is quiet. It is beautiful. You are proposing putting a rail line between my deck and the cliff. I will hear it. I will see it. If successful and if people use the rail line, there could be many thousands of people going through Alta on their way to and from Park City from Salt Lake every day according to your data. That would be a travesty. I don't know if that would be worse than Snowbird's proposed roller coaster on Mt. Superior or not, but think about it. It is inconceivable that such a rail superhighway would be built in a treasure like Little Cottonwood Canyon.	Alta	04/03/2015
	Please give more consideration to simpler alternatives, like enforced improved bus lines.	Alta	05/01/2015
	Trains from SLC up Parleys creating a much broader loop, if you are going to tunnel through the canyons a lane for public traffic at least in a canyon evacuation scenario would be a plus	Alta	03/07/2015
	I think expanded bus service and even dedicated bus lanes would be positive. However, at this time I am not in support of connecting the Cottonwood Canyons and Park City by tunnel, gondola, or tram.	Alta, UT	04/30/2015
	Include the entire Wasatch front. Maybe the entire Wasatch should be a national rec area and cut the ski burns out. Quit catering to the rich	American fork	04/30/2015
	Salt Lake Valley The Salt Lake Valley has significant transportation issues. Our valley continues to be "car-centric" with a large number of single occupancy vehicles (SOVs) on our roads. The existing mass-transit system in the Salt Lake Valley is under-utilized and below capacity. Resources are needed to increase ridership of the existing system and reduce SOVs. Additional express bus service is needed in the Salt Lake Valley. An example of this is the need for express bus service from downtown Salt Lake City to Cottonwood Heights via 700 East and the Van Winkle Expressway. Consideration should be given to the construction of a "belt route" rail line along the east and south sides of the Salt Lake Valley. Such a rail line would connect the University of Utah to the Blue TRAX line in Sandy. Considerations should be given to lowering fares to encourage ridership on UTA buses and rail lines. Save Our Canyons believes that the greatest public benefit would be achieved by focusing investment on mass-transit in the Salt Lake Valley. Cottonwood Canyons and Mill Creek Canyon. Save Our Canyons believes the best method to implement mass transit, while preserving the wilderness character and natural habitat of these canyons, is to implement a reliable, affordable, and efficient shuttle system using vans and buses. This shuttle system would be operational year round, but would have higher capacity during peak use periods. For the resort transit hubs would also be used as boarding stations for the shuttle system. The shuttle system would be designed to provide service for all canyon visitors: resort skiers, dispersed users, hikers, resort employees, summer season visitors, and others. Current congestion problems in the Cottonwood Canyons are largely associated with ski resort operations, most notably on weekends and holidays. The shuttle system would provide express shuttle service to each ski resort from park and ride lots/transit hubs to winter trailheads. Similarly, in summer, shuttles would provide hikers express service from park and ride/transit hubs to trailheads. The proposed shuttle system is NOT a traditional multi-stop bus service. The proposed shuttle system is one that conveniently transports individuals from park and ride lots and transit hubs to mountain locations with "express" service. The shuttles would have a limited number of stops, and in many instances would provide nonstop transit service (most notably to ski resorts). A key feature of the shuttle system would be short transfer times at park and ride lots/transit hubs and at mountain locations for return service back to the park and ride lots/transit hubs. Shuttles will need to be able to meet peak demand. The success of this system is dependent on convenience and short wait times for users. Low fares need to be a part of the system to encourage use. A shuttle system using vans and buses has the benefit of being highly flexible. The shuttle system could easily (and cheaply) be modified as demands change in the future. There needs to be an evaluation as to whether this shuttle system is publicly or privately operated (or a combination of both). There should also be an evaluation of the feasibility of a system of vans for "home to mountain" service that would augment the shuttle service described above. Such a home to mountain system would resemble an airport limousine service, with scheduled pick up and return times. The vehicles used in the shuttle system would be vehicles appropriate for mountain travel, including travel through inclement weather. Ideally, these vehicles would utilize clean fuel systems (e.g. natural gas) to minimize impacts to air quality. Coupled with the shuttle system, there should be consideration to implement "congestion pricing" for private vehicles in the Cottonwood Canyons. Congestion pricing is a market based approach to reducing congestion. Congestion pricing is utilized in power marketing, where users pay a higher price for power during "on-peak" hours. There are also many examples of congestion pricing in transportation. The adjustable rates for use of the HOV lanes on I-15 is an example of congestion pricing. Congestion pricing is being used in the European cities of London, Stockholm and Milan to reduce traffic. In these cities, private vehicles must pay a fee to enter the "high-use" area of city center during peak congestion periods. These systems have been successful in reducing traffic. Congestion pricing in the Cottonwood Canyons could be implemented during peak traffic periods to reduce the number of private vehicles during peak use periods. Private vehicles would be required to pay a "congestion fee" to drive up the Cottonwood Canyons during said peak periods. Initially, this congestion fee may only be collected on weekends and holidays during the winter season (consistent	American Fork	04/14/2015
	If the train costs \$4 Billion, then why not just build a \$4 Billion Park City Airport and really protect the canyons with no train at all. We'd still get the ski tourism boost and have 2 great airports. A Park City Airport is probably the best solution.	American Fork, UT	02/22/2015
	Mandatory public transportation for anyone that is not a full-time resident of the area.	Berkeley	04/30/2015
	email comments submitted	Big Cottonwood Canyon	05/01/2015
	Any transportation corridor that proposes to connect the Wasatch front and back (other than Parley's canyon) must face the utmost scrutiny from economic, environmental, and common sense viewpoints. The north-south Wasatch crest is a natural barrier that is not amenable to being short-circuited for short-term economic gain and convenience. I applaud and I am in favor of reducing pollution in the Cottonwood canyons, however making the Cottonwood canyons a throughway to the Wasatch back is an invitation to disaster and an open door to massive further development (especially the Guardsmans Pass area) in the very area that must be protected. I am against any new right-of-way up either of the Cottonwood canyon bottoms for additional transportation modes as proposed as an alternative. The existing roadway must be able to support any selected alternative transportation mode. Mitigation of environmental impact and scenic degradation would be impossible. Any transport is completely impractical except within ski resort boundaries (not between ski resorts, or between ski resorts and ski resorts). Mass transit in the form of efficient, nimble, clean, and convenient multi-passenger vehicles is the only viable alternate I can see. The drawback to this is that there must be adequate dispersed parking for riders. This doesn't mean a massive parking lot at the base of each canyon road.	Bluffdale, UT	03/31/2015
	Thx for the opportunity to contribute. Good luck. mm	Boise, Id	03/06/2015
	Mountain resorts in Europe have had rail access for several generations - I was pleasantly surprised to see a light rail option considered for Little Cottonwood Canyon - The worst part of a ski day at Alta is the drive back down the canyon.	Bountiful	04/30/2015
	I would favor in particular new dedicated biking lanes to be added which provide safe passage for cyclists to venture into the canyons. I also feel that as public transportation into Little Cottonwood is upgraded, that automobile access should be limited to those who are either staying in the canyon overnight, or by special permit. Day users and resort workers in the canyon should be required to use the public transportation.	Bountiful, Utah	03/14/2015
	There are a number of options that all lead to almost the same desired end..to make the whole area open to those who wish to explore. It is not so much how many tourists will complete a tour or exchange..it is the perception of this whole that is important.	Bradenton, Florida	04/29/2015
	Car pool	Breckenridge	05/01/2015
	Not sure if the tunnel idea between Alta and Brighton is a good idea. Might be better to only link these two canyons by lifts. Do we really need cars travelling from one canyon area to the other?	Brighton	04/27/2015
	A trail/rail system with limited stops from downtown SLC/SLC airport, up LCC (stopping at Alta and SB), through a tunnel into BCC (stopping at Brighton parking lot) through a tunnel to Park City (stopping in downtown PC) - is the best option for transportation, the environment, preservation, recreation, and all of the interested economies. With a rail system you will discourage driving, and better control mountain Access with limited stops, not only for skiers but for all recreation and mountain enjoyment. The European countries which share the Alps also care deeply about their mountains and preserving the environments, rely on the mountains for recreation - and they are completely dependent on well thought-out train systems that very delicately transport millions of people through a very well preserved environment.	Brighton Utah	03/17/2015
	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. 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. 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 to the airports to the ski lift in Zermatt or Chamouix. 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. 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. 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. 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! 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. 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.	Brighton Utah	03/16/2015

Scale it back. Add park and ride space at the base of little and big. Increase city bus service to those park and ride spots. Add year round bus service up both canyons both early in the morning and late at night. Rail to PC, sure. And call it good. Why waste so much money installing and maintaining rail from PC to Little Cottonwood???	Brighton, UT	02/09/2015
I don't see that any of the proposals look favorable, they disregard the environmental issues that are of concern, such as continued deterioration of the watershed, noise and future impact issues.	Brighton, Utah	03/06/2015
Without substantial Funding from the Government, all alternatives besides Option B (Busses) appear to be totally unrealistic cost wise. Tunnels to utilize more vehicle traffic do not appear to be environmentally sound. Aerial Trams and Lite Rail do not appear to have the capacity realities that will actually aid this problem. Vast bus systems like in Zion Park that are mandatory appear to be the only realistic option. HOV use needs to be monitored and allowing people to pay extra money (as is seen on I-15) not only are detrimental to the ecological goals for HOV use, but are actually counterproductive on all levels. Enforcement for dedicated use of true HOV use is essential.	Brighton, Utah #4121	05/01/2015
Please consider a high-efficiency bus system vs. a cog-rail or funicular rail system for Little Cottonwood Canyon.	c.h.c., #4121	03/16/2015
Adding transportation lines (or expanding roads) is not an environmentally sound way of protecting our watershed. Inevitably grease, oil and other non-biodegradables will leak out. Perhaps we could look at making the roads up Big and Little one-lane with a 15-20 mph limit. Hand the rest of the space over to cyclists. Then install a light rail or all electric BRT system up an extra lane. By keeping the system all electric we can easily decrease the amount of petroleum based products that reach into the environment. The emissions will also be outsourced to the easiest to control source (the power plant). The lower speed limit on the road will act as a further incentive for individuals to use the alternative transportation mode.	Cottonwood Heights	03/02/2015
Choice B of BRT for Little / Park City corridor is the best choice. Do this first and reassess. It is very likely that with a good BRT, the needs are met. The Airport and Summit County proposals look good. Thank you very much for the opportunity to provide feedback. Please listen to the citizens, rather than the developers and those who will gain financially or politically. We owe it to the future generations to preserve this very unique resource. Once it's gone, it gone.	COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS	02/09/2015
Cleaner running buses.	Cottonwood Heights	03/16/2015
Creating tunnels with minimal impact is preferable to running aerial trams across the mountains.	Cottonwood Heights	02/05/2015
Drop the tunnel or tram idea and you'll have some good ideas that remain	Cottonwood Heights	02/27/2015
Emphasis should be on improving public transportation systems with current infrastructure.	Cottonwood Heights	05/01/2015
Expanded Bus service meets or exceeds 13 of the 14 criteria. This is a inexpensive option that would not destroy Little Cottonwood Canyon.	cottonwood heights	03/13/2015
Get ONE Wasatch on the table!	Cottonwood Heights	02/12/2015
I am against any train up little or big cottonwood canyons. Shuttle service up mill creek? Most people will drive.	Cottonwood heights	04/26/2015
I am delighted that the blueprint limits more development in the canyons, but I would favor giving incentives to use natural gas buses and do not support light rail, train or tunnels.	Cottonwood Heights	04/26/2015
I believe a train system in LCC will look fancy and slick - but will not work (see my questions above), and will become a huge tax burden on Utah residents	Cottonwood Heights	03/05/2015
I fail to see how establishing a transit-only winter connection (perhaps Guardsman's toll road for private vehicles) does not merit further consideration. Transportation system management alternatives would best serve ALL the needs of the Cottonwood Canyons. Up/down canyon transit and protection is a wise investment just not cross-canyon invasive infrastructure. Cross-canyon connections would saddle the local economy with a tourist-serving boondoggle that is only used for a fraction of the year. Travel reliability in inclement weather and the delay related to avalanche are an inevitable part of the skiing experience. The urgency to provide alternative evacuation routes seems like a straw man motivation as these canyons, for the most part, have never been connected for years. Cross-canyon connections are the antithesis of preserving the community character. Improved transit connections (regardless of mode) from SLC to PC would be a wise investment however NOT through the Cottonwood Canyons.	Cottonwood Heights	02/05/2015
I strongly oppose putting a light rail up Little Cottonwood Canyon and tunnels to connect the canyons. I also oppose any ski interlink between the resorts as proposed by One Wasatch. Transportation development should have a minimal impact on the environment, which these would not. I support using increased bus service for summer access to the canyons and use of Guardsman Pass to connect Big Cottonwood Canyon with Park City.	Cottonwood Heights	03/29/2015
I think more attention should be paid to the idea of Salt Lake to Park City light rail, that seems an afterthought to this current proposal. This is both beneficial for the larger community and moves more commuters where they already are, while giving greater access to the resorts at PC, instead of so much focus on expanding commuters into the already cramped Cottonwood canyons.	Cottonwood Heights	02/04/2015
I think that the impact of LRT up Little Cottonwood could potentially damage/limit the trail and outdoor experience. I think that improving the Guardsman road for year round use (at least as a stepping stone) should be reconsidered.	Cottonwood Heights	05/02/2015
Ideas to improve communication between SLC and the airport and Park City are much more acceptable as there is a large and existing corridor up I-80 that can be piggy-backed with less environmental impact. Use that. Don't link LCC or BCC to each other or to the Park City side. Please, please please don't ruin LCC or BCC. Park City is already commercial. LCC and BCC are quaint and special and small and limited. That's the beauty and the magic of those areas. Let Park City be the "Vail of Utah" and let LCC and BCC be local treasures.	Cottonwood Heights	03/06/2015
If a train would be built up LCC I could see that as a viable alternative. The current bus systems is rarely if ever actually on time, the park and ride is almost always full, and hitchhiking up the canyon is easier, faster, more reliable, and more pleasant than a bus ride. It makes me wary that the proposed alternatives all look at increasing users in the canyons. They're already tight, please don't make them tighter.	Cottonwood Heights	04/07/2015
I'm happy with what I've seen thus far. BCC will be challenging.	Cottonwood Heights	04/08/2015
I'm neutral on this because I don't see data backing up the proposed alternatives. I am opposed to aerial connectivity between the Cottonwoods and Park City (destroys view shed).	Cottonwood Heights	03/06/2015
In the little cottonwood corridor I do not believe that options a, b and c meet purposes 8, and 13, which as I said above are really 2 of the 5 actually useful stated purposes. I would also need to see data to convince me that alternatives a and b would actually meet purposes 3 and 11. That doesn't seem like very good agreement to me. It seems like some combination of D and F could best meet the needs. De-incentivize driving, use the revenue from this to increase frequency and decrease cost of buses, and provide convenient parking in locations that are acceptable.	cottonwood heights	04/24/2015
Increase bus service in mixed traffic up Little Cottonwood Canyon is the best option and fills most of the purposes. NO extra Lanes or a Train up Little Cottonwood Canyon.	cottonwood heights	04/29/2015
Increase bus service up Little Cottonwood Canyon. It DOES meet most of the Corridor purposes.	cottonwood heights	04/29/2015
Increase bus service is the only acceptable idea. Your corridor purposes seem to be written to only support destructive extra Lanes or a Train.	Cottonwood Heights	05/01/2015
Increasing bus service in mixed traffic with fare free natural gas or electric buses with multiple stops in off ski seasons would certainly satisfy almost all the purposes, why does the "purposes and alternatives" document say it only addresses one?	cottonwood heights	04/30/2015
Keep guard road open year round. No trams, no tunnels. No connection between Alta and others except by ski or foot. That will win in everyone's favor.	Cottonwood Heights	03/12/2015
light rail up little cottonwood makes sense, but there's no need to connect to park city. there is zero need to connect the back with the front (by lift or tunnel). anything connection between summit county (deer valley, vail) and the cottonwoods is strictly for tourism. I'd gladly pay \$345 per year per person to NOT bring more tourists to the cottonwood canyons.	Cottonwood Heights	02/24/2015
More frequent Buses up Little Cottonwood Canyon meets 13 of the 14 criteria. This is the only transportation idea that should move forward for LCC.	Cottonwood Heights	03/16/2015
Nearly all of these options would greatly impact the homes of people in Granite, Cottonwood Heights, and lower Little Cottonwood. These home owners have purchased in these location to be closer to the mountains and the peacefulness they provide. I'm interested to see how and where these means of transportation would start and end. Light rail and Bus seem to be the best options but also see to have the greatest impact on space and noise pollution.	Cottonwood Heights	04/26/2015
No extra lanes and no trains/tunnels. Buses only. Especially up LCC.	Cottonwood Heights	03/19/2015
No linking resorts and no tunnels please	Cottonwood Heights	05/01/2015
Rail or Aerial Little - Big - PC - Bus Parleys.	Cottonwood Heights	02/11/2015
See above.	Cottonwood Heights	03/09/2015
See other note	Cottonwood Heights	03/13/2015
Shuttle in mill will need to accommodate dogs and bikes. Need to clarify why light rail is not considered an option in Big. Need to understand better where transportation hubs would be located with impact statements for the proposed area.	Cottonwood Heights	03/15/2015
Stop while you still can.	Cottonwood heights	03/27/2015
The ski areas in Big & Little Cottonwood Canyons should provide a park&ride location and a charter bus service for all the employees...that would help with parking and traffic in the canyons. A good start. Next could be a charge to enter the canyon with a car...similar to paying to go up Mill Creek Canyon.	Cottonwood Heights	03/16/2015
This is about the future and all options need consideration. The goal is to preserve what we have for generations to come to enjoy. To ultimately achieve this we need to move away from the single passenger in a car model and move to a more viable and economically friendly combination of public or shared transportation.	Cottonwood Heights	03/12/2015
To misquote Mr. Spock: All your alternatives indicate a reliance on two dimensional thinking--or 20 year development thinking, as the case may be. Just like the Cottonwood Canyons, engineering the correct right of ways should be the point of the short (5-7 year) game. Getting mass transit off the freeways and into properly designed, weather protected (and up there, perhaps subsurface would make the most sense) right of ways should be the focus. But rail is far too expensive--not to mention that evolving technologies will make it obsolete. 19th century solution, yes?	Cottonwood Heights	03/03/2015
USE HIGH SPEED BUSES IN ALL CANYONS AND PARK CITY, NO TRAINS	Cottonwood Heights	03/12/2015
We don't need more roads. We need viable mass transit. Trains and tunnels would be the best, albeit not the cheapest. The backcountry land would remain intact, and transportation would be solved. And if it eventually connects to the East side of the Range toward Heber, the mountains local population could now chose to live in a way cheaper community and help spread the population growth of the SLC Valley.	Cottonwood Heights	04/29/2015
We have to be careful what we wish for. Who and how do we determine saturation? over use? multiple and compatible uses(s)? live here and am in the canyons daily. I am a stakeholder.	Cottonwood Heights	03/12/2015
Would favor transit options that would decrease private vehicle use in the Cottonwood Canyons.	Cottonwood Heights	03/12/2015
Year round bus service is the best alternative.	Cottonwood Heights	05/01/2015
Yes. Why did you take more buses off the list it does meet almost all of the purposes? This is the kind of thing that makes it all look corrupt.	cottonwood heights	04/29/2015
You list many alternatives for the future, but I'm wondering if it would be valuable to have a transition plan that provides immediate benefits and still works towards a long term more comprehensive objective in a phasing approach.	Cottonwood Heights	02/27/2015
You seemed to ignore the, increased bus service idea, even though it fit most of the criteria. That makes Mountain Accord look very bad.	cottonwood heights	04/29/2015
You should be considering how to get out of the whole idea.	Cottonwood heights	03/17/2015
You should consider additional alternatives.	Cottonwood Heights	03/02/2015
A monorail system going up big cottonwood canyon would be a challenge both financially and logistically but it could be a very environmentally sound solution and could be a good connection for all the ski resorts.	Cottonwood Heights	02/12/2015
We really need to consider additional alternatives to regulating land use. Putting more people on the winter slopes will only generate more economic development until the first disaster or the dissatisfaction that comes when overcrowding the mountain tips results in an unpleasant experience on the "greatest snow on earth." And we especially need to consider other/additional alternatives before our drinking water, our clean air, our environment, and our other mountain resources (for example...fishing, hunting, hiking, biking, camping, solitude, etc.) no longer support our population.	Cottonwood Heights City	04/21/2015
I support public transit expansion (busses) to limit private car travel/parking in the canyons. I do not support trams or tunnels to connect resorts or canyons.	Cottonwood Heights, UT	04/18/2015
Some of the alternatives are too damaging to the watershed, such as bigger roads with dedicated bus lanes, etc.	Cottonwood Heights, Utah	03/05/2015
Don't hurt the rock climbing boulders or cliffs, please.	Cottonwood Heights, Utah	05/01/2015
I repeat my statements above here and for the same reasons.	Cottonwood Heights, Utah	03/15/2015
Only issue is where are 2 additional travel lanes or a rail system put without destroying the visual splendor of the canyon	Cottonwood Heights	02/10/2015
These enhancements encourage further loading of the resource. Unless access is somehow restricted and implemented, these alternative only exacerbate the problem over time. I am very much in favor of reducing vehicle travel in these areas, but only if access is somehow limited. I also feel that those (ski areas, etc...) should pay the lions share of the expense that would result from these implementations. They are the economic beneficiaries in this scheme.	Cottonwood heights	02/05/2015
I think that in all circumstances an ariel links between the resorts for both winter and summer would be huge improvement for the pedestrian (skiers and hikers). I would combine this with light rail.	Deer Valley part of year. Otherwise London	02/05/2015

	As a tax paying snowboarder, I find any expansion of Alta extremely offensive. How dare you try to even further limit accessibility in the Wasatch. This plan is a direct attack on snowboarders and shows the extent that discrimination is accepted in Utah.	Don't worry about it	04/30/2015
	For one thing remove the transit connection from Alta to Brighton (no road, tunnel, or tram). That is a pristine area and any public access road access will destroy it. If the proposed transit route from Brighton to Park City exploits Guardsman Pass, I would consider that. A road already exists (albeit the Guardsman pass section would need improvement as proposed). This would permit transportation over the mountain to park city without having to access Parleys.	Draper	03/16/2015
	LRT is not economically nor environmentally appropriate. If large investments must be made then Guardsman Road is the most sensible of the large projects listed.	Draper	04/05/2015
	Stewardship of our Watershed Health and Recreation Resources vs Killing the Goose that laid the Golden Egg. Elements of the Wasatch Accord "proposed blueprint" are very good, but some of the options still under consideration represent significant short sighted folly, in my view. The Express bus service to Park City is a very good decision. Use of NG and low emissions buses would make it even better. Relative to access into Little Cottonwood or Big Cottonwood, managed access with preference and significant incentive for express bus (low emission) into the canyons makes great sense. Several options on the transportation table will almost certainly exceed the carrying capacity of a healthy watershed, resulting in degradation of the mountain recreation experience and healthy watershed. While the Wasatch Accord and blueprint study notes the trips to the Wasatch are nearly 2x that of Zion NP and population pressure is expected to increase many times over in the future, all but one of the transit alternatives are based on the premiss that added transportation of more people is better. Quite the contrary. Look at the heralded successful approach of Zion. Leadership and stewardship of the Wasatch would emulate that successful approach of managed access to retain the recreation experience and health of the ecosystem. Notably, Zion does not have the same pristine drinking water supply water quality resource to protect, yet the value of a reliable and high quality water supply in the Wasatch will increase dramatically to supply the growth in the region. The only sustainable transportation options are those which recognize and honor the healthy population carrying capacity of the mountain watershed, both in terms of vehicles coming up the canyon, but also in the safe number of people who can and should be "extracting" recreational resource value from the area. Do we want an experience that boasts 80,000 persons on the mountain a day with respective "footprint" of deleterious impact on the recreation and local environment, or a healthy experience which boasts a quality recreation and quality watershed health? The transportation decision we make will dictate the protection or decimation of our resource, and respective value we receive in return. What is the healthy carrying capacity, and what is the transportation management scheme which assures that? That is the question and strategy we should follow.	draper	02/15/2015
	The proposal relieves economic congestion to the Park City area, in exchange for land protections surrounding the Park City area. It 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, developers will benefit wildly with large property/business owners, while local, Salt Lake Valley people stand little to gain.	Draper	03/06/2015
	The proposed plan does not address the poor cycling transit routes on the east side of the Salt Lake Valley. There are no safe east-west bicycle lanes between I-80 and south of Fort Union Blvd. And there is no way to commute by bike north-south to a fixed-rail transportation option. I would like to see an option where I can safely ride from Wasatch Blvd to the Murray FrontRunner station. The bike-to-bus-to-Trax-to-FrontRunner-to-Utah County is too long, cumbersome, and expensive. It's cheaper, faster, and easier to drive by myself.	East Millcreek	02/05/2015
	The LRT approach is the best, long-term solution to this issue. More buses just kicks the can down the road and has the same environmental impact as expanding the roadbed for trains.	East Millcreek Township	02/05/2015
	Jason Hammond I would like to see an underground rail system going up Little Cottonwood Canyon that connects Alta, Snowbird and Big Cottonwood resorts and continues over to Park City. This system would cost more but the long term benefits and savings would be worth it. People need to understand that not just skiers will benefit, but essentially everyone who wants to visit these areas for whatever reason year round would have this option. If we made the underground system big enough and fast enough, people would also use it for work commuting between SLC and Park City. This could eliminate the future need for a rail system up I-80. An underground auto traffic and pollutant removal system would eliminate the future need for snowplows and the environmental damage to the canyons due to roads closed/avalanche etc, create faster arrival times than autos, negate parking issues, and minimal impact on the environment because we can bury the system and replant over the underground rail line. People from Ogden to Provo could take light rail from their home cities to the underground train up Little Cottonwood canyon year round to resorts, cities and shopping in Big and Little Cottonwoods and on to Park City.	Farmington	02/26/2015
	Imposing fees for driving cars in the canyons is a realistic disincentive to drivers and would push people to use public transportation such as buses.	Granite	02/12/2015
	Leave it alone.	Granite	02/04/2015
	Digging tunnels is NOT the solution!! We need to incentivize people to use the already existing transit, ie if you ride the bus to ski you get X off your ticket/pass...or creating a lane that is strictly bus access so if we drive we can see the obvious benefit to taking the bus. A tunnel to Park City is not cost or environmentally effective...why not work to create a routine all day bus system up/down Parley's that would not only serve skiers but also people that work in PCS/LC. Bottom line, unfortunately, we are a very "ME" focused society, so we need to find a way to convince people that using public transit is beneficial to "ME", ie. I can do work and respond to txt and email on my way to ski and take care of business so my ski day can be that much longer, and I don't risk being a distracted driver!	Heber	05/01/2015
	I cannot envision a train or connection to the Wasatch Back. That will just bring too many people into wilderness areas and will encroach on wildlife habitats.	Heber City	04/09/2015
	Reducing auto use and all residual affects is still the goal. Deciding on a tram system from Sandy vs. a tram from Park City to the Cottonwoods shouldn't be considered. Neither is the correct choice. KEEP THE EXISTING BACKCOUNTRY - BACKCOUNTRY! Do not touch our jewel. Only work to acquire private lands to designate them a protected federal lands.	Heber City	03/26/2015
	Some really dumb ideas.	Heber City	02/10/2015
	When you plan on ruining something you definitely have a great plan go with it!	Heriman	02/10/2015
	I think the plans need to recognize that the canyons are used in three distinct ways: 1--Summer. Fewer visitors doing many different things. Parking lots are often full. People are going to many various locations. Traffic is not a major problem (now) but access points are generally insufficient. Note full lots at most hiking trails, notably those in the Albion Basin. 2--Winter, typical day. Current transportation and access seems to be working well. 3--Winter, holiday and weekend. This is the current problem. Too much traffic and environmental impact. However, this really is only a few days a year.	Heriman, UT	03/11/2015
	Guardsman's pass already connect BCC to park city, why not just pave the dirt sections and plow it in the winter and only allow busses to connect people along guardsman's pass? A train is just flat out excessive and would be way to disruptive to the mountain environment. I think a better idea would be to have something similar to what they do at Zions national park, where you park and take the bus to where you want to go and no cars are allowed. You could have a big parking garage where the current park and ride is at the base of BCC and have busses that go up both canyons all day and restrict all cars, or add a significant fee to drive a car up like \$30 or something.	Highland	04/16/2015
	Keep our environment intact...no trains or trams!	Highland	04/16/2015
	The fastest growing areas along the Wasatch Front is Utah County, and this is where a third of the Wasatch Front lives today. I would like to see more options for getting to the ski areas from Utah County. For instance, a single ski lift and parking lot near Tibble Fork Reservoir in American Fork Canyon to Mineral Basin/Snowbird may alleviate drive traffic up to LCC/BCC/PC by a third.	Highland	03/12/2015
	Express Bus in any canyon is a difficult ride. The roads are curvy and it's hard to see out windows all the time. Would rather see more ariel transportation or light rail.	holladay	02/04/2015
	Great meeting Monday night Feb 23, at Alta. Some ideas mentioned during the meeting have helped me clarify my position in support of bus rapid transit. I believe the engineering concept of putting a train up Little Cottonwood Canyon to solve the sometimes chronic car traffic issues must be considered separately from the engineering concept of connecting Alta with Park City through a tunnel. Accepting bus rapid transit in a dedicated third lane, along with possible snowsheds and highway realignment away from the biggest avalanche slopes, need not require nor rule out the underground tunnel to the Backside. The underground tunnel solution tying the three communities of Alta and Brighton to Park City must be considered independently of the hill-climbing cog railway proposal. A transit solution that does not require a central railway yard in Salt Lake Valley could function independently as a closed loop system, wholly underground, with daily maintenance performed at a service facility that is part of the terminus. It would not need to go up and down the canyon. The underground environment in a tunnel is at constant temperature, protected from the weather. This is nothing like outdoor highways and rail lines. A cog-rail train pulling a string of cars adequate for canyon travel is costly over-engineering in a tunnel. Furthermore, it can provide prompt travel demand that a queue of, say, driverless, programmed shuttles based on technological advances which might become reality within the next decade. An electric shuttle car system on a simple loop track would be economically practical in a tunnel. Please note I am not arguing in favor of a tunnel, only that it should be offered as a choice separate from solving the red snake of cars problem. Transportation choices must not be limited to transportation hardware manufactured for other legacy projects. Choosing bus rapid transit now, instead of a cog railway, allows the dedicated highway lane to be used in the future by some yet-to-be-invented UberLyft pod car solution that doesn't require a canyon parking space, computer dispatched to you and a few friend's locations to autonomously carpool up the canyon and to be available for your return at a scheduled time at the end of the day. When canyon residents, visitors and FOA supporters, think about whether or not they want the interconnect to Park City, they should understand it is a completely separate issue from the Alta highway. The discussion of the best transit modality for Little Cottonwood Canyon needn't be influenced by the OneWasatch interconnect decision. Instead, the conversation can be about land conservation, watershed preservation, how to keep Alta's end-of-canyon experience intact, and how not to love Alta too much. We must make it clear that the choices don't need to be driven by trains. As Sheridan so eloquently argues, community values, economic growth, and quality of life choices are far more important than fixed asset infrastructure investments intended merely to gain competitive marketing advantages	Holladay	02/24/2015
	I like that there are a variety of options being presented. Which one is the best, I'd need more information to determine, but I think that the discussion is on the right track.	Holladay	04/29/2015
	I think the range of transportation alternatives for the Cottonwood Canyons and for the I-80 corridor are good. The range of alternatives for the Summit County connectors is too narrow.	Holladay	05/01/2015
	In 2010 I uprooted my family and changed a 20-year professional course to experience life and raise my children in the Wasatch mountains. I have recreated extensively in the backcountry since that time and consider myself as close to a native Utahn as one can be if not born here. Though I appreciate the Mountain Accord effort and goals, the bottom line is simple. When it comes to the wilderness, the concept of compromise is unreasonable. The human footprint on the backcountry should be minimized in order to preserve the wilderness experience for all to benefit. Destroying the backcountry for the purpose of development and economic benefit should be avoided at all costs. To do otherwise would ruin the unique aspect of our home--living in a thriving metropolis that allows incredible proximate access to a pristine wilderness experience. I support the goals of the Accord, but discourage an attempt to link Big and Little Cottonwood canyons and their resorts to Park City and theirs. Charles Katz, M.D.	Holladay	05/01/2015
	In terms of the cottonwoods, you should forget about connecting them with park city and each other. And instead think about enhancing the bus system and perhaps restricting single ride passenger vehicles. The problem is not because you can't drive to solitude from Alta or from Park City to Brighton. The problem is the popularity of Little cottonwood and the said traffic and high use of that canyon.	Holladay	03/11/2015
	It's pretty clear that the skiing industry is driving this, as the issue of connectivity between Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons is mainly a wintertime issue. Same goes for Park City to Big Cottonwood Canyon. Hence all funding for any solution should be via a ski ticket tax. Switching non-winter transportation to buses will solve your list of problems without costing that taxpayers. Those who want this should be willing to pay for it. Failure of this is grounds to kill Mountain Accord.	Holladay	03/04/2015
	Keeping our Cottonwood Canyons wild will entice those who really want to be in them and who will protect them as stewards of our environment. Do not increase transportation ability to the Cottonwood Canyons. Do not build a train up the canyon. Do not widen the roads. Do not tunnel through the mountain. Do not build a gondola over the mountain. We do not need new evacuation routes. If the mountains are kept as mountains and not as commercial centers then the people will come. Do not encourage the decimation of our children's playground by those who would take advantage of our natural bounty and leave it worse than they found it over and over and over.	Holladay	04/30/2015
	Light rail and tunnel building will only limit the access to the canyons or will excessively crowd the canyon.	Holladay	03/16/2015
	Once again: Extending TRAX up I-80 to Park City makes a lot of sense. The other options -- the ones that seem to be at the top of the stack -- not so much. Depending how they play out, they support either a Disneyized outdoor experience (not a plus!), or the privatization of the upper Wasatch.	Holladay	04/15/2015
	Please keep as much of the ski traffic as possible in Parley's canyon (already aesthetically degraded by I-80 construction). If an additional link must be built in Little Cottonwood, please design it so that it won't make traffic worse by offering an attractive way to get to Park City resorts.	Holladay	04/24/2015
	Rail is preferable to buses for public transit. Tunnels should be used as much as possible to preserve the landscape, especially between Little Cottonwood Canyon and Park City. A loop is preferable to a terminus and the turnaround logistics involved. Direct connection between ski resorts should not be a priority for the system.	Holladay	02/08/2015
	Scenarios should limit the number of personal vehicles in the canyons and reward environmentally friendly transportation behaviors.	Holladay	05/01/2015
	See prior comment	Holladay	03/12/2015

	The Cottonwood Canyons suffer from too many cars. Provide low cost valley parking and demand pricing for resort parking with economical Express Bus Rapid Transit from an inter-modal transit hub located at the Wasatch Blvd gravel pit up both Cottonwood canyons. Provide an exclusive Bus Only lane alongside two normal opposing highway lanes. The bus lane could allow uphill express buses in the mornings and downhill express buses in the afternoons. Morning down-canyon and afternoon up-canyon buses would travel with the car traffic as usual. Several snow sheds to cover the road at critical avalanche zones would increase safety and allow the road to open more quickly on powder days. This transit system could suffice until the underground section is completed, then the proposed cog rail tracks could be connected coming up from the valley to finish the loop.	Holladay	02/10/2015
	The proposals don't include an option that is NOT aggressive. Honestly, I don't feel like the system is that in need of major change... however, it seems as though the only proposals or alternatives involve major changes. I've lived in Utah for over 30 yrs and have only seen the need for minor tweaks and changes. These major changes have ulterior motives written all over them.	Holladay	02/17/2015
	There is not adequate information on the proposed new transit systems to make an assessment.	Holladay	02/12/2015
	Yes! There is no alternative to leave the Wasatch Front and Wasatch Back unconnected (where transportation improvements would end at the top of Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons). This must be considered for the purposes of preservation and protection of the environment and our water resources, as well as preserving existing backcountry recreation experiences. Economically, it may not be necessary to make this connection either. Also, there should be an alternative that does not connect Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. In addition to the reasons listed above, it will significantly change the visual resources of each canyon, as well as the opportunities for solitude and each unique canyon experience. We should consider leaving more canyons unconnected. This connection of canyons seems to be driven by the ski industry (and I'm a skier!) but it will significantly change the Wasatch. The motivations for connecting the canyons should be seriously examined. In addition, for the impacts of these connections to be fully disclosed in the EIS, you must have alternatives that examine fewer or no connections.	Holladay, Utah	03/03/2015
	see above	Ivins, UT	03/13/2015
	Having alternative transportation to Quinn's and Kimball Jct's, sounds like it would create more congestion in those areas accommodating traffic and parking though it would alleviate traffic into PC. Focus should be on connecting communities where the work force lives (outside PC or SLC) so driving to a parking area is less necessary, and transporting tourists to major ski areas w/o the need of a car. We are still envisioning a future where the car and our individual convenience is paramount to preserving the rural surroundings. My vote is for increasing mass transit in whatever form : rail. bus Forget the aerial tram connection.	Kamas	03/28/2015
	I would suggest that rail is of higher priority as it is better on the environmental impact as well as ridership levels. This also encourages more usage of the canyon without increasing traffic in the canyons directly.	Keams	04/30/2015
	See above comment.	Kimball Junction	04/29/2015
	Salt Lake city would benefit by the development of a well designed parking facility with hotel and condominiums at the base of the 2 cottonwood Canyon with and express bus service to the ski areas and lockers to store ski equipment so that skiers from Salt Lake or out of town could ski on short notice, have parking and rent locker space, hotel rooms or condominiums. This would most benefit all, without dunning the state and Federal taxpayers for some real estate developers in Park City.	Kingsville	04/15/2015
	The theme of my comments is seeming to be repetitive with regards to transportation - focus on improving experiences within the footprint of the existing infrastructure.	Lahaina, HI	03/16/2015
	Eliminate existing roads, convert one or more to electric rail only.	Layton	02/06/2015
	Never build rail.	Layton	04/12/2015
	Nowhere do I see discussion of base-of-the-canyon parking for access to the rail systems (or bus rapid transit). The current park and ride system is overwhelmed. Park at the canyon base park and ride on a busy day, and every bus that comes by is already full. So aggravating. There needs to be a plan for large numbers of vehicles to park, then access the trains and/or buses.	Layton	05/01/2015
	I am upset to see that increased bus capacity is not being pushed forward. A rail system is likely to cause extensive damage to the landscape, some of the world class bouldering in the area, and again makes no provisions for displaced users.	Layton, UT	03/30/2015
	Is the "vision" achievable without a ski lift interconnect? Could existing ski areas achieve greater profits by abandoning the interconnect concept and instead expanding on the best available terrain? I expect the latter is the case. As far as I know, no one has compared the two alternatives.	Lebanon, N.H.	03/07/2015
	Transportation is the key and needs to include some modest increase in capacity up/down the canyons during peak winter times. Big/Little Cottonwood need to be increased to three TOTAL lanes, use two up in the morning and one down then switch to two down in the afternoon with one up during the winter season. During the summer season use only one lane up and down and use the third lane for bikes and other non-motorized travel.	Lehi	04/30/2015
	NO LANES NO TRAINS UP LITTLE COTTONWOOD CANYON. There are more options that are less permanent and damaging! As tax payers we do not support this! The Ski resorts want this they should be the ones accountable! they should pay not us! they are the ones who are the reasons for more than Half the traffic up little cottonwood canyon from their employees! Make them provide a way for them to get them to work by using the public transit already in place provide more opportunities to use it! Also! the traffic is only bad about 12 days out of the whole year... and only for a couple hours in the morning and evening... Sounds alot like a classic commute on the freeway! there is still rush hour even with all kinds of public transportation there will still be congestion in LCC with or without a train! The ski resorts have state money to mandate anyone to take the public transportation! maybe you should look into that! NO LANES NO TRAINS UP LITTLE COTTONWOOD CANYON. We should not pay so you can make it big and we will use the use of our canyon! Also many people live in the canyon and you are doing nothing to protect those residence! NO LANES NO TRAINS UP LITTLE COTTONWOOD CANYON. Pollution is just not carbon it comes from multiple things and you are ignoring those! Noise, and Trash, will increase dramatically! also Trains run on energy... energy sounds so clean but behind the plug is a coal plant more energy more coal being burned coal pollutes more than cars! so many have told you your process is flawed stop ignoring us! Just because you have people with big money on your side does not in anyway make it allowable to push us aside for your Olympic agenda ( in 2002 they decided that LLC was too delicate for the Olympics... that still has not changed!) NO LANES NO TRAINS UP LITTLE COTTONWOOD CANYON.	Logan	03/02/2015
	Your "listed purposes" need adjustment. You are not looking out for the public's benefit, you are looking out for what the Cummings want. Busses! Consider busses! Busses are the correct alternative. I do not want the Olympics up Little Cottonwood Canyon. I do not want the canyon destroyed to move people into other canyons. No trains and no extra lanes up Little Cottonwood Canyon. Help the general public, not the fat cats. Your purposes and criteria need to be adjusted.	Logan Utah	03/10/2015
	I feel that we don't need quite the extension on the public transit part. It seems to me that buses and shuttles should be our focus not so much on the tunnels light rail or trains maybe one train to Park city, but not tunnels etc.	Magna	02/07/2015
	See above.	Menlo Park, CA and St. Paul, MN	02/11/2015
	Charge fees -- not do we want to become California? The wilderness is for all to enjoy if they are able or have an interest to do so. Imposing a fee limits that use. Is that the goal? I have not visited Millcreek canyon since a fee was imposed - I used to hike / ski there often- but no more -- has the fee improved what is there -- no! Bus service no cars -- where will we park how often will they run where will they stop how late will they run will there be exceptions for property owners as there is now for their dogs? Rail service same set of questions. Tunnel just stupid and cost is over the top. Connecting the Park City bedroom to the cottonwoods just adds to the problems! Cars - People - Pollution- and last but not least more development! Aerial transportation-- not a viable idea at all and who would it serve -- the resorts not those who use the lower reaches of the Cottonwoods.	Midval, Utah	03/26/2015
	no ridge line trams for transportation, this is an eye sore for our beautiful mountains and a danger to migrating raptors, etc. I like the idea of rail transit through the canyons to reduce automobile traffic but ONLY as long as it can be done with little impact to the environment and safe for wildlife (any possibility of running that train up the canyon underground, maybe directly under the existing roadway?? This would cost more for sure, but would be safer for people and wildlife, cause less damage in the canyons themselves, and would be a solution without the canyons visually looking any different with the train running under the road that is already there.	Midvale	02/15/2015
	I strongly suggest starting small and monitoring the reaction. An example could be to provide parking at the bottom of the canyons with regular bus service to the resorts. Partial financial support could come from charging by the carload (tolls) to use the roads. If nothing else, it would encourage car-pooling. Consider a 3-level charge for cars: zero for EV, 50% for hybrid and 100% for normal fuel. Trucks: 50% for NG, 100% for the rest. If this works, avalanche covers and trains might be more likely to succeed. Adding a third lane doesn't really reduce traffic volume. I don't see any real value.	Midway	04/28/2015
	The canyons get a lot of snow, they have avalanches. Putting a rail system above ground in the canyons would mean snow removal from the tracks and extensive maintenance on the exposed infrastructure. Has any thought been given to using a TBM (tunnel boring machine) for the railway? Less maintenance and no avalanche worries. No impact to the scenery or water drainage. Very little impact during construction to the existing roadways up the canyons. A TBM can be operational 24 hours a day regardless of the weather above ground, shorting the overall construction schedule.	Mill Creek	04/08/2015
	I am not clear on how well each of the mountain destinations would be served by various modes of transit. Perhaps this will become clear after the NEPA study, but it appears certain modes might serve certain destinations better than others.	Millcreek	02/18/2015
	I believe the only hard connection from Summit County to The Cottonwoods ought to be the improvement of the Guardsman Pass road, if indeed a hard road connection IS NECESSARY. A Hybrid Bus Rapid Transit system via a tunnel linking Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons at the top, if found to actually be necessary between the two canyons might be acceptable, however I really don't see the need. The larger issue is greatly reducing vehicle traffic and its related congestion and air and water quality degradation in each of the canyons, rather than linkage of the two for the nebulous reason of avalanche safety or evacuation. In my forty years experience, I cannot see nor have I ever witnessed where the tunnels scenario would have played out as necessary to life safety in any natural or man caused event during the time frame, and my professional career was public safety/law enforcement. I think the reasons being put forth in support of the tunnels scenarios are red herrings.	Millcreek	05/01/2015
	I do not believe that rail transportation is appropriate for Little Cottonwood Canyon. Expanded bus service, whether via conventional bus or dedicated BRT lanes, could provide better access at significantly less cost and much lower environmental impact. Bus transit can provide much more flexibility, both in terms of quantity of service at peak times and ability to stop at multiple destinations. Rail transit seems to be more suitable for long-term (i.e. overnight) visitors, not for short-term (day or half-day) visitors. Rail requires too much infrastructure and has too much environmental impact. It seems to be included primarily for the purpose of keeping resort lodging full, rather than providing a quality experience for local canyon users. One of the alternatives that is proposed to be dropped is to provide BRT in Big Cottonwood Canyon. The stated reason is that needs are greater in Little Cottonwood. However, a combination of BRT in both Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons would meet many of the stated purposes, and I believe it should be kept as an alternative for consideration but modified to include both canyons.	Millcreek	04/26/2015
	I don't think an aerial tram is a good alternative - it would be slow, which would discourage use. Lightrail would be a good option for speed, but we would be giving up protection of the mountain scenery by digging a tunnel through it.	Millcreek	04/26/2015
	My concerns are for sufficient parking and security at the transit stations so that people will use the public transit and for sufficient and safe parking at trail heads so that people will not park in the residential areas near the trailheads.	Millcreek	05/01/2015
	I live by Millcreek and so am concerned how it will work there. Very narrow. But needed.	Millcreek Township	04/09/2015
	Move aerial transit to the "Alternatives Proposed to Drop from Further Consideration" section. An aerial transit system fails to meet goals 8, 9, 13 and 14. Quality recreation experiences are totally extinguished by the presence of transit structures and roads to serve them in the mountains. Parley's Canyon would be better served by a complete, paved trail system connecting Emigration Canyon to Summit Park. Propose user fees equal to transit (bus or shuttle) fees in the Cottonwood Canyons to encourage transit use.	Millcreek Township	05/01/2015
	My primary interest is the Cottonwood Canyons because it is a major source of my drinking water and recreation winter and summer. The system group recommended to drop certain options. The car situation is not good, but only so few days of the year. The idea of a train is one I thought should have been done decades ago. At this point with the health of this ecosystem, impending drought, and the fiscal need of more urgent highway projects such as replacing infrastructure in this country and state, I think this is now irresponsible. The juxtaposition of conservation and increasing human pressure on this part of the Wasatch does not satisfy the environmental goals. Even though I have been told that engineering can ensure limited impact to the environment if tunnels are built, there is no room. We have not seen a detailed proposed route. Where is it going to come out, at the Wasatch Tunnel? How much money will/has been spent on an adequate geological, hydrological study? Is this the shoot, ready, aim approach?	Millcreek township	04/30/2015
	More park and rides at the canyon entrances are needed to enable use of any mass transit systems. I would use the UTA buses more if parking to get on the buses was not such a hassle. Also, Millcreek needs a shuttle/bus. There is way too much traffic in Millcreek and then the parking is very limited. I watched one day as the snow plow needed to wait for several cars to leave, just so he could turn around.	Millcreek, UT	04/30/2015

	The Cottonwood Canyon proposals are interesting but not sure how feasible. Tunnels seem to work well in Europe but they were built long ago when there were many fewer hoops to jump through, making costs much much less. Not clear why the aerial option between top of Little to Brighton was dropped, that seems like a viable option. Likewise, it wasn't clear to me that opening Guardsman road round only addresses one goal. That seems like a very easy (relatively) solution. Suggestions for airport to Park City transit seem great. Would there be a stop at a park and ride near the mouth of Parley's so the bus could serve Salt Lake locals as well as tourists arriving at the airport? Also if the bus could go late at night, Salt Lake people could go up to Park City to party but not drive drunk down Parley's. I am not familiar enough with traffic within Park City to comment on the several options proposed, but don't they already have an extensive and free shuttle bus system? If a free system isn't helping alleviate traffic, why would a new light rail or bus rapid transit system work? Presumably you would have to pay to take either of those, and using the Trax system, it's hard to believe transit times would be competitive with driving times.	Millcreek, UT	02/11/2015
	While a more robust transit system in Big Cottonwood Canyon would be ideal, the cost would likely be too overwhelming, so the alternatives identified to go forward are appropriate.	Millcreek, UT	03/14/2015
	Again until I see a PLAN, not just a LIST of alternatives, I can only say what a poor job of suggesting a DIRECTION for feedback. Are you afraid to say, let's try more buses for skiers because there is no parking space left and we are polluting the air and causing all kinds of problems, where we could give stickers to residents similar to SLC city parking in neighborhoods, but regulate/limit traffic and supply busing service for the rest of us? This seems inevitable as TRAX was, but we need to get going. Give us a DIRECTION to argue about at least, and give us RESEARCH about the CURRENT NUMBERS of wildlife, plants, acres needed to ensure they won't be extinct by 2040 when you want this plan to go into effect. You seem to be trying to please politicians and developers and have not even included the ecology in your thinking process here. Really?	Murray	04/25/2015
	As I mentioned earlier, I do not think that it is necessary to connect PC to the cottonwood canyons.	Murray	04/05/2015
	BRT with no tunnels. See above comments	Murray	02/09/2015
	Do not construct a light rail train in LCC. It would destroy the environment and only be used on a handful of weekends per year. Aside from powder days that fall on weekends, allowing private vehicles works just fine in LCC. To alleviate growing traffic in the canyons, start charging a parking fee as most other major ski resorts across the USA do, which will encourage car pooling. I have yet to see any proposal with discusses how/where parking would be available in SLC to access the proposed light rail trains. If there is not parking at the mouth of the canyons, the project will be a failure.	Murray	05/02/2015
	I can not express enough how much I do NOT want Park City to have rail, improved road, and/or aerial transportation to LCW or BCW. I honestly feel the increased traffic from PC will absolutely ruin the outdoor experience in LCW or BCW.	murray	05/02/2015
	In my opinion, any way to get less people driving their own cars up the canyon is an excellent alternative. Again, it keeps it less crowded, decreases the strain on the environment, and is less of an eyesore. The tunnels suggested connecting big and little cottonwood canyons are a very interesting idea, as it would easily allow for more recreational access without driving out one canyon and back up the other.	Murray	04/26/2015
	It seems there are three main ways to get to Park City area and from Park City area. With traffic continuing to grow and more huge trucks on the roads, all that pollution is going to wear everything out. Consider park and shuttle options, electric street cars, limiting gas emission vehicles from certain areas, carpool. One of my favorite places in the world is New Zealand. The place is paradise because they value nature and restrict everything, including residents, in order to keep their natural resources. The question is, what do we value? Economic development or our already scarce natural resources? Development, Tourism and Revenue come with a price. Are we willing to pay that price? What will we leave our children? Do we value money or a future? Things to consider.	Murray	04/20/2015
	Thank you for your efforts whoever you are to make a difference.	Murray	03/12/2015
	What is the legal authority of this quasi-governmental "authority"? I didn't vote for this shit.	Murray	04/30/2015
	I support all except 2 and 12. Again, what are the details.	Murray	03/05/2015
	Bikes (see above comments)	Murray, UT	05/01/2015
	We don't need tunnels, trains or more ski lifts. We need to increase bus service to where it is so convenient and affordable that people will not want to drive. Create a bus only third lane in the canyons, and turn the gravel pit into a parking/transit hub. Connecting the two Cottonwood Canyons to Park City (or even to each other) would be a disaster.	Murray, UT	04/30/2015
	Maximum conservation. Limit the amount of access and usage to the current level.	Murray, Utah	04/28/2015
	I am not sure there is a good solution, other than charging an explicit fee for every car ride up the Canyon.	New York	03/03/2015
	Parleys Canyon should include a trail.	North Salt Lake	04/30/2015
	Buses	Ogden	04/16/2015
	With apologies, once again repeated from above ... "Light rail transit(LRT)in exclusive guideway up Little Cottonwood Canyon to the Park City area, including tunnel connections between Alta, Big Cottonwood Canyon and Park City." The foregoing is an encouraging quote from the study. The most "exclusive guideway" would be a master tunnel with Draper as the portal into the "front" with respective branches to access all ski areas and Park City proper. There is Global precedent for such tunneling. Such precedent has been expressed in its very early conceptualization by Master Geologist Leon Hansen ... deceased. There are many of us who believe that a "Super Tunnel" would remediate if not eliminate most environmental concerns and create a cornucopia of economic activity. The father of the Utah Tunnel concept is Leon Hansen. Leon was a Masters degree level geologist who had a lifelong working relationship with the Greater Park City Mining District of Utah. Leon has held senior positions with several large, international, mining enterprises. There exists a repository of proprietary data that confirms the existence of precious metals resources that equal or exceed what have already been recovered from the mining district prior to its closure. Mining was halted decades ago because the metals resources were impacted and impounded by water in the mines. Leon believed that the water in the mines is a resource even more precious than the remaining gold and silver reserves. If the waters are recovered, the metals can also again be recovered. Synopsis: The Utah Tunnel will be a tunnel like many other long, long tunnels...New York-85; Sweden-51; Japan-33; Moscow-25; Madrid-25; Finland-74; LOETSCHBERG-21; Chunnel-31; Utah Tunnel-21. The Utah Tunnel would also be 21 miles long and most like the LOETSCHBERG tunnel. Loetschberg is the longest land tunnel (21Miles) in the world. The Loetschberg tunnel took 8 years to build and cost \$3.5 billion. The Loetschberg tunnel transports skiers to Swiss resorts more quickly. The Utah Tunnel would be a multipurpose/multi use resource. It will Convey...Water...Strategic minerals...Tourist transit to world class ski and recreational resorts...and other economic benefits to all of the citizens of Utah. The Utah Tunnel...it can be done...during economically difficult times. The famous symbols of recovery in the West during the Depression include: Hoover Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, The San Francisco Bay Bridge and the Golden Gate Bridge. The Utah Tunnel will develop the following resources: Water...Multi-Millions of gallons from aquifers under and around the Uinta and Wasatch mountains recovered. Strategic minerals...\$0,000,000,000 (at thousands of dollars an ounce) of water locked, precious metals (gold, silver etc.) resources freed!!! Travel to ski and recreational areas...rapid, uncongested, and safe transit from the airport and other points to resort areas developed. Hydro and Geothermal power...other economic benefits. The tunnel from Draper to Park City will pass under three of Utah's most famous ski resorts. The plan is to connect those resorts with the tunnel thereby ensuring safe and rapid transportation from the Salt Lake International Airport to the resorts. It is our understanding that there is an existing railroad right of way from Draper to the Airport. Submitted respectfully by ... Wayne L. Wickizer Wayne L. Wickizer - Chairman Golden Lamp Regional Center, Inc. First National Bank Building 2nd Floor 480 East 400 South, Suite 201 Salt Lake City, UT 84111 United States chairman@goldenlamp.org Skype = wwickizer1 Business 801-528-3732 Home 801-326-4960 Cell 435-828-0496 Wayne LinkedIn = http://goo.gl/Rgz9vd Website = www.goldenlampregionalcenter.com	Ogden and Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	do not want trains, trams or more ski lifts polluting the landscape in our mountains and do not support selling off public land to real estate developers	Orem	04/16/2015
	I'm strongly opposed to both the proposed tunnel and the train up Little Cottonwood.	Orem	03/15/2015
	Please keep our mountains as natural as possible.	Orem	03/04/2015
	Please keep in consideration the light pollution of aerial transportation. Tunnels can be used all day and all night with no visual impact. Just what we need is another set of lights going up and over Park City Mountain resort polluting our environment for the sake of out of state stockholders. The Guardsman Pass road is already established and out of sight of the town of Park City so this is a better option than aerial transportation.	Park City	03/28/2015
	A faster train, rather than a rail should connect I-80 to downtown SLC. Rail is too slow and only connecting to University is unhelpful.	Park City	04/04/2015
	Aerial trams are not a reasonable transit alternative for any of the goals of the transit plan. Current airport transit connections are very user unfriendly requiring long walks with baggage, infrequent schedules, limited service hours, and long travel times. How would BRT be better? May be special vehicles could be designed, but an over the road bus is not a great way to access a nice resort.	Park City	04/25/2015
	An overarching alternative that I do not see is leveraging the existing "back pressure" from inadequate transportation up the Cottonwoods to limit growth. Perhaps an integrated analysis of effects across the 4 focus areas would provide transparency and clarity for proposed actions.	Park City	03/26/2015
	As far as the Kimball Junction to Park City proposed light rail alternative goes - I actually support this but there needs to be adequate park and ride stations along the way (this would apply to the bus alternatives also). I live off old ranch road in the Willow Creek Estates sub-division. Taking the bus from this neighborhood is not an option. If we had a bus stop by I would be using the bus system. When I lived in the old town we used the bus system frequently but now we cannot. Before jumping into building a rail system please make sure that it will also serve the neighborhoods along the entire corridor - NOT just the tourists coming into town. Of course - if park and rides were put in and the huge, sluggish buses were replaced with smaller, zipper, electric vehicles that ran more frequently and increased the routes into pocket neighborhoods perhaps more locals would ride the buses - which might make the dedicated bus lanes on 224 more attractive. You could most likely do this (and add a dedicated lane) for less money than putting in a light rail. I think that with the savings in money you could give every family in Park City a big subsidy to put towards the purchase of an electric car!	Park City	03/12/2015
	As I said above, Park City government is opposed to any public transit between Park City and the Cottonwood Canyons, but I think this would be a great benefit to both residents and visitors alike. It could take the form of rail through a tunnel, or a public tram (not a ski lift out of one of the resorts, however). Lots of people are opposed to the idea of tunnels, but the Park City area already has more than 100 miles of tunnels left from the mining days. Tunnels are relatively safe for the environment because the surface is only minimally disturbed. Buses are not a popular means of transportation except when there are no other options (as in third world countries). So I would favor rail service not only to Little Cottonwood Canyon, but also to Park City and up Big Cottonwood Canyon, including a connection between Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons. After all, you are looking at long term solutions, right? Finally, concerns about the cost should be set aside, because over the long term, these costs will pay for themselves. And people act as though the current costs of maintaining the roads are insignificant, when in reality they are very high (consider the costs of pavement maintenance, snow removal, avalanche control, cost of gas, depreciation on all individual vehicles, etc.	Park City	03/16/2015
	As I see it, the long term plan for establishing a rail and bus / tram system will enhance the Wasatch experience. I just hope that I will see it before I am in my 80's, aka 2040. That stated, the Wasatch would be enhanced immediately with the connecting of all of the resorts via chair lift and Gondola / Trams. I hope this is accomplished in the next couple of years. The time is now!	Park City	02/25/2015
	Ban all cars in Cottonwood Canyons. Buses only. It works in Zion NP. It will work here. Trains are too expensive and have many negative impacts on environment, economy, and character of communities.	PARK CITY	02/25/2015
	Bus rapid transit or light rail is the most realistic solution in the LCC, Park City areas. I do not support a connection between the canyons via tunnel or in any other new way. We need to improve the existing connections with either light rail systems, bus rapid transit or both. Also looking to improve transportation hubs and access to them. Promote public transportation and bicycle transportation.	Park City	05/02/2015
	can we think more "outside the box" and more "decades ahead"? I feel like we are still a little behind the times in our scope of possibilities.	park city	05/01/2015
	Can't a rapid transit line that goes up LCC to reduce traffic and parking issues just end where the road currently ends at Alta? Why does it have to go all the way to PC? Seems like the proposal to go all the way to PC is just a touristy gimmick. Once again, more development hardly EVER equals increased environmental protection!!! Nor will it "protect and enhance" things like character or natural scenic resources at a place like Alta that looks great without rapid transit cutting through it and has character because it still has two-person chairlifts. More buses, HOV lanes, public transit to and from PC and SLC is necessary and doesn't have a huge environmental impact to build; please move forward with these plans. Aerial transit from BCC to PC, not good for anything other than a few people getting rich and paying a huge price environmentally to impress tourists who are already impressed by this place. This is such a huge plan with a massive scope. Please take the time (more time) to REALLY hash out details, provide more MEANINGFUL public feedback sessions and really think about what environmental stewardship actually means. Once we go ahead with this, there is no turning back. We have some precious resources in those mountains. Sometimes it is best not to tamper and invade even though the dollar signs are tempting. Often when we think we are solving one environmental problem (transportation/air pollution being the biggest problem for us currently) we are actually making things much worse over all (destruction of habitat and inevitably more polluted and higher demand on our watersheds). Please take even more time to involve the community who lives here, refine plans and think about future generations.	Park City	04/30/2015
	Connecting the areas by tunnel is an unworkable solution and should not be considered. The construction would damage to water supply for the residents. Connecting the resorts by Gondola is a waste of funds. The few that would want to travel the distance for a few short runs will be at a minimum especially after the initial few ride wears off. The skiing is different between the PC side and the Cottonwood side. "Alta is for Skiers" PC is for resort Skiing.	Park City	04/30/2015
	Consolidating transit during the winter up the Cottonwood Canyons is positive, but accommodations for road cyclists in the summer need to be met and made safer than they are now.	Park City	05/01/2015
	Ditto above. We do not need to turn the entire Wasatch into a giant ski area for the benefit of the ski industry.	Park City	04/30/2015

	Elevated tram/gondola systems should not be dismissed out of hand. They do not solve the puzzle of getting people from the airport to ski areas, but they are very effective measures for moving people from one resort to another. That is a worthwhile objective in and of itself. The only long-term solution to airport to ski area transportation is light rail for BOTH Cottonwoods AND Park City and they should be undertaken at the same time to be fair to the needs of all involved.	Park City	02/17/2015
	For the airport/PC route, I wouldn't go via the University. Tourists are eager to get on the slopes and that would take too long, so they'll just rent a car, which is not the desired outcome. Tourists are already spending a lot of money to come vacation here, so if you can provide good mass transit and eliminate the need for a car, I think that's great. My family and I would use this, too. As for the Little Cottonwood/PC proposal, I think using aerial modes for some of it is bad. I think seeing gondolas would ruin the pristine views and experience for both tourists and locals.	Park City	05/02/2015
	Forget the buses, no one wants to ride a bus. The only thing that makes sense is a dedicated TRAX line up Parleys that goes from the University to Park City (without stops in SLC), and that stops at Jeremy Ranch, Kimball Junction, and then at the various ski resorts in Park City. The TRAX line would serve the local population and the people who drive from SLC to work in Park City, thereby reducing the congestion that starts at Kimball Junction and goes all the way into Park City.	Park City	04/30/2015
	Four Lifts. No tunnels from the Cottonwoods.	PARK CITY	03/22/2015
	Guardsman Pass improvements to keep it open year round, especially for buses, is a much better idea than a tunnel. A tram might be a viable second option. A tunnel is a waste of money. This idea should be removed from the table.	Park City	04/22/2015
	I believe that a combination of B & D will cost the least and still meet goals with a limited need for additional infrastructure. The gridlock up the Cottonwoods causes an unnecessary amount of pollution and increases the risks for pollution and accidents. 1. Protect watershed health, water supply, and water quality. Shutting vehicular traffic up the Cottonwoods reduces added air pollution from vehicular traffic which falls to the ground and into our water/snow with every snow storm. Reducing air pollution increases and protects our watershed, water supply, and water quality. http://www.chesapeakebay.net/issues/issue/air_pollution 2. Provide competitive transit service in the corridor. Reliable bus service is considered competitive if it is designed correctly to be timely and provide the right level of service. Major cities like NYC, Boston, and San Francisco have achieved this. As well as many international cities. 3. Reduce avalanche-related risks and delay in Little Cottonwood Canyon. By forcing only bus traffic up the canyon and closing it to all other vehicle traffic, this would eliminate the stop and go congested traffic that occurs on the road. A communications system to the bus would alert drivers to avalanche control. 4. Provide new evacuation options from both Cottonwood Canyons. No comment. 5. Reduce auto use and congestion in Little Cottonwood Canyon. Access to Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons should be closed to all motorized vehicles except for residents, campers, and those with disabilities during the winter. The canyons are clogged with unnecessary traffic. By implementing this, auto use and congestion would be eliminated. 6. Reduce vehicle emissions in the Cottonwood Canyons to improve air quality. Access to Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons should be closed to all motorized vehicles except for residents, campers, and those with disabilities during the winter. The canyons are clogged with unnecessary traffic. By implementing this, vehicle emissions in the Cottonwood Canyons to improve air quality would be reduced. 7. Reduce parking impacts on environment, safety, and economy. Access to Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons should be closed to all motorized vehicles except for residents, campers, and those with disabilities during the winter. The canyons are clogged with unnecessary traffic. By implementing this, parking impacts on environment, safety, and economy would be reduced. 8. Support land use goals for reduced sprawl and concentrated development. Increasing public transportation would support land use goals for reduced goals because new infrastructure within the canyon would not be needed. The only change would occur at the mouth of the canyon where an expanded parking center would be made available. 9. Create unique, attractive "traveler experience" to increase tourist and resident visitation. People would get out of their cars and just enjoy the ride up rather than be stuck in traffic. 10. Improve access and connections for pedestrians and bicyclists. With less vehicular traffic, pedestrians and bicyclists would not need to fear being hit by a car. 11. Improve travel reliability in inclement weather. Existing UTA buses serving the Cottonwoods are auto-timed with chains that are deployed with the flip of a switch during bad weather. I've seen it... It's pretty cool! Service would not be interrupted. 12. Provide competitive transit service to a range of recreation destinations and economic nodes. People going into a canyon are mostly interested in going to a specific resort. For example, if I go to Disney World in Florida, chances are high that I'm in for the whole day. I'm probably not interested in spending 1-2 hours to get into the park only to turn around and then try to go to SeaWorld for example. Especially if it costs me \$96 to go to Disney and then another \$80 to go to SeaWorld. The opportunity costs to getting up and leaving one resort to go to another are high and not within the realm of most budgets. Again, this point makes me ask the question if your organization has surveyed actual resort goers. More importantly FREQUENT resort goers who this system should be designed for. 13. Protect or enhance the natural and scenic resources of the Cottonwood Canyons. Improving public transportation would not change the Canyons at all except for bus stations. 14. Protect and enhance community character. People would be so happy to know that they don't have to sit in traffic anymore. Many mountain enthusiasts want to do the right thing and get out of their cars to reduce pollution and congestion. Proposing an alternate system will not ensure this at all. Let's just improve upon what already exists!! You can run a pilot program which can be implemented at a fraction of the costs to build an alternate system. Incentives should be built into the system, including discounted passes that are only valid if it has been scanned by the UTA bus. Snowbird for example is already setup this way to some degree. My Snowbird pass gets me free access on the bus. I never use it though because the service is not	Park City	02/05/2015
	I can only comment on the Park City corridor. Having lived here since 1999, I have seen a dramatic need for increased public transportation. While the bus service in PC is a gift, transportation to and from Salt Lake has been a challenge. Best wishes to you all as you pursue solutions.	Park City	03/16/2015
	I could possibly support a transportation option running concurrent with I-80 provided it fulfills the requirement to reduce overall auto traffic in and about Summit County. In fact I strongly urge Park City institute a permit system that restricts vehicles that are not resident to our community. As example, Mirror Lake Highway requires a permit for any vehicle which stops along the highway, it is a through connector and actual trained traffic is free to continue through. Park City is not a throughway and therefore any non-resident traffic coming into our community should pay an impact fee for access and city limit wide parking fee for any public lot or roadside.	Park City	04/28/2015
	I do not believe that "Aerial" is a good alternative because it will not be able to carry the necessary volume during peak loads. I favor a combination of "Mountain Light Rail" and "Bus". The possibility of getting on a Light Rail in PC and getting to Alta in a few for skiing would be great. Because Light Rail would not be as weather dependent as a car or bus it would be safer, quicker and more efficient.	Park City	03/16/2015
	I like the idea of transit servicing some of the choke points in Park City, but object to tunnels to and from Park City.	Park City	03/12/2015
	I support the Express Bus in mixed traffic from the Salt Lake City airport to Park City via I-80 as an effective alternative. I do not support the train to Park City. The end point in Park City would be problematic in terms of location and getting to homes and accommodations. Buses have much greater flexibility.	PARK CITY	04/14/2015
	I think existing HOV lanes to Park City is the most reasonable solution for now. Light rail does not seem very popular in Utah and I for one am not interested in paying for light rail and gondolas when only 3 or 4 percent of Utahns ski, also LRT and gondolas degrade scenic value not enhance it.	Park City	04/11/2015
	I think that the train and tunnel ideas for all corridors should not be seriously considered. They are very expensive and have huge environmental impacts. Imagine the carbon footprint impact from constructing a tunnel through the Wasatch or building light rail systems.	Park City	04/26/2015
	I would like to see a train that runs in a C starting at Kimball Junction ending in the cottonwood canyons with the airport in the middle, running in both directions. I have no issues with the cottonwood PC connection. I just think it should be made over the snow (gondolas etc).	Park City	02/08/2015
	I'm totally in favor of the overall plan with the exception of the proposed tunnels. The bulk of the traffic issues are coming from the valley back and forth to the resorts. Tunnels do nothing to reduce this traffic. Create an efficient transportation system (bus and/or rail) to/from the valley to the resorts and the problem is solved. A well planned lift system can better promote economic development and transport between the ski areas. Come on guys this is not rocket science. Let's get this right!	Park City	05/01/2015
	It is too late. At best, we need to develop a European model of sustenance and stop being an economy dependent upon growth, growth, growth. Unfortunately, you cannot get people to give up their cars. Trains (in the plan) will be as empty as the buses currently. Connecting the resorts does nothing but encourage more growth for more greedy developers. Nothing is being done to preserve the current status of our mountains. Skiing/riding at Park City has been miserable this year, due to overcrowding (amplified by horrific snow conditions, which are the new normal). We need LESS people to come to Utah to preserve the EXPERIENCE of our mountains. The last thing we need is to encourage more development, more people to move here, or more tourism. Develop a focus on QUALITY over quantity (think Europe). I'm planning my move to Alaska where I can have the kind of skiing/riding experience I used to get in Utah. It is sad to leave my home of 45 years but it is even more sad to see what has become of the Wasatch Front. My best suggestion: develop a few more 'destination' ski resorts in the Uintahs. Maybe that could reduce the overcrowding at local resorts.	Park City	04/07/2015
	Item E) I think opening the Guard road from Park City to Brighton year round can bring increased economies to both areas but will also relieve some traffic pressure. Not to mention cutting 60 miles off a round trip to/from BCC & PC. It does not have to be open everyday or every hour during snow storms.	park city	03/04/2015
	It's a huge range: Rail, bus, sky (Gondola). I believe that the aerial route is the preferred way to go; it has the minimal environmental impact, and in many cases would not operate year-round. By not operating year-round, this would give the mountains time to "breathe".	Park City	02/24/2015
	Like some of the alternative plans. I understand the congestion in Little Cottonwood Canyon and perhaps all cars should be limited in that Canyon.	Park City	04/30/2015
	Locals as well as visitors should have access to the Wasatch front. Left out of the thinking is the inevitable need for commuter traffic not just resort traffic. Done well a rail system could meet both environmental concerns as well as economic needs. Midway seems to be left out. Connect all the resorts, and population centers. Provide for more year around permanent housing and therefore increase the use of the transportation infrastructure and decrease the per trip cost. Rail, bus, and private vehicle access should be allowed via guardsman's Pass. A toll could be charged for non resident vehicles. Rail could be subsidized to reduce vehicle use. Electric vehicles should be encouraged. There needs to be a big cottonwood, Guardsman pass, Park City, and I 80 mass transit and road loop. All the resorts and population centers need to be accessed either by mass transit or by year around roads, hopefully both. It is missing the point, the transportation and recreation industries over minimal environmental impacts when the 6 big polluters in the Salt Lake Valley are allowed to not clean up their pollution and are permitted to increase in size. The recreation industry is the future of UT not the old polluting industries.	Park City	03/28/2015
	Look for unique ways to transport people without compromising goals.	Park City	05/02/2015
	LRT is very expensive. I prefer fee based access.	Park City	02/05/2015
	Mountain Accord Comments (Glenn Wright, Park City Resident) The Recreation and Environment pieces of this project are well done and mostly of concern to Salt Lake County. The Transportation element is more controversial. My comments are based on the document called Mountain Accord Transportation Corridor Purposes and Alternatives 2/3/2015. I favor a combination of alternatives B, C and D. -BRT or bus up both Cottonwood Canyons, with other traffic restricted to commercial vehicles and residents only. -Aerial connection from Park City to Brighton. -Express Bus from SLC airport connecting to a BRT line from Kimball Junction to the resorts and Quins Junction. Aerial Connection - similar to the Peak to Peak Gondola at Whistler (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peak_2_Peak_Gondola). The Aerial connection to replace the Town Lift and start on the west side of the ski bridge, with stops near the uphill terminus of the Crescent Lift, proceeding to a point near Scott's Bowl or Puke Hill, terminating at Brighton base area. This lift is about twice as long as the Peak to Peak gondola at Whistler which cost \$51M CDN. I suggest that it be built in a public/private partnership between the resorts and the UTA or UDOT, to be operated by the ski areas during the ski season and by resort personal, but paid for by the public partner during non-resort operational hours and days. Express Bus - This service must be easy for the visitor to use and include a system to seamlessly deliver luggage to the final destination (perhaps in different vehicles) as well as merging into a robust BRT spine on SR 224. The Chamber of Commerce and travel agents should be promoting mass transit before the visitor arrives and attempt to intercept visitors before they hit the rental car counters	Park City	03/08/2015
	No rail tunnel to Park City	Park City	03/13/2015
	Oops - my comments are above. I found the question confusing.	Park City	05/02/2015
	Opening the Guard road in the winter allows another option for getting to and from BCC and PC. It's important to think about options that are not just skier related. Allow people to live in one place and work in another. I currently drive from PC to BCC several days a week in the winter for work. A tram would not help me. I need my car and the distance in the summer is cut in half.	Park City	03/06/2015
	Park City has its own issues that Summit County needs to solve. They are confusing themselves with an infinite range of solutions many of which are not affordable or impractical. More dedicated bus lanes, frequent runs, no traffic zones on Main Street and expensive parking should do it.	Park City	04/29/2015
	Perhaps add a parking fee, at least during peak periods, for each resort parking area to encourage people to use mass transit.	Park City	03/11/2015
	Perhaps tunnels are not financially feasible. Over mountain gondolas/trams might be cheaper, increase all-season tourism, and have less impact on the environment.	Park City	04/29/2015
	Please preserve the backcountry!	Park City	02/18/2015
	Please see above. I think there could be an eloquent bus solution- it just needs to be well thought out. At the end of the day, I prefer trains, but we are a long ways off from the public accepting them.	Park City	04/30/2015
	Please try to focus on I-80. That makes sense and that will be used by the public.	Park City	02/04/2015
	Please wait for new technologies before decisions are made.	Park City	03/27/2015
	poorly chosen priorities	Park City	02/24/2015
	Probably buses because of their economy and efficiency. Tunnels would be unnecessary as most people actually ski at only one resort in a given day anyway. The tunnels would also be very expensive. Having an interconnect using chairlifts, trams or gondolas to Park City will just degrade the back country experience and compromise the environmental qualities of the Wasatch. Making Guardsman Pass a year round access road will just increase the traffic in Park City.	Park City	03/15/2015

<p>rail system too expensive and will take to long to implement provide free, reliable, timely, first-class (like a nice train) bus service in lcc and bcc. somehow make all 7 ski areas charge for parking. acquire parking area, such as gravel pit on wasatch blvd., to serve as transit center for all lcc and bcc buses. buses to be modern low- or no-emission vehicles (electric, nat gas, hydrogen) based on technologies already in existence and economical. bus frequency to be extremely high during ski season commute times. lower frequency at other times. rider should have mind-set that it is easier (as fast, cheaper) to park and ride the bus than to drive up the canyon in their car. provide van service for dispersed recreation users e.g. bc skiers accessing mineral fork trailhead in bcc. i see no reason to try to link Park City with lcc and bcc</p>	Park City	03/15/2015
see above.	Park City	02/28/2015
see above.	Park City	02/05/2015
See above. We have a very predictable pattern a few days a year that does not require this level of investment. If this were Disney land, would Disney spend 5 million dollars studying how to deal with 30 or so busy days a year (and then argue about spending billions of dollars to solve the "long term" challenges" that can be so easily resolved in the short term using existing infrastructure and resources?	Park City	03/11/2015
Still includes tunnels, etc.	Park City	04/27/2015
The following proposals are good and would accomplish the goals: A. Light rail transit (LRT) in exclusive guideway up Little Cottonwood Canyon to the Park City area, including tunnel connections between Alta, Big Cottonwood Canyon and Park City. B. Bus rapid transit (BRT) in exclusive guideway up Little Cottonwood Canyon to the Park City area including tunnel connections between Alta, Big Cottonwood Canyon and Park City. This following proposal would also be attractive for commuters, which may decrease traffic more than adding the options above. C. Rail from the University TRAX line to Park City via I-80.	Park City	02/05/2015
The gravel pit at the base of BCC is a logical place for a transportation hub. Increased bus frequency, dedicated bus lane going up/down canyons, free bus pass w/ ski pass, free bus pass with lift ticket purchase, charge for parking if less than 2 people in vehicle (and parking fee goes toward public transportation).	Park City	05/01/2015
The ideas are there, but they need to be bolder and sooner.	Park City	02/06/2015
This area needs more attention. I think it important to get this right the first times there is no need to rush into the first option what we need is the best option for our canyons and our future generations.	Park City	02/06/2015
Train up I-80 in lieu of any "new" transit corridor (like tunnel or Guardsmans Pass route, or gondola)	Park City	03/17/2015
Trax up Parley's to serve the Wasatch Back. Linking through LCC is ridiculous - we have commuters, more every day, who could use the Parley's line. A tourist train serves far too few. This is our future - not the ski areas or metropolitan area who want to be ski areas.	Park City	04/30/2015
Use bus lanes on I-80 for transportation to new proposed Kimball Junction transportation center and Park City Transit Center. Some buses may go roundtrip to the airport and others to SLC or Cottonwood Canyons.	Park City	04/30/2015
Wasatch front and back have unique characteristics, while integrating recreation across them via lifts and trails is an excellent idea, building roads and trains to expand the metro area from wasatch front, through the wasatch, and to the wasatch back is a BAD idea. Please go back to the drawing board and take OneWasatch concept, possibly building upon such with some better transportation to the Cottonwood resorts from the Wasatch front, possibly with some better transportation on the Wasatch back, but no new transportation corridors through the Wasatch other than by ski lift and ski trail (which is great and will have no environmental impact, roads, tunnels and pollution from vehicles will).	park city	04/09/2015
We need to see a more detailed plan to accommodate increased transit flow up 80 and particularly along the 224/248 connectors into Park City. It is also important to see data on the economic feasibility of the various proposals and that some of the proposed funding models be shared with the public.	Park City	03/11/2015
Well thought out	Park City	04/30/2015
You can talk about busses all you want, but the reality is that people prefer not to use them. However, One Wasatch, coupled with the use of busses up the Cottonwoods would provide for some pretty amazing ski days.	Park City	04/08/2015
Aerial gondolas are a bad idea. Tunnels are the best long term plan. Could tie in with water treatment of water produced by old mines to produce stable supply for Wasatch Front.	Park City	02/24/2015
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 !!! 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 and enhance the small town culture I don't think either of the councils have the long time PC residents interest at heart, 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 & 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 vs bus in mixed traffic seems as well as long as it doesn't diminish the hike paths. This winter has seen many days (sandy) 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. Also, I do agree with all of the current proposals for the Transportation options to be DROPPED...none are acceptable.	Park City Ut 84098	03/11/2015
\$10 million is an excessive amount to be spending on planning. The public needs to know where it is going, how much is being paid in salaries and for consultants.	Park City, UT	04/30/2015
Increased bus service and park-and-rides for the Cottonwoods seems more achievable and useful than a light rail. Frequent every 20 minute bus service with extended hours. A Park and Ride at Kimball and at 248 (and mouths of Cottonwoods) could serve employees at the restaurants, hotels, resorts, as well as tourist and residents. A Summit County and Park City frequent transport bus from the airport during the winter months (perhaps subsidized by the ski resorts) to a new Kimball Transit Center could be helpful. There would need to be a sizable area for taxis to pick up tourist to deliver them to their hotels; as many won't want to use the transit buses on their initial day.	Park City, UT	03/16/2015
see earlier comments	PARK CITY, UT	04/26/2015
See previous comments	Park City, UT	04/08/2015
\$6 Billion Ouch! Why spend \$6 billion if the resorts can be connected by 3 to 6 chair lifts? Buses, etc can take people to access their nearest Resort. Chairlifts, Gondola's and Trax can take people the rest of the way to the Resort(s) they want to ski. As someone who has been traveling to Europe twice a year to ski, chair lifts and Gondolas make sense. I look forward to seeing Utah ski areas connected in a way that is environmentally sensitive but not at this expense. Please allow the Resorts to bear the bulk of the burden of connecting multiple ski areas instead of the tax payers.	Park City, Utah	05/02/2015
Again, how does increasing population flow to the Park City area improve the Park City area? Please respond. I am confident that you have no valid argument for this position.	Park City, Utah	02/11/2015
I am also going to put in my vote for 1 Wasatch ski area connect	Phoenix	03/17/2015
If it is operated by UTA I support it fully I have very good experience with UTA.	provo	02/06/2015
The destruction of these untouch places should be left as god has created them.	Provo	03/15/2015
Too little consideration has been made for alternatives that are less invasive and destructive of the mountain environment. Once track beds have been blasted out of the mountain, it will never be restored. Please reconsider all parts of the plan that involve commercial infrastructure. More emphasis is needed for development intended to protect the fragile mountain ecosystem. Preservation of resources, rather than building new commercial ski resort facilities.	Provo, UT	02/09/2015
I would support bus or air transit but not train transit up the canyons.	Richfield	04/08/2015
How can a key component of transit to PC go through Alta? You, lol never make town of Alta Avalanche proof enough that this would not be a huge problem it seems to me.	Salt Lake	05/01/2015
I am a backcountry skier, hiker, fisherman and general muscle-powered user of the Wasatch. I encourage all planning that comes from this process, with particular attention to the following issues- 1) Water quality preservation is of utmost importance. 2) Transportation by car should be limited, bus service improved, LCC particularly should be expanded for possible shuttles, train service, or similar alternatives. 3) No tunnels through the mountains, no gondola, ski lift or mechanized transport should be considered. 4) No further ski resort expansion should be allowed, particularly in Grizzly Gulch, Flagstaff, White Pine, American Fork side of the divide. 5) Overall enviro concerns must take precedence over developers' and resorts' needs. Chris Proctor 1464 East Emerson Ave. Salt Lake City, UT 84105 801.466.1905	Salt Lake	04/17/2015
I don't love the idea of a shuttle in Millcreek Canyon. I would much rather pay twice what I currently pay for an annual pass to not have the shuttle option. I know a lot of my neighbors and friends agree.	Salt Lake	04/30/2015
I would support increased transit to park city but worry about the cost-benefit of a rail line. The current fees for the bus are costly and would rather see increased service and BRT and subsidized fares rather than a capital project. I support the development of Guardsman Pass to a year-round roadway but do not support an aerial tram or lift.	Salt Lake	05/01/2015
See above.	Salt Lake	03/22/2015
We should have a toll station in these canyons first and foremost. Fewer cars are essential. Then work on banning cars altogether, at least during peak hours. NO TUNNELS	Salt Lake	05/01/2015
What about an alternative that accepts the fact that it is not necessary or desirable to always "grow". Rather we could concentrate on better, more environmentally friendly, and sustainable options. I question the sustainability of many of the options either environmental, economically, or culturally. I also wonder about the equality of the options and whether or not they take into account lower income populations rather than favor higher income individuals and growth-oriented public agencies. I think that rethinking "growth" and reconsidering "equality" and "sustainability" are lost or misrepresented in the alternatives and the concepts presented.	Salt Lake	03/25/2015
Would like to see more creativity here. For example did not notice considering requiring 2 or more people to a car. And charging. The ski resorts are probably pushing interconnectivity but that does not really seem to benefit most.	Salt Lake	04/19/2015
no extra lanes and no trains up Little Cottonwood Canyon.	Salt lake city	03/10/2015
I think that with respect to the bus system in the canyons something is missing. Instead of just going from the mouth of the canyon to Snowbird and Alta or Brighton and Solitude, there should be in between stops. For people going on hikes and climbing in the canyons, you could take public transportation to a location for instance in between snowbird and the mouth or the canyon. I think this would be more incentive to take the bus up the canyon. Currently you cant stop halfway up the canyon and therefore are forced to drive up to get where you want to.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
"Competitive transit service in the corridor" Does this mean it will not be UTA? UTA is a horrible company and doesn't have SLC or the Wasatch Mountains best interest at hand. Cut UTA out and open it for a real competitive transit service.	salt lake city	02/28/2015
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 having the road used for recreation and public land for hiking, snowshoeing, cross country, and backcountry skiing. I do NOT support transportation goal #4 providing new evacuation routes out of both canyons. This transportation goal should be removed from the list. One way up and down traffic is a normal and natural condition and limit on growth the Wasatch. If development cannot increase in the canyons due to safety concerns, development should be limited. Unnatural creation of alternative evacuation routes is unnecessary and does not consider appropriate development within the landscape.	Salt Lake City	03/01/2015
1) Improve the summer trail system - new trails and maintenance 2) provide year round subsidized mass transit in the three west side canyons and to PC 3) rail transit from I-15 along I-215 to mouth of BCC, across to LCC up to Alta and tunnel to Brighton. Majority of ski traffic comes from the north past BCC through Cottonwood Heights to LCC; no one will drive to LCC and park to then ride a train for the last 15 minutes. Do not connect BCC to PC with a tunnel and transit. 4) improved road bike lanes in Parleys, MCC, BCC & LCC 5) annual or day paid parking pass required for MCC, BCC & LCC to pay for mass transit, restrooms, picnic areas, trails, bike lane sweeping, parking lot snow plowing, maintenance, etc (\$100 yr/\$10 day)	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015

	1. Optimize bus service up the Canyons; 2. Consider long Gondolas up the Canyons. The transportation issue has to be addressed first and foremost. The above options are far less expensive and far more effective and practical than any tunnel system. We must protect our mountains. Tourist dollars are important, but not as important as protecting the mountains.	Salt Lake City	03/11/2015
	A few comments: 1. A shuttle system is a GREAT idea! Right now the canyon is at capacity (car capacity). If more users are going to use it, a shuttle is necessary. I do feel that the speed limit should be reduced, and there needs to be limitations on how wide the road becomes. As I own property in the Firs development in Millcreek, this is important to me. 2. The only way rail makes sense in the Cottonwoods is if driving private cars is limited to land owners in the canyon or there is a hefty \$5 fee (ala Millcreek). 3. The land swaps seem fair to me, but there needs to be zoning restrictions so that a Brighton Hotel (for instance) cannot be 20 floors tall. This way we retain as much of the traditional character of the place as we can. But I do feel that if Grizzly Gulch isn't part of the agreement, then there should be no land swaps at all. 4. I very much oppose any type of transportation linking the ski resorts that would put any kind of tram/ski towers over the ridges between big and little cottonwood canyon. The only place it makes sense to link the canyons is brighton/PC through hidden canyon. UNLESS we are talking about tunnels. 5. I think it's important to establish legitimate trailheads for some tenuous situations, such as Heughs canyon, for instance. 6. Mountain Accord should seriously look at stopping motorized access in Mineral Fork. There is motorized access for almost the entire northern and southern Wasatch. While the number of hikers increases, the amount of land set aside for hiking is not getting any bigger. Mineral Fork seems like the best place to do that. 7. Make sure the new parking lot at Wasatch Mountain State Park is not so close to the cabins up there. Cabin owners don't want it, and recreationists also don't want to see cabins there either. There are alternative locations for that (abnormally large) parking lot further down-canyon that make more sense.	Salt lake City	04/30/2015
	A long-term plan of tunnels to our ski areas (high speed) would be nice if the expense was mostly paid from those of us that ski. It would solve the avalanche issue, and the emission and parking issues with personal vehicles.	Salt Lake City	03/15/2015
	Additional comments: 1. The Blueprint should include a description of the carrying capacity of the Central Wasatch and in particular the CC area, or at least describe a process for determining that value. It is disingenuous and misleading to frame the Blueprint in such a way as to pretend that there are no limits to future growth. At the current time, how many vehicles can make day use of the Tri-Canyon area without degrading environment? How many user days? How many overnight visits? Planning as if there were no hard limits to human use of the canyons is a fundamental mistake. 2. The Blueprint should include a statement that no land transfers will take place until a completion plan has been agreed to by all key stakeholders. For example, it would be a mistake for the FS to allow further ski and recreation development in the Tri-Canyons before the various private property owners have conveyed the agreed upon real property to the public agencies. The concern is that all land use proposals will be heavily dependent on FS actions. In the current political context, the FS cannot predict what it will, or will not, be allowed to do.	Salt Lake City	04/02/2015
	Again, as mentioned above... use what you have and add as little as possible. Keep the transportation issues for each corridor to each corridor. Tunnels and connections don't make sense if you are truly adhering to your proposed interests.	salt lake city	02/06/2015
	Again, as Utah grows, there are many other areas where this obscene amount of money should be spent to better serve Utahns. Namely, education and public transit routes through Salt Lake City.	Salt Lake City	02/12/2015
	Again, don't do anything on the surface. I think Guardsman Pass Road should have been paved all the way and maintained year round decades ago. Yes, it costs money, but it is obvious that it would be a good thing to do. As I posted above, more buses in the lunch to afternoon time going up the canyons. That's been the reason I haven't taken the bus much.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	Again, it is important to maintain the intended use of the public, individual, and family experiences. For example: if I want to go to Millcreek canyon for a picnic with my family, do I really want to drive to a parking lot, gather up my kids and cooler and firewood and blankets and get on a transit bus? Then do I want to travel up the canyon on the bus looking for a picnic spot? And after we have been lucky to find a spot, unload everything, only to do it all again after our fun picnic?	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	Again, the proposed actions are incongruous with the alleged "mission".	Salt Lake City	04/14/2015
	Again, this seems to be about a very small group of people making money. More people in the resorts is the resounding message. We are just very unsure as to who really is asking for changes. Little Cottonwood is a problem the day after a storm, but it is all part of the character of the resorts. Everyone eventually makes it up that wants to. There are many many choices in the area and if getting up LC or BC is too frustrating, there are other options. Traffic up LC and BC on selected days is not the source of our bad air.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	All alternatives should be considered and I think that the option of not expanding should also be considered. A new blueprint should be drafted that doesn't impact the watershed, the environment, and the locals that reside for all time near the Wasatch front.	salt lake city	04/05/2015
	Alternative D is the only one that should be considered for the Little Cottonwood Canyon/Park City corridor (which shouldn't be considered a transportation corridor in the first place). It does need further refinement to clarify that reduction in private auto use and enhancement of bus service is the goal. Construction of avalanche sheds should be financed from private auto user fees and parking fees.	Salt Lake City	04/08/2015
	Alternatives are narrow in focus and emphasize expensive new construction.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	Alternatives should be scaled back. More winter buses, modified vehicle plans, better in county transit for winter visitors. Rail line and interconnect should be scrapped and not studied any further.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	An aerial transport link would diminish the aesthetic and natural qualities of the Wasatch canyons. Other methods must be prioritized.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Any additional access to little cottonwood with damage the canyon. Remove the road and switch to rail only access.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	As above I think that bringing all the issues to light is helpful but we are not addressing larger issues of over development, overall development impacts and ultimately what the canyons will look like and exist as with these huge proposed projects. We have to find a middle ground of fast, efficient, environmentally conscious transportation without overusing the place itself.	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015
	As stated above, I think Transportation Concept D is the better plan presented. However, I do think it should also include Big Cottonwood Canyon in the rail system. I think the only way to protect these local canyons in the future from the constantly increasing population on the Wasatch Front and Back, is to build systems which will deliver people and their recreational toys to the canyons, and eventually limit automobile traffic in these areas. This will not only quiet the canyons, it will "clean" the canyons by having so many machines operating for transport purposes.	salt lake city	05/01/2015
	Aside from my earlier gripe about some of the purposes, the alternatives selected for further consideration are okay. Environmental impact statements that are done properly will be the key to evaluating what if any projects should be done.	Salt Lake City	03/26/2015
	Better buses and headways could solve the problems not a rail.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Better transportation in Parley's Canyon--better bus service, or possibly light rail--actually benefits those of us who live here and commute up and down the canyon. Better public transportation in the Valley and to outlying communities begins to address our air quality issues, and helps us work towards a more sustainable future for all members of our community, not just resorts, recreationalists, and tourists.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	BUS RAPID TRANSIT: BUS RAPID TRANSIT. I-80 and Park City are fine (who cares if there are traffic jams during Sundance?) boosting buses to PC and Kimball Junction and Heber are a good thing.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Bus service should be expanded and efforts put in place to curb automobile traffic in the canyons. Fixed lifts or gondolas should not be a part of a transportation master plan in the canyons.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Buses are cheaper and much more flexible. Much more work needs to be done to explore ways to enhance bus service and make it work better for the consumer. A billion plus dollars could make for an amazing set of task-specific buses, schedules, routes and supporting facilities such as park and ride lots and days facilities.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Buses don't work. They are too slow and take forever. A train would be nice, but it can't interfere with current traffic flow or go beyond Alta. Trax is a great example. It causes tremendous traffic jams and doesn't help very many people. If it was elevated, it would not interfere with current traffic and would actually have helped alleviate it, instead of making it worse.	Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
	Cannot read the proposal	Salt Lake City	02/07/2015
	Canyon to canyon access is important for the three (Mill, B & L C'Wood) local as well and out of area (tourist) will benefit by connected use. A world class system can serve both local users and visitors. Trail, road, transit, lift connections can all achieve connectivity. Not sure how increased user fees for forest service will help promote connectivity of the canyons. Infrastructure use fees from increased economy and expanded infrastructure would be the option to seek.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Concern for the building process for trams or aerials and Not for connecting Guardsman or paving it, no tunnels, low emissions buses that are incentivized by making parking expensive	Salt Lake City	04/23/2015
	Connecting the resorts by ski lifts is not a feasible alternative as it would grossly affect the natural beauty of the mountains	Salt Lake City	02/06/2015
	Cost as well as environmental impact should be the biggest considerations. A train would be good but very expensive and result in lots of stops. A cable way can move continuously with detachment stations.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Definitely need something like a train to PC and DV, the sooner the better. That road is terrifying, even in the summer, and we all know it kills people in the winter... but there is NO NEED FOR TRAM between PC and the Cottonwoods; different crowds and different cultures. Yeah, DV wants access to BC's snow, and Solitude needs somebody to stay in their condos ( Gary never should have built that mess ) but that is no excuse or reason for a tram over our pristine lands. Also, need to be able to get to the canyons from SLC. Currently the bus service is so very limited that people end up driving to the mouth anyhow. Maybe you could run the light rail up the 215 (south) corridor to the 7200 South ( 7-11) intersection. Personally I liked it better when it was a 4 way stop and there weren't any houses out there... Can't go back, so lets try to keep the Cottonwoods unique and authentic to themselves. That's what draws people there, winter AND summer... Don't try to turn it into a "little bit of the Alps" with a bunch of gimmicks. Park City is... Park City: condos and suburbs and another world... probably won't be any snow there in another 20 years anyhow... so run a train up there with a decent schedule and keep people off I-80.	Salt Lake City	04/26/2015
	Development is not the answer. Protect this place.	Salt Lake City	04/28/2015
	Do not build the tunnel between the cottonwoods. I don't want to see my tax payer dollars being wasted on that.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Do not change the road in Millcreek Canyon! Keep buses out of Millcreek Canyon!	Salt Lake City	03/26/2015
	DO NOT CONNECT THE CANYONS with a Tram or Tunnels.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Each canyon has its own distinct considerations with the continuing growth. Too preserve what is left, it seems obvious that no more housing or commercial development should be allowed in the Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. These are our water resources and should not be despoiled. We are in a continuing drought right now. Allowing development of the mountains where we get our water is a very bad idea.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Eliminate all language regarding a tunnel.	Salt Lake City	02/04/2015
	Encourage people who appreciate the mountains to visit; discourage those who don't. A fee should be mandatory. Mass transit should be the most appealing choice by whatever incentives are necessary. Anything that encourages foot traffic would be wonderful. I applaud the proposals to improve the trail system. Motorized ANYTHING should be discouraged. There are so many spiritual and health benefits to moving into a wild landscape on your own power. If a person sadly can't move about well, then count that a blessing to be challenged to work on becoming mobile (if possible). It also blesses others by asking for help to join in the adventure.	Salt Lake City	04/23/2015
	Encroach as little as possible.	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
	Except with regard to Little Cottonwood Canyon where a link to the other canyons would destroy the "wild" character of the canyon, compromise its natural beauty and have disastrous consequences.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Expand bus service for big/little and provide parking! only rail that makes sense is to PC and then Brighton/Alta.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Finally, there are some details. I like the idea of having public transit up the canyons, but it would have to be done with enough of an incentive to take it and a disincentive to drive. In my opinion, it should be free or incredibly cheap to take the bus or train, otherwise why would you park, unload your car, wait for public transit etc? There should also be hefty fees for driving your car up the canyons. This is the only way to make it work as intended. Eventually once everyone is used to the new system, it will be no different from driving, but the transition will be painful. If a light rail is chosen, I think it should ideally go along the current road as much as possible to minimize additional infrastructure. Another important consideration is that there need to be enough stops along the route so that distributed users (backcountry skiers, rock climbers, etc) can get to where they need to go. Also, if a train is chosen, the ski areas (who would be the biggest beneficiaries) should have to contribute some amount to the costs.	Salt Lake City	03/17/2015
	For the I-80 corridor, I think the analysis is very balanced and practical. Some of the alternative on the Cottonwood Canyons proposals are more practical than others, but still seem very impracticable	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Forget the BRT, it won't work. Reconsider the aerial solution up LCC please.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	Have the transit system include only natural gas powered shuttle buses running up and down Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons year-round every half an hour. Trains, tunnels and over-the-ridgeline ski lifts and trams should be excluded because they change the character of the canyons immensely, constitute huge visual impacts and may, during construction, negatively impact both air and water quality in the canyons. I keep hearing the local ski resorts saying that they need to increase their customer base by connecting the ski resorts via lifts and tunnels. When most Utahns do not downhill ski, why are we being asked to fund transportation systems that mostly benefit a private industry that most Utahns do not participate in? I have talked to backcountry skiers in Little Cottonwood Canyon who are visiting from Europe (they also happened to be downhill skiers) and they remarked that they continue to come to Utah for skiing year after year because we have something that is rare in Europe, i.e., a backcountry that is NOT covered by ski lifts going over the ridges. I have visited areas in Europe that have ski lifts going over all of the ridges and always come away feeling that I'm glad that the ridges in the Cottonwood Canyons have, so far, been protected from the intrusion of metal posts, chairs, cables and trams.	Salt Lake City	02/16/2015

	high occupancy buses and ultimately trains as the primary mode up the big and little cottonwood canyons are necessary. Avoiding ski lifts as mentioned is desirable. Be careful about the wealthy who have homes up the canyons as they may start helicoptering in.... Again, staging areas for local commuters is important, or increasing the rapid transit options to get to the canyons from various spots in Salt Lake County will be imperative to achieve this success.	Salt Lake City	04/26/2015
	High speed light rail to down town Park City up Parleys connecting to TRAX. NO interconnect between Park City and Cottonwoods. Bus service up Cottonwoods maximized and close Cottonwoods to private traffic on high volume days.	Salt Lake City	02/24/2015
	How about considering rail rather than bus up Parleys Canyon.	Salt Lake City	02/04/2015
	I agree that Parley's Canyon should initially have an express bus, with rail considered at a much later date. however, the logical middle alternative would be for a BRT in Parley's Canyon in a dedicated lane. Parley's Canyon does actually get congested sometimes, particularly at rush hour, and there is ample room in the canyon above mountain dell reservoir to built an additional, dedicated bus lane that would allow this. An express bus from the Salt Lake International Airport to Park City is obviously much easier (and less expensive) to implement than rail up LCC and tunnel connections between LCC and Park City. The Mountain Accord should acknowledge this fact, and recommend that such an express bus be implemented as soon as possible, even if recommended rail lines run into operational or cost difficulties (which they likely will). Therefore, a recommendation for an express bus from Salt Lake to Park City should include specific recommendations for a Park City terminus (in my opinion the Town Lift for PCMR on Main Street in Park City.) The Blueprint also fails to consider the idea of running a bus between Park City and Big Cottonwood Canyon via Guardsman Pass. The Road has already been paved, much of it is plowed year round. The additional infrastructure to construct such a bus route would be minimal beyond plowing the road all of winter (much higher elevation highways in Colorado are plowed year round, surely the same could be done at Guardsman Pass) this could be the simplest, most cost effective and most immediately operational transportation link between BCC and Park City, and would be much more cost effective than a tunnel.	Salt Lake City	02/04/2015
	I am a proponent for aerial transportation mainly for use up both canyons. It would be useful to go over to Park City but this might be better achieved by a different means of transportation. The fact that it would be protected from avalanche paths and it could provide the required capacity means automobile traffic could be greatly reduced or restricted up little cottonwood.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	I am extremely skeptical of the proposed mountain light rail and the tunnel that would link Little Cottonwood Canyon to Brighton and Park City. This seems like a billion dollar pipe dream that will never come to fruition. More and year round bus transit up the canyons seems like a much more reasonable and attainable alternative.	Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
	I am not against a rail system, in fact I am strongly in favor of it (cottonwood canyons). But you have to remove automobiles completely and you cannot connect the canyons or connect to PC. Having just rail for me, someone that hikes, skies, bikes in the canyons, will mean I have to find a way to get to the trail heads without a car, I am fine with that.	Salt Lake City	03/04/2015
	I am not in favor of a tunnel linking the Cottonwood Canyons and Park City. I am strongly in favor of reducing SOV traffic. I would prefer bus to rail. We are not Grindweld!	Salt Lake City	04/08/2015
	I am still concerned about access with public transportation since it may limit the trail head options.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	I am strongly against the construction of a train or gondola system. Those are not in line with good environmental stewardship and they would have quiet large impacts on the canyon. Even proposing a gondola system as a viable idea is reckless. However, I am strongly in favor of a drastically increased bus transit though, as that is the best compromise in my mind.	salt lake city	04/30/2015
	I am very concerned about the use of light rail in LCC it seems to be very costly (where does the money come from) and could have a negative impact on the environment. I'm also concerned that the path taken will hinder access to boulders and climbing areas and may even end up destroying some of the major bouldering areas in the canyon. Other options should be considered (tolls, etc).	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I believe I've already explained my feeling above.	Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
	I believe that the ideas for most of the corridors suit them well, and that there should be considerations for each. The shuttle for Millcreek, FastBus for Park City from the Airport, and other transportation items in the canyons (mountain train, bus/shuttle systems) need to be considered. But I believe you will need to do a LARGE amount of research for your EIS, and not let anything become a categorical exclusion. Everything inside the canyons matters, and we need to ensure proper use now, and look forward to the future in an adaptable manner, not a cash grab, or a temporary fix. I believe that connecting the canyons in a quicker manner, would be a mistake not only now, but in the future for all aspects of the systems (experiential, resource, management, etc) - so evaluate what can be managed properly for years to come, and not just "what sounds good" or makes the stakeholders the most money.	Salt Lake City	03/09/2015
	I do not believe that building new transit is good for the Wasatch in any way. A much better alternative would be to increase buses to all of the canyons and possibly implement a toll to increase the use of public transportation	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	I do not like aerial transportation over ridge tops as an alternative.	Salt Lake City	02/04/2015
	I do not support connecting Park City to the Cottonwoods.	Salt Lake City	03/06/2015
	I don't agree with dropping expanded bus or even rail options from Big Cottonwood. Maybe we should start by charging fees for the canyons, just like Millcreek. I'd rather have users with money fund this plan than commercial interests. That could eventually help fund rail/bus service in the canyons. I even like the idea of a Big to Little Cottonwood connector as long as it can be used year-round and can accommodate a variety of passengers (ADA, people with luggage, skis, bikes, etc.).	Salt Lake City	02/10/2015
	I don't see a need for a tunnel between BCC and Park City. It would just encourage more driving to the Cottonwood Canyons. A train only tunnel would be a better option but would be so cost prohibitive that you might as well just put up the two lifts linking PCMR to Brighton. The underlying problem with this tunnel is that everyone wants to stay live in Park City but ski the Cottonwoods. Right now, the natural geographic barriers help disperse the crowds. A bus only express lane up Parleys is a great idea. In addition from the airport, should have a bus from the mouth up to PC for locals. It needs to be convenient and affordable.	Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
	I don't think making the guardsman road a permanently open road is a good idea. It would represent lost recreation area.	Salt Lake City	02/04/2015
	I don't think the options are at all realistic. Option D is the only realistic option. Several different approaches could be used: a user fee such as what is in place in Millcreek could go towards building parking structures between the Cliff Lodge and lower Alta parking lot, complete with rooftop meadows to mask them, filtration systems to keep vehicle liquids from entering the watershed. Coupled with a real shuttle system (not UTA buses, which are not user friendly) and improve trail heads, and shoulder improvements for pedestrian and cyclists could achieve purposes 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13 and 14.	Salt lake City	03/05/2015
	I don't, but a shuttle in Millcreek canyon, is a terrible idea.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I especially support examining future rail services, particularly between SLC and Park City.	Salt Lake City	04/14/2015
	I have to ask. Does anyone actually read any of these? To me this all seems like you're trying to act like you're on the up and up all while sneakily pulling the wool over our eyes. I am TERRIFIED! Of losing my home. Of my daughter not being able to go up the hill to her Grandmothers because her grandmothers home was a casualty of eminent domain. I am TERRIFIED of losing the canyon that I love. Do any of you mountain accord people care about any of this? Honestly I would rather see the entire canyon closed off and shut down then to see it destroyed by tearing it apart for a train. The best thing to do is to not allow personal vehicles up the canyon. Residents should be exempt. And to bus everyone. Put your trams up at the top to link resorts. I believe this would be least damaging to the environment and to the community.	Salt Lake City	02/12/2015
	I like the idea of a light rail because it greatly reduced the amount of CO2 emitted by us.	Salt Lake City	04/01/2015
	I oppose any destruction of Grizzly Gulch by lifts or trams. In my opinion, Albion Basin should be made a state park.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	I oppose the alternatives A,B,C that put new development in the canyons: no new railroad grade with stations and platforms and additional disturbances. No tunnels please. No skyways or aerial trams, no extra bus lanes etc. These things will work against many of the purposes because they add development, and they increase the transport capacity, loading more people in the canyons, feeding the resort machine. Creating the positive feedback loop we need to have the courage to avoid. I like Alternative D. The present system could use some minor improvements...like a paved separate bike lane...paved shoulders to accommodate extra parking at some trailheads...more and cheaper buses.	Salt Lake City	02/10/2015
	I own a land with a 100 year old cabin in Lambs Canyon. Judging by this survey Lambs Canyon is not included in the plan. Is it or not and if not, will it be included at a time in the future?	Salt Lake City	04/26/2015
	I prefer tunnels from Big to Park City and not an aerial tram.	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015
	I said very poorly because the transportation alternatives lack an explanation for the corridor purposes. For example number 2, "Provide competitive transit service in the corridor." Competitive to what? Other towns? Competitive to driving our own cars up the corridors? Number 9, "Create unique, attractive "traveler experience" to increase tourist and resident visitation." What will we do to create those things? Isn't that kind of objective? Number 12 is similar to number 2, "Provide competitive transit service to a range of recreation destinations and economic nodes. Is there any way to know before construction what the "competitive price" that UTA would set is? Is there a way that we can vote on what is affordable? Of the Alternatives Proposed to Advance for Further Consideration, I strongly oppose A because a light rail is not a good solution. It is too expensive. UTA will own it, it will be too detrimental to our water and environment to construct. And TUNNELS! Out of the question. I favor option D. Transportation system management alternatives. I don't see a difference between the dropped option F, and the None of the links for the Transportation Key Actions work on the Blueprint site. Why are there no questions about the economy or recreation?	Salt Lake City	02/24/2015
	I still feel the plan needs to include a rail connection from Salt Lake Central to Park City via Parleys Canyon. I feel there are flaws in the idea of a rail connection from Sandy to Park City via Little Cottonwood Canyon for two reasons: 1. Limited right-of-way. 2. Avalanches. I feel it would be easier to engineer a rail system that would quickly deliver users from Salt Lake City to Park City, where they could then transfer to light rail (via tunnels) or an aerial tram to the Cottonwood Resorts. A rail line connecting Salt Lake Central and Park City via Parleys Canyon could also be used as part of a future high-speed line from Salt Lake City to Denver via Wyoming.	Salt Lake City	03/09/2015
	I still need to be sold on gondolas between LCC and PC as an effective high volume public transportation solution.	Salt Lake City	02/07/2015
	I strongly support the concept of making transit to the canyons more convenient and I think the Mountain Accord has identified the key issues. Due to cost, construction inconvenience, and likely larger impact on wildlife and habitat, I strongly prefer the development of a bus rapid transit system along with incentives and disincentives to reduce single occupant vehicles up all of the canyons, rather than local buses, express buses, light rail, and tunnels. I prefer aerial transport over tunnels. I prefer the multiple "short terminus" options for enhancing transit in the Wasatch.	Salt Lake City	04/15/2015
	I suggest you study Zion National Park and its shuttle system. Policies need to shift with the seasons, with temporary solutions for temporary problems! Once beauty is covered by tracks and asphalt, it is never recovered. The saying goes something like this, "We do not inherit the world from our ancestors, we borrow it from our children." Please do not forever trade our wild, wonderful, and soul-nourishing canyons into a maze of tracks, tunnels, and noise pollution.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I support transportation alternative D...increased incentives for mass transit without rail and tunnels. But the Bus system needs improvement and enforcement.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	I support the intention of the Accord but I do not believe that making such significant changes to the canyons by tunneling and widening roads is the answer. I'm concerned that those physical changes will do more harm than good. The cost to taxpayers is also a significant concern. The cost/benefit analysis just doesn't make sense. Has anyone considered charging individual vehicles for access to the canyon at a rate that would be higher than taking public transit for the same trip? If the canyons became toll roads and I could take a bus for less than the toll I would certainly find that a better alternative.	Salt Lake City	03/22/2015
	I think as we make plans for light rail and other expansions into the Wasatch Area, we need to evaluate how that expansion will offset other needed expansions in other parts of the wasatch front. For example, Would it better for the community to have a light rail connecting Salt Lake and Park City, or to build light rail or expand bus service in Ogden or Provo, extend front runner further north or south, or to expand light rail on the east bench of Salt Lake County? based on budgetary concerns it seems UTA would need to pick and choose which projects to seek funding for.	Salt Lake City	02/09/2015
	I think Bus service would be preferable in all canyons, with a well thought out roadside parking plan, stops, bike lanes, and select road widening to enhance and modernize the roadway, specifically in LCC where there seems to be the worst problems.	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015
	I think Little Cottonwood transit is well addressed though the funding for the proposals will be an incredible hurdle. Big Cottonwood transit is really not adequately addressed except for the proposed transit stops at the top of the canyon. There are vague references to increased buses, but specifics are lacking for access to dispersed recreation trailheads throughout the year. And I think the transit discussion for Millcreek Canyon is too vague and lacking specifics, especially for year-round access to dispersed recreation trailheads.	salt lake city	02/23/2015
	I think the idea of a shuttle service going up Millcreek is a pretty good idea, if it will be done well and actually reduce the congestion in that canyon. A similar approach should be used in the other canyons in debate. Please see my comments in the transportation section. I would welcome being involved with this proposal, should that ever be needed.	Salt Lake City	03/06/2015
	I think the information provided in the public open houses has been limited. We have only "heard" rumors about the "6 hours via gondola" to move throughout the ski connect. The global warming trends, snow trends, lack of water, predictions of the "40 yr drought" Utah can work on the "100 year mountain plan" but take into consideration possible infrastructures with no resources. IE snow....	Salt Lake City	03/11/2015
	I think the proposed train up Parleys to PC works because Parley's is a large canyon with the freeway which could handle a train corridor. Having a train in BCC and LCC would have an impact on these smaller canyons. There is probably 15 - 20 days a year where there is significant use in the canyons. On those days implement mandatory shuttle bus services, similar to Zions Canyon. Keeping Guardsman pass open year round is a good option.	Salt lake city	03/11/2015

	I think the range of alternatives meets the listed purposes well. I fail to see any real data indicating why low-cost, viable alternatives are being taken off the table for consideration.	Salt Lake City	02/18/2015
	I think the transit options, like trains and trams, to connect Big & Little Cottonwood Canyons and BCC and Park City cannot be built with negatively impacting the natural ecosystem to a high degree. Use of these trains or trams to connect these canyons will continue to harm the ecosystem over time and diminish any gains in any other parts of the blueprint. Other than these intrusive, unnecessary trains, the plan looks solid.	salt lake city	05/01/2015
	I think there are 2 perspectives to keep in mind here. 1) The tourist perspective. 2) The resident perspective. The tourist won't mind the transportation time quite as much. The resident will forever compare the transportation time to that of their car and their car flexibility. So, for each corridor the new system must be comparable in time, convenience, and pleasantness. I think the systems outlined are about right. I like rail, but I get the expensive issue. Having said that this project is a tremendous investment in Utah's future.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	I use American Fork Canyon a lot for recreation. I love that canyon and am appalled that Snowbird is proposing a 418 acre land grab there. Having a "convenient" corridor for the folks in Snowbird to travel an excuse to allow an excuse to be established. You can see what you want about installation but that area will never recover or be the same. Very disruptive to wildlife to say the least. Do the people of American Fork, Highland, Pleasant Grove know what is going to happen in their back yard? I am sure there would be a lot of unhappy people with the devastation incurred through construction, the increased canyon traffic, the heavy winter use, the destruction of wildlife areas including the mountain sheep, etc. As a taxpayer I know I am going to be on the hook for making sure Snowbird gets water for "snow making" to say nothing of the cost of wild fire control and containment. This is nothing more than a wolf in sheep's clothing and I do not need to be subsidizing Snowbird.	Salt Lake City	02/13/2015
	I use the Central Wasatch area in all four seasons. I am concerned about current and future auto traffic and parking in the canyons. A sustainable transportation solution is critical. I am concerned about the high costs for rail and would like to understand the merits of alternatives and strategies for funding. I support transportation alternatives that are convenient and safe.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	I worry that parking will be an issue, even if buses are used, but even more so with a rail, which would have fewer places in which passengers could be picked up. Buses would allow more points of entry or exit to the system, the frequency of the bus routes would be an issue if it is to follow what is currently done.	salt lake city	04/27/2015
	I would prefer a light-rail alternative and car-less canyons.	Salt Lake City	03/05/2015
	If too many vehicles in the canyons is an issue then perhaps an alternative would be to charge a toll like Millcreek Canyon.	Salt Lake City	03/13/2015
	I'm curious how all the transportation studies pan out, but one thing I agree on is that driving up and parking in LCC cannot continue to be an option for resort skiers. Powder days in LCC are pretty unbearable. A shuttle or something will need to happen. I love the idea of a rail system, as (once construction is done) it could be largely out of sight in tunnels which run in all weather and don't impact the surface flora and fauna as much... but it sounds expensive just to be servicing rec users. A better transit (faster and more regular) option to Park City from SLC will be exiting as well.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	I'm glad you have included improved access for bikes and pedestrians.	Salt Lake City	04/18/2015
	I'm very happy to see that Guardsman pass isn't being considered. We don't need more traffic up there! I'm even happier to see that we aren't considering widening the roads in the canyons. Bigger roads require bigger parking lots and bigger traffic congestion, that works on I-15 but NOT in the canyon!! I don't like the idea of connecting from Alta to Park City by rapid bus. I really support connecting that path all the way to Park City, but I'd prefer to see a Trax connection. I'd also love to see the trax connect to the Olympic park (within reasonable walking distance). I'm not certain about the idea of an express bus from Park City to the airport. I think if we build a trax line then people should use that. It may take a bit longer, but it will be very scenic and enjoyable, and we take vehicles off the road. Plus, even if it takes an hour longer, it's still better than flying into Denver. I'd recommend that we let private taxi and rideshare companies like Uber handle that service for people that don't want to use trax. My last comment is that I really hope we get this done sooner rather than later. I'd love to be riding the train within a few years, rather than dumping the idea onto some 30 year plan. We have a problem today, and each day we wait, the problem and damage get worse! Thank you for accepting my comments.	Salt Lake City	02/09/2015
	I'm very opposed to any aerial transportation options. In fact, I don't think the resorts need to be connected at all through the Wasatch Back. Each canyon gives visitors at least 2 resorts in which to ski that are quite close to each other. Why does it make sense to connect them from behind using very invasive methods (aerial, tunnel)? If anything, we should promote and celebrate the little remaining undeveloped natural backcountry as much as possible. Adding additional transportation corridors is only going to foul this beautiful, wild and undeveloped environment.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Improve what already exists! People have to drive cars into the Cottonwood Canyons because the parking lots are too small and the buses do not run often enough. It is frustrating! You have several huge hotels there for skiers/hikers. Run buses directly from the hotels too so they are not taking up parking spaces at the park/kide. All of this can be done today!	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Improvement of existing transportation is much needed. Why are we blowing up what is in place for a plan to replace it all? Can we really afford to do this without sacrificing parts of what we love about the canyons?	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
	It does support the listed purposes but I would need to first understand what is the reasonable number of recreational users that we can accommodate in the Wasatch front without compromising purpose no. 1 Making it easier and more convenient to access the resorts may not be what the mountains can take.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	It meets most of the purposes listed. And more important, wildness and nature are sacrificed which should not be part of the plan when trying to improve the Wasatch. How can we protect to Wasatch if we are cutting a big hole in it?	Salt Lake City	03/11/2015
	It seems the negative environmental impacts outweigh the benefits of the proposed tunnel and aerial scenarios. With the predicted snow pack decrease over the next 100 years, it seems unreasonable to construct such significant ski area related infrastructure. Also, increasing the accessibility of travel from one canyon to another via tunnel will hasten environmental degradation. Thus, tunnels proposed to enhance recreation experiences will eventually contribute to their demise.	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015
	LCC doesn't need to be connected to BCC by a tunnel. This doesn't make any sense and would drastically effect the beautiful and natural landscape. I also don't want to see a train going up LCC and up and over twin lakes pass to Park City. Instead have the Train going up Parleys canyon and beef up the buss network to the LCC and BCC. Another no-brainer would be to have Guardsman's Pass open year round. Having Guardsman's pass open year round makes the most sense economically and environmentally. This would allow a quick trip for people from Park City. Thank you for reading this!	Salt Lake City	02/19/2015
	Leave the Wasatch the way it is	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	limit access per day and per area.	salt lake city	04/30/2015
	Low marks for ambitious ideas without any notion of feasibility in LCC. The rest is fine.	Salt Lake City	04/20/2015
	Make sure #1 priority is watershed. NO COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT that includes Ski Resorts and NO NEW LIFTS, RAIL LINES or Highways.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Millcreek Shuttle is good	Salt Lake City	02/11/2015
	More forward thinking and practical transportation solutions including forgetting the senseless tram idea and instead increasing a fast rail option along the I-80 corridor and mountain rail in BCC and LCC without the use of expensive tunnels or at least limit tunnels. LLC rails system to connect over to Park City area. Do not construct new roads over to Park City side out of any canyons and do not improve guardsman pass for cars! Instead find a rail solution along I-80 and up and over LCC and out and back in service in BCC and prevent private vehicles from using guardsman pass all together. Limit this road to a shuttle system, no cars but connected by rail! Improve bike access and safety on all existing roads including guardsman. Ariel Trams are a slow unsightly way to move people.	Salt Lake City	04/19/2015
	more on connecting the canyons with trails	Salt Lake City	03/31/2015
	More study needs to be done on considerations related to each canyon separately. An effort should be made to keep their unique qualities in tact.	Salt Lake City	04/26/2015
	Most of these services will not get used.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	Need mass transit improvements for the Big and Little Cottonwood canyons but no aerial trams, tunnels, or roads to Park City	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Neutral view as everyone is giving up something in this process. If I had to choose one view as my compromise, it would be Train up Little Cottonwood though the mountain to Brighton. (making sure the ski resorts bear a good portion of cost, not tax payers) Gondola up Big Cottonwood to Solitude and Brighton. Another connection from Solitude-Brighton to Park City which ever is the shortest route	Salt Lake City	03/01/2015
	No additional gondolas, trams or aerial transportation between Big Cottonwood and Park City should occur. I cannot be clear enough about that. Please take that option off the table. This should be a non-negotiable item. Have you seen the snowpack this year?	Salt Lake City	02/06/2015
	No aerial interconnections (sporadically used and definitively damaging to the mountain scenarios) and no trains (huge impact on the environment and very high cost. How much will each train ride cost to recover the investment?). Should focus on improving existing bus system and limiting access to private cars in 'peak' periods.	Salt Lake City	04/03/2015
	No and no.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	No gondolas or trams. No light rail in the Cottonwoods. Improve bus service and rail options to get to the base of the canyons.	Salt Lake City	04/27/2015
	No gondolas or trams. And if gondolas are part of the plan, they should NOT go where the proposed SKI Link was going. It should go from park city to brighton in the area where backcountry skiers are not likely to be found. I am open to expansion of Guardsman but only for bus rapid transit, not normal passenger cars. Honestly, I think part of the solution is to make it harder to get in, so that only those capable to get in on foot/bike/ski are the ones rewarded to enjoy it.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	No more "compromising"! We need to protect what's left!	Salt Lake City	04/04/2015
	Not in favor of any aerial trams.	SALT LAKE CITY	02/11/2015
	Please address how the disputed areas will be handled instead of leaving them open for discussion - i.e. Grizzly Gulch. Please provide more content on where you want to put lifts and how many access roads will be needed to maintain the lifts. Also provide details as to where those roads would be placed. This report is vague at best, barely mentioning aerial transport. While progress has been made with this accord, it lacks depth and detail that is needed to garner support. Additionally - would a train be added while keeping the existing road open or would the road be shut down? That needs to be addressed. A train isn't a bad idea if the road itself is shut down, or access to the canyons is limited by shuttle. But to have both the road packed with cars and a train cruising up and down the canyon that seems to be a very poorly planned idea. Additionally, please convince us that all of this is necessary for an industry that is steadily declining and more people are exiting the sport of skiing than entering into it. Also, is all of this necessary with the snow we have been receiving in recent years? We haven't exactly been having stellar winters. I do not see any of this addressed in the study. I do not support this plan in its current state.	Salt Lake City	02/16/2015
	please see above comment. Thank you!	Salt Lake City	03/04/2015
	Please see above.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Please see the detailed comments provided by the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance, which represents my feedback for purposes of this comment box.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Probably better for Parley's Canyon than for Little Cottonwood. The trade off between using present funding for expensive infrastructure or for land acquisition would be interesting. Thanks for your work, Bob	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Probably this is ok. The train is proposed only for LCC, and this should be avoided. Trax might be extended up Parley's to Park City, but this should be part of the city's larger transportation plan, not about recreation.	Salt Lake City	04/07/2015
	Rail up LCC is attractive, but expensive. I am very opposed to aerial transit from Alta to Brighton, or Brighton to Park City. Tunnels in the same places would be more acceptable if any transit services are allowed in them - no cars or trucks. I do not want to see through traffic. Tunnels of course are very expensive. Tunnels risk damage to groundwater aquifers as well. The enhanced bus service or shuttles up all the canyons is relatively cheap and should be done without delay.	Salt lake City	05/01/2015
	reconsider the alternatives of NOT connecting Little Cottonwood, Big Cottonwood, and Park City - it is unnecessary	SALT LAKE CITY	02/05/2015
	Regarding "Avalanche Risk," it seems like a thinly veiled excuse to push through development that would be otherwise totally unacceptable.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	Sadly, as far as the Cottonwoods are concerned, the alternatives are really poor. Personally, I realize that good ideas are difficult to come by and agree upon, on top of a very difficult situation. I hope that when making any decisions about winter recreation we also account for the changing climate. Putting our money in the snow basket might not be the wisest decision. Similarly, attempting to alleviate the fact that Park City is just too low to get good snow for most of the year now by building them a train to Little Cottonwood is ludicrous. Preservation should be the ultimate goal. There isn't much left anyway.	Salt Lake City	03/26/2015
	Same basic position as Wasatch Backcountry Alliance (WBA), Winter Wildlands Alliance (WWA) and Save Our Canyons (SOC).	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	see above	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	see above	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	See above	salt lake city	04/28/2015
	See above	Salt Lake City	03/10/2015
	See above - the main objection is "soft pedaling" the implementation of alternative modes of transportation vs. taking a stance of requiring these changes. And, to not incorporate appeasements to the developers (i.e., tunnels and inter-mountain sky travel) as a compromise to secure their favor. These appeasements are just that, not compromises. They risk undermining the larger need for a sustainability approach to transportation. Buses and rail are viable options if they become the backbone of transportation - and not step-children to the larger transportation plan.	Salt Lake City	04/13/2015

See above comments on shuttle systems. Buses already exist and dont require more rail lines to be put in. Focus instead on creating rail to get people to the shuttles at the canyons.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
See above suggestion on transportation solutions.	salt lake city	05/01/2015
See above.	Salt Lake City	03/09/2015
see above. The transportation problem is a key component to helping make going up the canyons even tolerable in the future . As with most problems simple is best. "Marketable" means workable not flashy.	salt lake city	03/17/2015
See comment above	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
see comments from above. Thank You	salt lake city	04/29/2015
See my comments above	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
See my comments above	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
See my comments in the previous sections.	Salt lake city	05/02/2015
See previous comments	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
See previous comments.	Salt Lake City	04/27/2015
Seriously, drop the train idea. Why not just go forth with disney approach and construct aerial trams all over the mountain interconnecting everything? What purpose does that serve? I truly hope the mtn accord takes a big step back and evaluates the idiocracy it's presented herein. Do our natural recreation areas need protection: YES. Does the greater SLC natural recreational areas need trains destroying natural surrounds connecting all over into all the canyons: NO. In summary, the natural areas needs protection from ridiculous ideas such as trains proposed to connect all the canyons to a commuter system in the valley area that no one really utilizes.	salt lake city	05/01/2015
Similar to my comments above concerning how "environmentally-sustainable" the transit systems would be, again, I believe the monetary costs of the rail and tunnels systems will be huge--as well as extremely surface disturbing/damaging. Hopefully, there will be a "herculean" effort to mitigate those negative effects (i.e. increased erosion, topsoil and vegetation loss, etc.) so that once construction is complete, a return to a "natural" look will soon occur--i.e. revegetation, natural contours of the land restored as much as possible.	Salt Lake City	02/15/2015
Skip it, look at all the other ski areas ruined by overdevelopment. Why ruin Utah's unique experience? Start new in a different location and provide new transportation there.	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
Snow sheds over the road are the only cost effective and viable option to alleviating canyon traffic.	Salt Lake City	02/25/2015
Some proposals for handling congestion into Park City make sense, although Park City should pay for it, not Salt Lake residents. Big Cottonwood is the only canyon that should be considered for improved connectivity with Park City. Little Cottonwood should address canyon congestion but maintain it's autonomy.	Salt Lake City	04/17/2015
Sorry to be neutral, but the information seems pretty non specific. What about a tram or gondola system from the base up into the mountains like in the Alps? Hong Kong has a tram system up the north (city side) of the mountains and only trails on the south side creating a completely vehicle free side. Trams or gondolas would create a smaller foot print if only towers are constructed. Also i don't like the idea of transportation access from the east side of the mountains. thanks for your work!	SALT LAKE CITY	04/17/2015
Take UTA out of the planning process. They have terrible ideas, and terrible scheduling. Don't drop increased bus service from the proposal. It is the only good option.	Salt Lake City	04/28/2015
Teleportation would be ideal. Why do the cottonwood canyons and park city need to be connected at all? I see no reason to do that unless big business (as represented by Vail) is trying to consolidate power and land holdings. In terms of cost, a dedicated bus lane seems ideal. Buses seem to really delay up and down canyon traffic the most.	salt lake city	04/30/2015
The Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons should not be connected.	Salt Lake City	02/06/2015
The BRT up the canyons is an excellent solution. It has worked very in other areas of Utah that previously had similar issues (such as in Zion NP and Bryce NP). The natural gas bus system worked WONDERS to decrease congestion in those areas. Let's use a solution that has been proven to work!	Salt Lake City	02/04/2015
The economy of Park City and the Cottonwood Canyon ski areas does not depend on connecting roadways via tunnels, trains, ski lifts, or other such methods. What we now have works and it is an invalid assumption that increased connectivity will benefit the citizens of the Salt Lake Valley as a whole. To reduce congestion, start with increased and/or mandated bus service as the least impactful option and expand from there if necessary.	Salt Lake City	04/13/2015
The emphasis on light rail and aerial transit as 'viable' alternatives for transportation in the canyons is wrong headed. The highly seasonal use of the canyons (i.e. high in winter and summer and low in fall and spring) do not warrant the huge fixed costs of light rail or aerial alternatives. Bus rapid transit (BRT) is a much more cost effective approach to increasing access to the canyons in a flexible manner. During periods of low use, bus schedules can be scaled back and those buses re-purposed for other transportation needs. A light rail or aerial solution offers no such flexibility. Further, the likelihood of significant Federal dollars being made available for light rail or aerial solutions is very low. I doubt that the State would be willing to raise taxes, nor would private interests contribute large sums of their corporate monies to such an endeavor. Lastly, the notion that a tunnel can be built and efficiently maintained between the Cottonwood Canyons and the Park City area is laughable. I doubt that a trip analysis will show that there is a large enough 'need' to warrant this massive capital outlay. My guess is that this is more a marketing ploy than a real transportation solution. Once again, who is willing to front the huge per-mile costs of tunneling through the Wasatch Range? If the resort owners and land developers who favor this solution want to see this happen, then I suggest that they pay for it. Do not waste public dollars on this folly.	Salt Lake City	02/25/2015
The first transportation improvement should be a simple carpool incentive created by establishing paid parking lots. This would drive down the number of cars or incentivize existing public transportation alternatives such as buses.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
The largest percentage of destination skiers coming to Utah are staying in Park City. Obviously, the many 1000's of beds there. Seems more the a little silly to truck them down to Sandy to Alta to Brighton .... to PC. that is not very environmentally minded. so building a Rapid Transit to Park city is FAR more Practical. Needed., and there is a lot of people who commute from PC to SLC, that could also use that system year around.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
The light rail from LCC to Park City should be top priority both for the access to LCC and for transportation corridor from PC to Sandy which could relieve I-80. I am not supporting BRT or bus tunnel for the reasons of air pollution and also not supporting the gondola from Alta to PC because of the surface scars that it'll make (look at what happened when they built Whistler-Blackcomb gondola - promising that environment in between will not be touched and then they had to cut down all the trees along it to lay down the guide cables), and also because the gondola would have much more limited carrying capability and make commuting from PC to Sandy unattractive due to transfers. As for Parley's, light rail up should be considered too not just to decrease travel time from the airport to PC, but, also for transit between SLC and PC (especially the SLC east bench), from where the light rail can be travel time competitive with I-80. Also consider tunnel between Lambs Canyon and Jeremy Ranch for reduced energy costs. Honestly I don't understand why the tunnels are not being considered more around here since in other mountainous parts of the world they are a common place. Speaking of energy, electricity recuperation when the trams will be going downhill should be an imperative, the system will be a huge electricity hog no matter what.	Salt Lake City	04/22/2015
The Mountain Accord outcome I would like to see would focus on conservation of the land, Protecting our watershed and changes that would amount to a net reduction of development in the Central Wasatch. Land swaps that would concentrate development at the base of resorts in trade for minimizing private land in the backcountry seem to make sense both economically and environmentally. A Shuttle system involving buses or vans would be able to meet the varied recreational needs in the canyons. Trains are not conducive to multiple trailhead stops and are not as flexible as buses or vans for changing needs both over time and season. Plus the environmental cost of building rail in the canyon seems overwhelming for such a small area. I don't support further connectivity for the resorts. There is no good way for this to be accomplished and the benefit would have nothing to do with those of us who live here. It is all for marketing a declining industry. I would also favor fees such as we have in Millcreek Canyon. It makes sense that those that use the canyons for recreation should help in the maintenance of those facilities that we enjoy. Money collected should be earmarked for improvement and maintenance of those canyons.	Salt Lake City	04/27/2015
The Mountain Accord outcome I would like to see would focus on conservation of the land, Protecting our watershed and changes that would amount to a net reduction of development in the Central Wasatch. Land swaps that would concentrate development at the base of resorts in trade for minimizing private land in the backcountry seem to make sense both economically and environmentally. A Shuttle system involving buses or vans would be able to meet the varied recreational needs in the canyons. Trains are not conducive to multiple trailhead stops and are not as flexible for changing needs both over time and season. Plus the environmental cost of building rail in the canyon seems overwhelming for such a small area. I don't support further connectivity for the resorts. There is no good way for this to be accomplished and the benefit would have nothing to do with those of us who live here. It is all for marketing a declining industry.	Salt Lake City	04/21/2015
The overall mission of the plan should take a zero-emission and energy sustainability attitude into consideration. AIR is a common good with a poor commons-governance history along the Wasatch Front. Also, the future of energy is sustainable without any fossil fuels. Electricity, in a few years from now, will come almost entirely from renewable sources. So, the plan should include plenty of underground transmission for electricity. It is cheap to put in transmission lines while roads, rails and tunnels are built. Where you can, include solar panel installations, etc.	Salt Lake City	04/26/2015
The primary shortfall of the transportation plan is that it seems to serve the goal of linking the Cottonwoods with Park City more than relieving destination transportation needs of the Cottonwoods.	Salt Lake City	02/09/2015
The proof is in the pudding...hard to make a decision until we see how it actually meets the needs of the many (not the few).	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
The rail option linking the SLC Intl. Airport to Park City via the University of Utah is the wrong option to consider. We need to develop a more direct rail option. In my mind, a more direct Trunk Rail line between SLC Intl Airport and Park City is the backbone of the whole "World Class" Central Wasatch transit system and should not be so quickly dismissed. Please develop this option further as part of a bolder and more complete end vision. A tunnel from Alta under Twin Lakes Pass could be an option to serve both Brighton and Solitude. This could end up being a better way to access the BCC resorts without buses in BCC.	Salt Lake City	03/15/2015
The rail proposal, especially the idea of tunnel, I find dangerously amusing. A proposal to build a really expensive transport system to benefit a couple corporations? I would laugh if I didn't worry it would actually happen. Expand the bus service! Currently to get a bus to Alta without 2 exchanges or driving to the canyons and leaving my car at the park and rides I have to get my family to the stop at 7.30. No buses currently stop at trailheads. We already have most the infrastructure, let's use it. Interconnect has been a dream for the ski companies for ever. NO! If Park City and Deer Valley want to drop their ropes I say go for it. Sol-Bright and the lift between Alta and Snowbirds Mineral Basin are fine. Hardly anyone uses them. New lifts or gondolas going over ridge lines to connect the canyons is a terrible idea. HATE HATE HATE the idea in any form. OneWasatch, Ski Link, Interconnect or whatever you want to call it, it's a terrible idea.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
The real issue is the placement of the light rail system. If it can be placed in an area that reduces impact to other users (being other than skiers) and preserves the open spaces and watershed, I believe this is the best option; however, as it is proposed at this point, I think we are creating irreparable damage to our open spaces and greatly diminishing the ability to promote economic development through off-season activities such as climbing, hiking, camping, fishing and bouldering. As an overall strategy, I think it is important to place greater value on these off-season activities as climate change models predict a smaller snowpack and shorter winter for Utah - these recreational and ecological assets will have greater importance to the Utah economy as time goes on.	Salt Lake City	02/11/2015
The tram should leave the conversation, it would be an eye sore and ruin backcountry travel and terrain.	Salt Lake City	02/24/2015
The transit must be run often enough to be useful and be quick enough to get people out of their cars. The buses or trains could be so useful for people to explore the area. Take a bus up one canyon and hike over to another then have dinner in PC. Nice opportunities to market this if it executed well. Love the trail network!	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
There are many who are against this and want to keep driving cars up the canyon. I'd hate to see our state look like a weekend California attraction traffic. Public transportation is the best way to go. But again, we need to see costs. Is there anyway that this proposal will prevent the One Wasatch proposal by Vail?	Salt Lake City	02/21/2015
There are proposals in for each corridor that would help meet the traffic needs. It is important to realize that the congestion problems are temporal for about 3 months out of the year so a system that is flexible. Large infrastructure based projects are also only serving a minority of the population of the SLC valley since it is still only a small minority of the population recreates in the winter.	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015
There is no room to increase the size of the roads without significant tax-payer expense. If you want to resolve the traffic issues going in and out of the canyon, add a better public transit option or set-up a better fee-based or other limiting access model that reduces traffic.	Salt Lake City	04/26/2015
There needs to be a clear explanation how the individual proposed transportation alternatives for each canyon will actually resolve today's transportation problem. There needs to be a clear argument that 1) there is a problem today and 2) the proposed solutions will solve those problems. There are likely less expensive solutions to today's transportation problems. An additional question that also needs to be addressed is "Is the current level of ski area development and expansion presently at its peak?". Also, how likely is it that additional development will have unexpected impacts?	Salt Lake City	03/09/2015
there needs to be better speed control in Parley's Canyon or as I like to call it "the luge". While coming down is usually the most exciting part of my day when recreating in this canyon, I really should not have to pray so hard that I make it down alive. Where is the highway patrol? If they just gave out speeding tickets in the S turns alone, they could make millions in revenue. Also, I would love to see the wonderful road bike trail between Jeremy Ranch and Round Valley extended further to the east.	salt lake city	04/30/2015

	There seems to be total acceptance of the need to transport more people into the canyons rather than giving any thought as to how many people the canyons can survive.	Salt Lake City	03/16/2015
	This is an area where I agree with the stated objectives of Mountain Accord, but some of the options under consideration are certainly MUCH more desirable than others. For example, I would like to see further study regarding the impact of a tunnel between the Cottonwood Canyons and Park City before I could get behind such action.	Salt Lake City	04/29/2015
	This is better.	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	Toll roads. I don't go up the canyons during the ski resort business hours. The transportation is only going to benefit ski resorts to cram more people in the resorts to get more money. Our Wasatch is not Disneyland!!!	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Too many alternatives. The choices should be: Walk Bike Bus	Salt Lake City	05/02/2015
	Transit connection between BCC / LCC and PC / BCC / LCC should include ZERO ridge line development (lifts, gondolas, etc). I do not support the aerial interconnect options listed under Alternative C. Interconnect via tunnels and a rail line up LCC would require in depth analysis before a judgment could be made on wisdom / feasibility of those options. I cannot support those alternatives (A and B) until in depth analysis is rendered. Expansion of bus rapid transit with priority lanes seems a good idea, but I do support road expansion in any of the Canyons. I like the idea of discouraging automobile traffic by charging people during peak periods to drive a car in the Cottonwood Canyons. Until in-depth study is conducted, alternative D is best option.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Try to keep development to a minimum in order to better protect the mountains	Salt Lake City	04/28/2015
	Tunnels and trains are expensive, permanent, non-flexible alternatives. Climate considerations, necessary economic development to support installation, & mountain carrying capacity (water, sewer, recreational space, etc) are not guaranteed revenues. A dedicated fleet of "clean buses" running up each canyon "on demand" mornings and evenings during ski season and at 15-30 minute intervals summers and off-peak winter hours would be less expensive and more flexible. Snow sheds would help insure dependability. Combining this with a limit to personal vehicle parking and commercial passes would allow resorts to fill to their mountain capacities and reduce traffic congestion. Centralized parking hubs in the valley would facilitate easy access. Consider the bussing plans used during the Olympics. The Park City/Salt Lake connection is another matter. Salt Lake is not likely to benefit economically from tunnel transportation other than through lift tickets, whereas P.C. visitors coming through Parley's may take the opportunity to stop in the valley for dinner or entertainment. The same is likely for skiers traveling the other way. Salt Lake sking visitors are likely to find direct transportation through Parley's to P.C. most likely more than 2 or 3 snowbird stops, another 1 or 2 at Alta, and 1 (?) at Brighton before reaching their destination. A dedicated bus service similar to that outlined in paragraph two above should also serve well here. Dedication/express from a few central locations (airport, U of U, a central valley location (Murray?)) would eliminate the time drag noted in the transportation alternative that addressed this. Thanks. Keep the work upfront, honest and transparent.	Salt Lake City	03/10/2015
	Tunnels and trams are NOT preserving our existing Wasatch!	Salt Lake City	04/28/2015
	Until the proposed roads are discussed it is hard to know. My main concern is that access to features of the canyon such as rock climbing areas and bouldering areas will be adversely affected by the construction of a rail system, which I would greatly oppose even though I am generally in favor of better/more transit options in the canyon. Also, please do NOT connect Park City to the cottonwoods!	Salt Lake City	02/12/2015
	Until the proposed roads are discussed it is hard to know. My main concern is that access to features of the canyon such as rock climbing areas and bouldering areas will be adversely affected by the construction of a rail system, which I would greatly oppose even though I am generally in favor of better/more transit options in the canyon.	Salt Lake City	02/12/2015
	Using existing bus/carpool/shuttle with much better incentive programs such as earn as you ride system using the credit earned for ride shares and bus use on future season pass rate discounts (5% off for 5-10 bus trips, 10% for 11-20, 20% being the highest discount) or hotel/restaurants/ski pass vouchers? Make it worth it to resorts by rewarding them if goals to reduce traffic are hit. Better experts than myself can work out how and how much is possible. Disincentivize single cars with a toll of \$3 each single rider car up canyons. Incentives make the world go round you know. :) Any Keller-Bills	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	UT	Salt Lake City	02/05/2015
	We can do some road work and continue to do avalanche control. The risks need to be understood. Making the canyons a Disneyland will not help folks understand the dangers of wilderness and the respect that must be given our wilderness.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	We do not need more access to these areas, traffic is a good thing as it regulates the amount of people even willing to surround themselves in the environment that these areas provide. The elimination of one of Salt Lake City's most important resources and what draws outdoor enthusiasts here is going to be gone.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	We don't need more roads and tunnels. We need to limit the number of people and cars in those canyons, not find ways to encourage more growth within the private sectors. I'd rather you limit my access to preserve the wasatch than boost tourism for economic growth. Stop trying to meet the needs of the masses but instead, meet the needs of the mountains!	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	We don't need this. More damage than good..	Salt Lake City	02/04/2015
	We don't OWN the EARTH and its natural resources. Development should be very limited in the canyons and Wasatch Back. Providing efficient, environmentally sound and accessible transportation, using National Park models, should be a strong consideration of the Mountain Accord. Protecting our wildlife and natural wildlife habitats should be the focus - the economy will thrive if we choose to act as responsible stewards of our canyons. Once the canyons get developed, there's really no turning back.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	We have very few avalanches in the canyons. I think this plan is to assure more development in the Canyons. Please, leave our canyons. PEASE: leave our canyons alone and focus on limiting the amount of traffic by limiting the number of vehicles per day in the canyons when parking lots are full. Consider a plan like Logan Pass in Glacier NP. They use shuttle buses and when lots are full, turn people away.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	We need mass transit. We need frequent buses natural gas or electric buses up and down Parley's Canyon to summit, pinebrook, Jeremy, Kimball and PC. The commuters and skiers should have frequent and affordable mass transit. There should be park and rides along the way. No trams or gondolas or tunnels from west to east should be built. Need public frequent transit by bus up and down the cottonwood canyons. Guardsman's pass should not be open in winter.	Salt Lake City	04/30/2015
	When the Mountain Accord process was initially proposed I was enthusiastic and optimistic. I fell in love with the Cottonwood Canyons in the early eighties and the affair remains strong. Yet over the last three decades I have seen the impact of a dramatic increase in users despite the efforts of the Forest Service, Town of Alta, Friends of Alta and many others to mitigate said impact. Clearly something needs to be done. My comments address the following: Overview - the unique nature of the three primary core Wasatch areas of Park City, Big Cottonwood Canyon, Little Cottonwood Canyon Transportation in the Canyons Transfer of Private Lands to Public Entities Transfer of Public Lands to Private Entities Water Issues Cost Overview - The three main areas (PC, BCC, LCC) of the core Wasatch each have unique characteristics that offer both locals and visitors distinct and special experiences. We are not Europe nor should we try to be. We are Utah; let's celebrate and preserve the special characteristics of each of the three areas. The mountain accord as proposed would destroy the individual character of each of the three areas; the combination of ready access via rail line and increased developable space in the base areas would create a much more homogenous experience across the zones. Additionally it appears to me that what began as a transportation plan has been hijacked by development interests as a real estate development plan. I am in favor of a sensible transportation plan. I am opposed to a plan that opens the door for significant additional development in the Cottonwood Canyons and has the additional unfortunate consequence of diluting the unique experience offered by each zone. Transportation in the Canyon - A rail interconnect is a bad idea. As described above it will result in a much more homogenous experience across the three areas. It also would take a long time to come to fruition and would be extremely expensive. Fortunately there are better solutions. Note again that a rail interconnect is extremely expensive. The cost is measured in billions of dollars and it will likely take decades to plan, approve and build. The problem exists now and needs to be resolved. Adding a dedicated bus lane in LCC would cost millions not billions and could be completed in years, not decades. (Note: A billion is one thousand times greater than a million. This dramatically lower price tag should appeal to our congressional delegation that claims to be fiscally conservative). Transfer of Private Lands to Public Entities - The idea of preserving lands from future development is appealing. It would be a relief to be assured that the Gizzly Gulch Area and the Emma through Flagstaff Ridge in LCC would be safe from development pressures in perpetuity. Unfortunately transferring private lands to public entities would not create this assurance. Large parts of the existing ski terrain in the Cottonwood Canyons is on permitted public land. The political pressure to develop these areas would not cease as a result of the mountain accord and future Utah congressional delegations will likely find themselves pressured by the existing resorts and other developers to open up these public lands to additional development. The only way to assure these lands remain safe from development pressures is to have title in the properties pass to a not for profit entity like the Utah Land Trust. Otherwise the transfer will be a development delaying tactic and nothing more. Transfer of Public Lands to Private Entities - Alta has retained its unique character over the decades through the dedicated efforts of the local community of people who love the area, through governmental entities, right now, I have no come to love Alta for its relatively wild and undeveloped nature. Yet much is changing. We have seen Vail resorts take control of the Canyons ski area and take ownership of Park City Ski Area. We have seen Deer Valley acquire Solitude, Vail, along with other ski area operators, has figured out the formula to dramatically enhance shareholder returns by creating comprehensive base areas with a full range of services including lodging, dining, shopping and entertainment. The land swap as envisioned which would pass title of much of the land in the Alta base area to the Alta Ski Lift company would be an economic bonanza for the shareholders of the Alta Ski Lift company. It would also make the Alta lift company far more valuable to an acquirer like Vail Resorts who need developable land in the base area to build it out according to their model. This would come at the expense of the broad public who owns the area, through governmental entities, right now, I have no idea what the Alta Ski Lift company plans to do and count many of the individuals managing the resort as friends. However I do not think it is appropriate to provide an economic bonanza to a private entity at taxpayers expense. Additionally such a transfer would allow development space at the Alta base for development and acceleration of the homogenization of the three core Wasatch areas which I oppose. Water Issues - I am not sure what the political process was that resulted in	Salt Lake City	03/07/2015
	Who will pay for it?	Salt Lake City	03/20/2015
	Would prefer year-round BRT in Canyons without option to connect canyons/PC via tunnel system. SLC to PC Express service would be amazing. Is there a possibility to have a two leg express system: 1. Express Bus from Airport to Downtown then to end of U of U trail line. 2. Light rail from U of U up I-80 to Kimball Junction and beyond?	Salt Lake City	04/27/2015
	You need more data to make that decision. Studies need to be done to determine the best possible ROI for taxpayers and not ski resorts. Most all the proposals favor ski resorts and not preservation.	Salt Lake City	03/02/2015
	You need to mix the trains up Little Cottonwood. Nix the tunnels linking all the resorts. Improve/expand year-around bus service. Build avalanche sheds if need be. Do all of that and my rating jumps to "Well" or "Very Well." You should also understand that OUR natural environment should not be at the mercy of the ski industry's mega-dreams. We cannot afford that and neither can this slender range of mountains. thank you	Salt Lake City	04/16/2015
	Your corridor/purposes lists are surprisingly biased and poorly defined. This is a flawed document lacking fact and impartiality. The document is leading. As such, the conclusions clearly are opinions based on interpretations of such vague purposes like "protect and enhance community character", or "protect watershed health...". My opinion is that any solution short of eliminating cars in LCC will NOT "protect watershed health". Someone else's may be complete elimination of all humans from the watershed. The document's authors have created a leading document to support their own beliefs, rather than provide information to the public to make an educated solution. The TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM GROUP voted on 4 transport concepts. Concept B was the LEAST favored, yet is largely the one on the Blueprint. This fact demonstrates the Mountain Accord is a flawed system being manipulated by personal and private interests, rather than a consensus-based process as it is purported to be.	Salt Lake City	03/02/2015
	Bus Rapid Transit for LCC is the best option. Light rail in Parley's Canyon would be a good alternative.	Salt Lake City	03/15/2015
	I think that this is much better overall than the one wasatch plan. However, do you realize what your doing? We have these beautiful mountains that many people including myself with spend 200+ plus days in year around. Once we make these development we can never reverse them. What is wrong with someone having to drive to the resort the way it is now? It will take longer? so what, you really won't see that much more riding in your day as much as you will sitting around on a bus or train. Please do ruin our backcountry.	Salt Lake City	02/04/2015
	See comments above for LCC. I think the same allies to BCC. Mill Creek shuttle: strongly support Parley's: I'm not as familiar and, thus, reluctant to comment. Though not addressed in the Accord, I would strongly support a cycling route through Parley's that does not include I-80.	Salt Lake City	02/15/2015
	Since when do people who ski Alta want their resort to be connected to anyone? Oh that's right. They don't.	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	YOU NEED LIGHT RAIL!	Salt Lake City	05/01/2015
	Vehicles operating with internal combustion engines emit harmful pollution. At any time of year, thousands of vehicles per day go up and down the canyons. This is devastating to the natural ecosystem. A tunnel, accessible by vehicles would encourage more air pollution in the canyons. A tram from Park City to Big Cottonwood and one from Big Cottonwood to Little Cottonwood would meet the goals of the Accord if passengers could only embark or disembark at existing developed sites (i.e. ski area bases) and the route did not cross or interfere with routes used by backcountry skiers, hikers, mountain bikers, climbers, etc. The rail system in Little Cottonwood Canyon would be acceptable if it operated from 5 am to midnight daily, was available for boarding at least every half hour, and stopped to let off passengers on demand. A fleet of clean diesel or electric buses may be more practical. Both systems should operate in conjunction with bans on vehicles for at least two or three days per week and restrictions on the total number of vehicles allowed to enter the canyons on other days. All of these changes should be phased in over a five year period.	Salt Lake City (East Millcreek Township)	05/01/2015
	I am in favor of less cars in the canyons and more public transportation options using buses.	Salt Lake City / Alta	03/12/2015

	The distance between the front ski resorts and those on the leeward is not that far. Most of us do not use more than one resort a day. Most of us drive directly to the resort we want to ski at. Please do not Disneylandize the Wasatch and spend my tax money on some scam that will only serve a few wealthy disinterested, disinvested tourists who want the thrill of boasting. I challenge those behind this proposal to take a hike in the mountains and picture those same mountains with trails going over your head as you hike. This proposal will cause irreparable harm to the fragile environments, and the wildlife that live currently in the Wasatch. Destruction and the experiences that many of us moved here to have will be permanently altered or simply vanish.	Salt Lake City use mostly Little Cottonwood Canyon	05/01/2015
	Leave the Wasatch alone !!!	Salt Lake City UT	05/01/2015
	The Mill Creek proposal needs more clarification and certainly more feedback from the public, that is the locals canyon, and quite frankly keeps many of us here... The question of shuttle and protection for that canyon brings to question Dogs in the canyon which was avoided in last night's Q&A. Something has to be worked out with upper mill creek in the summer, people are angry and running users off the road, a dedicated road bike lane would be nice protection for both cars and cyclists; but I want my cake and I want to eat it too... so can you work a dog friendly shuttle? That is the only place cool enough to take dogs in the summer on the Salt Lake side, that is also, personally my 5 am morning trail run or ride, and why I moved here, if Mill Creek is closed to cars, can I get my morning run in? or will I need to drive over to Kimball Junction in the morning... those are thoughts that come to mind? The LCC/BCC and tunnel proposals sound like very ideal solutions to the problems, but again can the numbers of people movement work and can you start the idea of public transit in the valley instead of just at the base of the canyon? It currently takes me about 4 hours of round trip bus time and \$15 to get to Brighton or Alta from Liberty Park and honestly hasn't been conducive to doing so, it takes me almost 1:20 to get to the park & rides at the base of the canyons by bus, so at this point the transit up the canyon isn't the deciding factor for many locals. The proposed increased light rails in the valley presented last night were only two southern routes, I believe there's a clear need for additional rapid transit from Salt Lake down there (i.e. foot hill/wasatch Blvd) and even 1300 E/Highland to VanWinkle or similar? Will the proposed transit solution adequately take into account people and their gear? In the summer, many of us will bring bikes up BCC and Mill Creek... in addition to dogs and skis in the winter, if there were better bus options (weekend and more weekday options) up to Park City, many of us would bring bikes and skis as well, will the incentive to use these systems be self-limited by gear space? (i.e. 3 bikes per bus as current?)	Salt Lake City, 84105	02/12/2015
	I am opposed to all tram or aerial connections between the Cottonwoods and Park City. Light rail connections between the Cottonwoods and Park City would have the least environmental and air quality impact. I support using light rail and or bus only transport up both Cottonwoods to preserve the quality of our mountains. Homeowners in each canyon would be permitted 2 vehicles to have in the canyons with an additional user fee to offset road maintenance. Light rail from the University could go through Emigration Canyon to Summit County and provide a link other than I-80 corridor for commuters and visitors.	Salt Lake City, Emigration Canyon	02/09/2015
	I don't think that either goal 13 or 14 are met by the proposed transportation system. I like the idea of a shuttle in Millcreek but it would not be highly used unless dogs would be allowed.	Salt Lake City, UT	02/04/2015
	There is not enough information provided in the "Alternatives and Purposes" documents to know how it would truly effect each purpose. It seems like a less expensive and easier alternative would be to start charging a fee to travel up the canyons by car, and to make the current bus system more frequent and cheaper than the car fee, and to provide adequate parking at the canyon mouths.	Salt Lake City, UT	03/17/2015
	While I applaud the facts gathered for this analysis, the results are a 50% hit/miss. The transportation plan for Park City is a great start--rail service along the I-80 corridor, and a light rail transportation backbone in the Snyderville Basin. This may reflect the more advanced and realistic planning of Summit County compared to Salt Lake County. What I question is why the approach for Salt Lake County is not comparable to that for Snyderville Basin. Instead, the "alternatives proposed to advance for further consideration", which only address Little Cottonwood Canyon, are a MISS. While Little Cottonwood currently has the worst traffic/avalanche problem, it's not the only problem, and the problem is really a result of what is going on down in the valley. Without a serious revamp of the transportation system that delivers people to the mouth of Little (and Big) Cottonwood Canyon, light rail transit up LCC is basically giving people a cherry to put on top of a (melting) snowcone. The start of a comprehensive mass transit system for the Salt Lake Valley is shown in the blueprint, but neglected in the identification of options. Bus or rail up LCC, I don't care, as long as people get to the mouth via mass transit, and can get around the valley with mass transit so we can have snow (and breathe the air) in 20 years.	Salt Lake City, UT	04/24/2015
	I think aerial transit to Park City is not viable. I like the idea of tunnels which would be snow free, safe from avalanches. I think they should only be open to public transit, not private cars. I hope veer round bus service in big cottonwood is considered.	Salt Lake City, UT 84109	04/03/2015
	Feasibility of tunnels needs further study to determine costs and feasibility.	Salt Lake City, Utah	02/25/2015
	I think you are all overdoing it, over thinking this. I suppose it's the mighty dollar that will prevail. The less development there is, the better. More transportation means more people going up the canyons. What's the point of the "experience" for a tourist. It's already getting to be overbuilt anyhow. Look at The Canyons. It was way better when it was Parkwest and Wolf Mountain, when skiing prices were still affordable for local skiers and boarders. I say respect what a wilderness area is all about. The mountain accord idea is in direct conflict with this designation. Or is it that "Utah" is once more playing games with the Federal gov. and poking a finger in the Fed eyes. History and contemporary Utah politics will tell us this is still the case. The Wasatch is practically barren of what wildlife used to be there. All killed off or their habitat is destroyed. Nice history. The Wasatch should be preserved and protected, especially from pervasive development and people who think that it's ok.	Salt Lake City, Utah	05/01/2015
	My only comment, as a long term resident (Since 1974) and having enjoyed the uniqueness of the Wasatch Mountains all these years (and yes I am a resort skier) is I hate this "blueprint" of trying to "improve" this very fragile area. I do not believe that our watershed or mountains will be "improved" and only benefits the ski resorts. We already have wonderful ski resorts and I love resort skiing but am not in favor of ANY MORE EXPANSIONS. I have only attended one mountain accord meeting at the SLC Public library (transportation and economy) a while back and I was not impressed about how the transportation plans are being proposed. Tunnels, Trams, etc. Lets work with the bus system ideas, and yes, this is not an "upscale" idea but these mountains are very unique. NO more expansions and development in the canyons. NONE.	Salt Lake City, Utah 84106	05/02/2015
	see above	Salt Lake County (Canyon Rim Area)	04/28/2015
	Promoting more public access to the Uintahs, Quirrhirs, north central Wasatch, and southern Wasatch should be part of the plan. There are many beautiful areas people don't know about closer to their home.	Salt Lake City/Taylorville	05/01/2015
	**** I do not support a rail system from SLC or Sandy to Park City. **** I support designated bus lanes without public HOV access "busses only" to Park City.	Sandy	04/30/2015
	A bus system or other flexible transportation system would be more cost effective and more environmentally friendly.	Sandy	02/23/2015
	A is ok. I cannot believe Alternative D is even being considered. A train up a pristine canyon like Little Cottonwood canyon. Come on!!	Sandy	05/01/2015
	A key factor with any mass transit plan, will be if it reduces private vehicles in the Canyons. To accommodate the needs of dispersed recreation, the routes will have to include stops (and pick-ups) at trailheads and run early enough and often enough to meet the needs of hikers, backcountry skiers and snowshoers.	Sandy	02/26/2015
	A light rail-type train up the canyons would be ideal from a user point of view, but it may be technically difficult.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	According to your own criteria and bogus screening process, you have omitted/rejected many other viable options for alleviating traffic congestion in LCC. Idea #1: How about adding east-bound passing lanes up LCC? The first up-hill passing lane starts 4.7 miles up the canyon (where the cops always sit). Slow vehicles create looong lines behind them. Idea #2: How about increased and optimized bus schedules?? Seems a lot less expensive than a train. Idea #3: I don't like your idea of adding bus lanes in LCC (not enough room), but if you did, why not make it an HOV lane as well? Idea #4: Better communication on canyon closures. Most of the time the large lines extending past the mouth of the canyon are because the canyon is closed. If more people used the UDOT texting/emailing service (or some other means) maybe fewer people would line up when the canyon is closed. Idea #5: Employee shuttles. I'm sure Alta and Snowbird represent a large amount of the traffic in LCC. What if they provided shuttles for their employees? Idea #6: Snow sheds. If you are planning to build snow sheds over train tracks to protect from avalanche and keep transit moving, why not build snow sheds for the automobiles??? A lot less expensive! Idea #7: More and better parking. Expand and improve parking at various canyon access points along the road including hiking trail heads, as well as ski resorts. Cars parking along the side of the canyon road on busy days slows traffic and increases frustration. Trailhead parking along the side of the canyon road can be a safety concern as well. Idea #8: Pilot programs. Mountain Accord seems all ready to do major construction and damage in LCC but I have not heard of any serious efforts to see if other easier and cheaper alternatives will work just as well... if not better. Lets do some pilot programs with buses and shuttles and carpooling, etc. That is a hell of a lot cheaper than dumping BILLIONS into a train! Train: Dumbest idea EVER! Go back and do your homework!	Sandy	03/02/2015
	Adding more buses during peak hours in the winter time would make the bus a more viable transportation option for skiers. Building trains in our canyons would generate severe noise pollution and have disastrous environmental and recreational impacts. I can't imagine that anyone other than the ski resorts would be on board with this??? I am shocked and extremely disappointed in SOC's support of this concept.	Sandy	03/05/2015
	Additional CNG buses are being purchased by UTA and would be able to meet these needs.	Sandy	04/24/2015
	Although light rail was said to take longer due to number of stops, the advantage of not driving especially on icy roadways could make this quite attractive to many people. An alternative that I have seen in some other countries, and which is in use with some bus routes, is an express train every few trains that would skip some of the stations.	Sandy	02/13/2015
	As above --charge tolls and parking fees.Reduce number of cars on the road with a toll and parking fees for vehicles with fewer than 3 occupants. Provide more buses and places to park away from the mouth of both Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. We don't need additional bus lanes. Consider bus only traffic during the peak periods. Why do we need to spur development with the addition of new transit corridors. Doesn't this disadvantage those that have already invested in Salt Lake City. We need proposals that will revitalize the City.	Sandy	04/20/2015
	Better and more flexible bus plans. Can traffic be restricted to 2 lanes up canyon for 2 hours in the morning and 2 hours down canyon in the evening? Something more flexible like that rather than a train.	sandy	04/07/2015
	Consider each corridor separately - please consider how they will need to adapt for each season.	sandy	02/23/2015
	Do not allow any Aerial Trams or Gondolas across ridgelines or mountain public recreation areas. It will take away from the scenic beauty of the mountains for hikers, BC Skiers and all users.	Sandy	02/12/2015
	examine more transportation options that are fossil fuel free	sandy	05/01/2015
	Express, low emission buses or nothing! Ski resorts are large enough and should be made to construct multi level parking on their own property as any other business would need to do in order that they can demonstrate the ability to handle their customer load. This is one of the big delays on mornings in the canyon. Parking is a problem that could be streamlined by the use of multi level parking structures unless the low emission buses become required. Cars can easily be restricted by charging \$15 per car, week days, \$25 per car on Saturdays and Sundays, which would encourage car pooling and bus use.	Sandy	04/16/2015

	<p>GENERAL COMMENTS oppose new roadway or railway development BUS TRANSIT AND SHUTTLE I SUPPORT increased and improved "Local Bus" for LCC, BCC, and Millcreek. Improvements should include: 1. increased service including year round for BCC. But, to support such increases there must be much greater incentives to use the buses and perhaps even a penalty such as usage fees, parking fees, etc. for those who choose not to take a bus. For LCC in particular I think increased service should include buses that do not stop at Snowbird but instead go directly to Alta. When I have ridden the bus to Alta I was greatly annoyed by how much time it takes the bus to wind its way through the 3 stops at Snowbird. 2. more stop stations or the ability to "flag down" a bus at designated, but not regular, stops (i.e., where safe pull offs would be constructed and kept cleared of snow). Currently in LCC, the highest use back-country area in the canyon below Snowbird is the White Pine trailhead, and there is no bus stop there. 3. greater incentive for users to take the bus and, perhaps, penalties or disincentives for those who do not in the form of user fees or parking fees. However, I don't like the idea of asking users to pay because that disadvantages people in lower economic percentiles. In my opinion, the current ski buses are pretty expensive. Here's a wild and crazy idea: Institute an optional county use tax (e.g. for SLC, Summit, Davis, etc.) that provides a FREE YEAR ROUND BUS PASS. The tax could be graduated a la US income tax and our former state income tax. Non-locals could be allowed to purchase the pass or they could pay for each ride. Alternatives such as passes for a fixed number of rides or days for both local and non-local users could be considered. I think Express Bus could not be implemented due to the mostly single lane structure of the LCC and BCC highways as well as the limitations of bus speeds on steep mountain roads. I OPPOSE Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) in all canyons because of the impact and cost for building an extra lane. See my comments below with respect to rail rights of way. Regarding building of snow sheds in LCC (as well as BCC) it seems to me not worth the cost. Because there are so many potential avalanche slide areas (in addition to the 6-8 or so signed slide paths), it would seem to me that the miles necessary for coverage would be so great that the cost would be prohibitive. Covering only the main slide paths would be questionable in my opinion as that would leave UDOT and the USFS having to decide when the avalanche hazard is safe in the uncovered sections on roadway. Plus, I think there would still be need to do control work on the main slide areas even if the road were covered. It is also my impression that most of the road closures in LCC occur during night time hours. Plus, with the diminished snow fall due to climate change it seems as if road closures are decreasing. RAIL TRANSIT I OPPOSE any form of rail transit in all canyons primarily because the impact upon the terrain would be immense (huge amounts of cut and fill for either the route parallel to the existing road or the independent route). If it were feasible to add roadbed for trains, then it would also have been feasible to add roadbed for additional highway lanes years ago. The meager additional lanes added only recently in LCC attest to the difficulty of making those additions. Secondly, I oppose rail because of the cost. It is obvious that the counties and state could not afford to pay the full cost of rail lines, and they would have to ask for a large portion of the funds from the federal government (e.g., a la the Salt Lake County and Utah County I-15 rebuilds). Can you imagine Congress voting to spend a billion or more to "make a cooler experience for the guests of some Utah ski resorts"? Ha, ha, ha!!! Thirdly, I oppose rail because of the fixed nature of its stations and need for large parking areas at the valley terminals. Bus stops can be changed if demand changes. Train stations would be extremely expensive or infeasible to change. Although buses also need valley parking facilities, they can be more dispersed as they are today. I think valley parking facilities for train service would be much more expensive. AERIAL TRANSPORTATION Are you kidding me?</p>	Sandy	05/02/2015
Gondola system over the mountains		Sandy	05/01/2015
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 haven. 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.		Sandy	03/11/2015
Here is my idea: use the Snowbird Tennis club area or the plaza on Highland and 94th South as a nice "landing pad and shuttle launch" for clean air shuttles that go up the canyons. These can be nice coffee shop and hang out areas for people to park and take quiet, roomy shuttles that go directly to the lifts of the resorts or trailheads on both canyons. Gondola type transport seems more viable between the resorts over the passes, but please...NO extra lanes or trains going up our canyons. They would destroy our trails--some of the few natural trails. As it is already there is no where to park when hiking. Wouldn't it be great to ride a bike or drive to a cute and quaint little village, and be able to easily board a shuttle to take you anywhere up the canyon without the hassle of parking then schlepping all your gear? I say put the expense in a nice town square center, shuttles and bike lanes and over the pass gondola AND save our trails, wildlife, sanity, neighborhood feel of our precious canyons.		sandy	03/03/2015
I am strongly opposed to the development of light rail train lines being built and run up both Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons. This alternative is only destructive to the environment and harmful to the residents (noise, pollution-as in the eyesore it will be, eminent domain, etc.) of the Cottonwood Canyons neighborhoods. Development of an aerial tram between Park City and Big Cottonwood Canyon would not only be an eyesore, but would also be an irresponsible decision that would jeopardize the health and well being of our canyons, wildlife, ecosystems, and watersheds. Certainly there are traffic issues up the canyons (but it is particularly true on prime ski days). The proposed blueprint serves to benefit the few (the skiers and ski industry), while leaving the rest to suffer the consequences. This is not a responsible plan. It is neither environmentally nor financially responsible. If there is so much money to be spent on improving transportation why not spend it in the valley to further improve mass transit and our air quality (particularly throughout the winter months when we deal with the inversions)? Why not run more buses more frequently up the canyons (especially on prime ski days)?		Sandy	03/20/2015
I am supportive of buses and/or shuttles with incentives and disincentives for auto usage, but would also need to see transit systems addressing service for those seeking less traveled destinations, ie, beyond the resorts and major trailheads.		SANDY	04/29/2015
I completely agree with Save Our Canyons opinions and statements regarding this proposal.		Sandy	03/17/2015
I definitely feel that there are some that are better than others. I am very much against a ski link idea. I honestly do not believe this is viable to ski multiple areas in one day. It is a marketing idea to get more out of town skiers. I am for maintaining these mountains for the beautiful and pristine habitat it provides and the fresh water it provides for the people in the Salt Lake Valley. I am also against any type of major construction in this mountain range. I would need an environmental impact study before I would feel comfortable with some of the alternatives. Thank you.		Sandy	05/01/2015
I do like the idea of increased buses and a designated bus lane. But NO TRAINS and NO Tunnels, PLEASE. We want to leave the beautiful mountains for our children and grandchildren.		Sandy	03/12/2015
I do not like any part of this idea. I personally think the canyons should be left alone. You talk about reducing the impact of cars, parking, and whatever else, however, you are just transferring it to other. Also why would you want to take light rail up the canyons. I know the resorts see it as making more money and so do the construction companies submitting the bids. But the light rail is not profitable and never will be, so while these companies are making more money the tax payers are left with the bill. Don't get me wrong I am all for corporate america and growth, I am studying business and finance, however, not when it comes at an increased cost to me. Last I would not use any of these so called improvements, I do not like public transit and am not an outdoors person. I like the idea of the mountains so don't ruin them any more than what they already are. So no do not consider alternatives scrap the whole project and leave things as they are.		Sandy	03/22/2015
I don't think it is desirable to spur development with new transit corridors.		Sandy	04/20/2015
I don't think we have a expander build any additional transportation court orders that was for development. Let's make use of what we have, we should support the city center and build transportation from the city centers up to the resort. Encourage right sharing. Provide incentives to use the bus and rideshare by charging a toll in parking fees for vehicles with fewer than three occupants. It's impractical for our family with all their gear, snacks, and lunch to take the train or bus to go skiing. The tax payers shouldn't have to pay the cost of the propose transportation solution. Let's not be so ambitious at the expense of the taxpayer.		Sandy	04/30/2015
I will just say this: Don't eliminate the LCC quarry trail! I ski on average 40x a year at Snowbird and understand transportation & parking is an issue. I also MTB the quarry trail more than 50x a year. To do away with the trail for the sake of a shuttle train would be foolish and wreckless for the thousands that use this trail throughout the seasons. Preserve the trail!!!		Sandy	04/22/2015
Improvements need independent economic / environmental impact studies for decision rendering 1) improvement to current bus system in BCC and LCC with improved schedules, improved base parking or enroute park and ride spaces and improved available buses during peak times 2) bike lane improvement 3) train up LCC -- 5/10 possibility rating -- must be largely resort funded 4)-----NO tunnels -- ONE Wasatch taking it underground is no different--NO NO NO 5) This continual transportation improvement as a guise for ONE Wasatch vision is getting very old -- NO RESORT EXPANSION--NONE!! ---		Sandy	05/02/2015
It's obvious from your prospective something needs to be done. It's all about money! And the resorts and there needs. It's just to bad that all good things come to an end over it.		sandy	03/16/2015
Light Rail trains here are powered by overhead electric catenary lines. Are ways to produce some or more of that electricity on site being considered, such as biogas, biomass, wind, etc?		Sandy	02/14/2015
Like the idea of Express Buses to PC from the Airport. An "Exclusive Guideway" needs some explanation I can't find. Doesn't it require widening the road? I don't see how that can be done without major environmental damage.		Sandy	04/14/2015
Limit expansion of any transportation.		Sandy	04/30/2015
Limit the number of allowed skiers at the four Cottonwood Canyon resorts as part of the resort base land swaps.		Sandy	03/14/2015
Limit tourists by not us tax \$\$\$ to advertise out of State. Canyons are Federal lands leased to ski resorts. Connect by lift from Park City area to both Little and Big cotton canyons.		Sandy	04/13/2015
Maintaining the integrity of the watershed needs to be the top concern. However, I like the idea of improving especially bus availability. Perhaps a year round vs. ski bus route would be helpful. I wonder if the light rail system would exacerbate environmental degradation in the watershed and the canyon in general. This would increase maintenance traffic and could cause serious disruption of pristine forest land. I am not convinced that further development will be beneficial.		Sandy	04/30/2015
More buses and a more flexible bus schedule should be the solution. Yes this additional alternative needs to be considered and is better than all of Mountain Accord's plans. It's far lower in cost, will not damage the canyon or watershed and can be implemented in a pilot program. We need a system like Zion's National Park with more buses for Little Cottonwood Canyon. That should be the solution with more parking outside the canyon possibly in Salt Lake or lower Sandy. I want more buses, and no more digging into the canyon. The canyon is small, and should be preserved. Not to mention the water supply. We cannot endanger the watershed for the greed of UTA and ski resort owners. Extra lanes or a train would be a huge footprint in a little canyon, not to mention it would cut out recreational needs of Utah residents. Since cars will not be limited it is just more of packing the canyon full. The new transportation will be too expensive to ride, and will not help the residents. The maintenance would be a burden on taxpayers as well. It seems that the major transit system only benefits UTA and the owners of the ski resorts. I do not want to pay for that as a tax payer, and I do not want the money taken from education as an educator.		Sandy	04/30/2015
Mountain Accord is doing good work. My undecided votes here only express frustration with insufficient information to make an informed decision.		Sandy	05/01/2015
My family has experienced skiing and snowboarding at all the resorts of which we are speaking. It is just not that hard to access any of these canyons using the existing roadways. Between Ogden and Provo a skier can choose between many of the worlds finest resorts and get there in an hours time. Let's work harder to make buses and vehicular traffic work before we even consider ripping up our canyons. I find it hard to believe that anyone (state, local or federal government) can afford to do what is proposed here.		Sandy	02/26/2015
No extra lanes or trains up Little Cottonwood canyon. Only more buses, and a more flexible bus schedule.		Sandy	05/01/2015
No extra lanes or trains up Little Cottonwood Canyon. Only more buses, and a more flexible bus schedule, like Zion's.		Sandy	05/01/2015
NO LANES NO TRAINS!!!!		Sandy	04/29/2015
NO TRAIN!		Sandy	03/06/2015
No trains and no lanes up little cottonwood canyon.		Sandy	03/03/2015
NO TRAINS OR LANES UP LITTLE COTTONWOOD CANYON		Sandy	04/29/2015
No trains or tunnels in the canyons or foothills		Sandy	03/12/2015
no trams in the canyons.		sandy	03/01/2015
No....		Sandy	03/14/2015
Passes for residents up the canyon, like Millcreek?		Sandy	03/15/2015
Plan D is the best option.		Sandy	02/13/2015
Putting a train up Little Cottonwood is a crazy idea. It is not a good economic choice either in initial construction (there are more pressing transportation issues in the valley) or ongoing operational costs. Comparisons made by MA of Little Cottonwood and European ski areas is like comparing apple to oranges. The size and capacity of these disparate areas are fundamentally different in scale and scope. This appears to be more about marketing tourism than fitting a solution to a transportation. Better bus service is a more reasonable, scalable solution.		sandy	05/01/2015
See above		Sandy	03/10/2015
See above		Sandy	02/16/2015
See above comments.		Sandy	03/11/2015

	See the last question for this discussion. Realistically, I think that with respect to the cottonwood canyons area, it would be prudent to use existing resources (roadways and buses) to see if some goals can be achieved. If necessary, regulating automobile traffic could provide incentives to get people on shared, public transportation. Lets not jump into a plan to install rail service costing billions before we try to implement a more practical solution with available resources.	Sandy	03/06/2015
	Selfishly, as a year-round user of Big & Little Cottonwood Canyons (and as someone who lives close to both), I would prefer NOT to make it easier for Park City residents/tourists to make it over to "my" Canyons. However, since they will come anyway, lowering the Big & Little Cottonwood Canyons congestion is a worthwhile goal. How does building a Light Rail line up Little Cottonwood jive with the propensity for avalanches in that canyon?	Sandy	04/30/2015
	The best alternative would be to limit the amount of traffic into the Wasatch Mountains to preserve the wilderness and watershed.	Sandy	05/02/2015
	The buses in mixed traffic seems to have been dropped prematurely without a solid reason. Avalanches are a bigger problem for light rail than for bus.	Sandy	02/18/2015
	The purposes and conceptual alternatives are terrific. What causes some worry is the impact on the environment of actually building rail lines up canyons, etc. Till more details are worked out, I certainly am interested in the alternatives being explored.	Sandy	04/27/2015
	The question is nebulous. It assumes more modern transportation (more environmentally friendly) is good (as I see it). What happens on top of snow is not what happens without snow. More people is not good for the area in the summer months.	Sandy	04/30/2015
	The report fails to adequately consider alternatives or adequately explain why some alternatives are being excluded from further consideration. The report fails to adequately consider alternatives or adequately explain why some alternatives are being excluded from further consideration. For example, one of the most obvious solutions for managing traffic in Little Cottonwood Canyon is increasing bus service in mixed traffic up Little Cottonwood Canyon. This alternative, however, like many others has gotten short shrift in Mountain Accord's analysis. Specifically, the Transportation Purposes and Alternatives Report available on the Mountain Accord website proposes to drop this alternative from further consideration based wholly on a conclusory assertion, with no accompanying analysis or facts, that this alternative succeeds only in "reducing avalanche-related risk and delay" and would "fail to meet the other 13 purposes." No explanation is given as to why this option would not "reduce auto use and congestion in Little Cottonwood Canyon," "reduce vehicle emissions in the Cottonwood Canyons to improve air quality," "reduce parking impacts on environment, safety, and economy," "support land use goals for reduced sprawl and concentrated development," "improve access and connections for pedestrians and bicyclists," "protect or enhance the natural and scenic resources of the Cottonwood Canyons," "protect and enhance community character" or any of the other articulated goals for the plan. It defies logic to assume that more frequent and better timed bus service, coordinated with bus service schedules throughout the valley, would not decrease auto use, vehicle emissions, and parking demands in Little Cottonwood Canyon. This failure to grapple fairly with the issues at hand suggests a rigged, agenda-driven analysis rather than a careful, fair consideration of potential alternatives. Moreover, one wonders how the proposed approach "protects watershed health, water supply, and water quality" better than increased busing, given that the negotiated proposal requires providing increased water for culinary purposes to Alta and increased water (in unquantified amounts) for snowmaking at the resorts. Additionally, while Alternative D, Transportation system management alternatives—which "are combinations of incentives for transit use and disincentives to auto use, without adding new transit guideways or expanding roadways"—is mentioned as an alternative that will continue to be considered, the Report evinces very little actual consideration of this alternative. It seems that a deal has already been struck between the existing players (who do not represent all relevant stakeholders) and that other alternatives are falling by the wayside without careful study. There seems to be little actual data in the report, so it seems unlikely that any alternative has received enough consideration to be eliminated from consideration at this stage. The report also fails to prioritize the many listed goals in any meaningful way and assumes that increased tourism in the Canyons is an unmitigated good. No sense of relative priority is given and the report fails to explain, for example, why creating a unique "traveler experience" in the canyon should be given equal weight with reducing congestion and parking demands. Relatedly, the report also assumes that increasing tourism in the Canyons is an unqualified good without any explanation for why that is so.	Sandy	04/29/2015
	The report fails to adequately consider alternatives or adequately explain why some alternatives are being excluded from further consideration. The report fails to adequately consider alternatives or adequately explain why some alternatives are being excluded from further consideration. For example, one of the most obvious solutions for managing traffic in Little Cottonwood Canyon is increasing bus service in mixed traffic up Little Cottonwood Canyon. This alternative, however, like many others has gotten short shrift in Mountain Accord's analysis. Specifically, the Transportation Purposes and Alternatives Report available on the Mountain Accord website proposes to drop this alternative from further consideration based wholly on a conclusory assertion, with no accompanying analysis or facts, that this alternative succeeds only in "reducing avalanche-related risk and delay" and would "fail to meet the other 13 purposes." No explanation is given as to why this option would not "reduce auto use and congestion in Little Cottonwood Canyon," "reduce vehicle emissions in the Cottonwood Canyons to improve air quality," "reduce parking impacts on environment, safety, and economy," "support land use goals for reduced sprawl and concentrated development," "improve access and connections for pedestrians and bicyclists," "protect or enhance the natural and scenic resources of the Cottonwood Canyons," "protect and enhance community character" or any of the other articulated goals for the plan. It defies logic to assume that more frequent and better timed bus service, coordinated with bus service schedules throughout the valley, would not decrease auto use, vehicle emissions, and parking demands in Little Cottonwood Canyon. This failure to grapple fairly with the issues at hand suggests a rigged, agenda-driven analysis rather than a careful, fair consideration of potential alternatives. Moreover, one wonders how the proposed approach "protects watershed health, water supply, and water quality" better than increased busing, given that the negotiated proposal requires providing increased water for culinary purposes to Alta and increased water (in unquantified amounts) for snowmaking at the resorts. Additionally, while Alternative D, Transportation system management alternatives—which "are combinations of incentives for transit use and disincentives to auto use, without adding new transit guideways or expanding roadways"—is mentioned as an alternative that will continue to be considered, the Report evinces very little actual consideration of this alternative. It seems that a deal has already been struck between the existing players (who do not represent all relevant stakeholders) and that other alternatives are falling by the wayside without careful study. There seems to be little actual data in the report, so it seems unlikely that any alternative has received enough consideration to be eliminated from consideration at this stage. The report also fails to prioritize the many listed goals in any meaningful way and assumes that increased tourism in the Canyons is an unmitigated good. No sense of relative priority is given and the report fails to explain, for example, why creating a unique "traveler experience" in the canyon should be given equal weight with reducing congestion and parking demands. Relatedly, the report also assumes that increasing tourism in the Canyons is an unqualified good without any explanation for why that is so.	Sandy	04/29/2015
	The way you shuffled thru the purposes seems very directed to one answer. If the purpose of the 'purposes' is truly to meet the states transportation needs in and out of these canyons I believe these would not be you only proposals. These are costly and overkill with precious state dollars at a time when we have pressing social needs. Your critical needs seem overly based on increased demand and expansion of the ski industry heavily skewed to out of towners which many people do not see as the ideal use of our natural resource planning. You are planning to fix a problem you want to make. What other city has the beauty of Little Cottonwood Canyon 10-20 minutes from thousands of peoples back door and if they did would they destroy it and make it a transportation corridor for other destinations? Something is not right here. Parley's Canyon has already been sacrificed for transportation. It should be the only canyon we sacrifice on that alter. Instead you quickly dismiss major transportation up that canyon for an untouched canyon. I read but did not buy into your reasons. Something is not right here.	Sandy	02/13/2015
	There are several aspects that seem vague. We might explore a fee station. We want to reduce auto traffic. We want to increase pedestrian/bike access, but really those are minor actions to help seal the deal on a tunnel and train. If we give you this, we get this. That's kind of how I see it. I'm not convinced that a train helps wildlife, water quality and the ambiance of the canyons.	sandy	04/01/2015
	There seem to be many options for our canyons. I cannot see the public accepting light rail up either Big or Little Cottonwood Canyon. We would much rather see an increase in the buses rather than a rail and train traveling routinely through our canyons. We are familiar with the buses that run in our national parks (Zion) and I and my neighbors would find these easier to accept.	Sandy	03/16/2015
	There should only be transportation that won't damage the environment. Widening roads and trains will ruin the canyon. Local residents have been there because of the beauty of the mountain. We don't want it to look like a city. You could limit the amount of cars that go up the top. Just like Deer Valley only allows 400 skiers on their mountain in any given day, we could limit the amount of people or vehicles that go up the canyon. Existing buses could do the job. This is better than inviting unlimited amount of people there.	Sandy	04/15/2015
	Train is the best idea, by far. Build it! We already have buses and it's not that good. Trains could carry many more people and is better for the environment.	Sandy	04/13/2015
	Very poorly if you seriously consider trains and your indicated transit hubs in or near the canyons. Put your hubs in existing commercial areas.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	We don't need the canyons to connect for any other reason than for the tourists and that is not a good enough reason to justify the impact it will have on those of us who make our home here at the mouth of the canyons!	Sandy	03/16/2015
	We want LESS road/transportation, MORE mountain!!	Sandy	03/16/2015
	Well, the winter trailhead parking problem could be solved if the buses would stop at all the major trailheads and if there was bus service connecting the bottom of BCC, LCC and then a few trips from Millcreek back to BCC. It was much better back when you could park at the base of BCC or at 2700 south and 2000 East and catch a bus up LCC, ski over and return on a bus down BCC to the same starting point. It is such a hassle now that most just park in BCC, or drive up BCC, leave a car, then drive up LCC, leave a car there, ski over, then hitch or take the bus out BCC then drive back up LCC and get the car. That's 2 cars and 2 trips up each canyon for what we used to do with a bus. So much harder. These multi-car shuttles are also run between Millcreek and BCC with frequency.	Sandy	04/20/2015
	what I see the focus is on Rail. That is a mistake. You need to look at affordable and realistic alternatives Bus or some systems that use rubber wheels on asphalt with or without an additional lane is what should be studied. You are wasting a lot of time and energy and upsetting many people with this proposal of Rail	Sandy	03/08/2015
	Yes you should consider other alternatives. Enhanced bus service, limiting employee travel up the canyon to buses and vans, Here's an idea, let the buses up the canyons first on weekends. Take the bus and ski the untouched powder. How about no cars with two or less people up the canyons on weekends prior to 10am? All of these ideas would encourage car pooling, taking the bus, etc. Try these solutions before resorting to spending a few billion dollars (not so much when its not your money), or even before spending 25 million on an EIS. These small solutions could fix the majority of the problems for pennies on the dollar.	Sandy	02/25/2015
	You are crazy to propose a TRAIN. Honestly crazy.	Sandy	04/14/2015
	You ask for input but will not listen	Sandy	02/12/2015
	You should consider increased bus service, and if needed a dedicated Lane for bus service that could be one way in the morning to accommodate traffic to the resorts and one way downhill in the afternoon to accommodate going home. Incentives for car pooling, required bus travel by the 100s of ski resort employees, all could and should be considered long before spending Billions on a train system that will destroy the lower canyon, climbing areas, trails and natural beauty of the canyon	Sandy	03/13/2015
	You should increase the number of buses that run on the existing roadways during peak usage times.	Sandy	04/30/2015
	I think the bus and train are the best options, I am adamantly against the aerial system. Limiting construction and optimizing implementation time are two priorities for me, as well as long term sustainability and preserving the wild, raw experience of being in the mountains. Additionally, a protected bike path would be a huge draw for me to ditch my car when going up into the mountains.	Sandy	05/01/2015
	The "corridor purposes" make a lot of sense. However again the only transportation alternatives include using LCC (example) to access Park City. WHY???????????? The two area serve entirely different populations of sports and recreation minded people now. There is not reason to change that. Keep the places separate! The goal to go over the snow or summer flora and fauna to get from one resort to the next is a very bad idea for the people. It only makes sense to the developers. There must be many alternatives. To get a valid response on transportation please ed-link access up LCC from access to other resorts	Sandy (Salt Lake County)	04/16/2015
	If cars are lined up for 2 miles outside Little Cottonwood Canyon, how does interconnecting the resorts solve for that? When the snow conditions are better at Alta and Snowbird (which is perpetual), what are people likely to do when conditions are poor in Park City? The answer is, they'll go to Alta/Snowbird, further congesting these two resorts. In this case, there will be people adding to the transportation burden because they have the option to do so.	Sandy (Wasatch Resort, LCC)	03/17/2015
	disagree with the bus statements there never has been a good bus system It takes forever / not often enough / not available when storming how about designated busses that are just shuttles for big and little? has that been tried? not in love with the idea of bus transportation but not that thrilled about the canyons being ripped apart to construct train access either and what is lost then vehicle access? feels like it really isn't being considered as it should be! Lots of variables without answers to questions of how it will be implemented the canyons are used year round with a ton of different variations those of us who really use it year round need to be considered think about access in May or Oct. very different from a powder day or midsummer	sandy ut	04/30/2015
	HOV lane on I80 seems to be the alternative for the Park City area.	Sandy, UT	03/26/2015

<p>I don't know how you think you are going to protect the water resource, but it would be nice if that was the case. I do not agree with the gondolas or tram up Little Cottonwood Canyon this is an eyesore &amp; takes away from the wilderness experience, the same with the rail. People are not going to give up their cars unless you make them!!! I've been riding my bike for years to work &amp; I see very few people committed to other modes of transportation. Also I do not know how you will make bike travel safer unless you create a paved trail next to LCC creek. There is rock climbing in the canyons on both sides of the road &amp; the train, tram will take away from the wilderness experience. I suggest limiting development of any kind. Snowbirds do not need to expand their terrain &amp; we need to maintain the wilderness area that they propose to develop (into Alpine). Pretty soon you'll want to put lifts into Lone Peak Cirque or Bell's. When will the assault stop. Come up w/a better way of managing these precious resources please.</p>		Sandy, UT	04/26/2015
<p>I will provide comments on each alternative below: A (Light Rail Transit) This alternative would require a large construction project in the critical riparian habitat near Little Cottonwood Creek. The environmental impacts of this would be difficult and in some cases impossible to mitigate, and would likely be ongoing due to train maintenance and operation. This alternative is also extremely costly and it is unclear who would pay this high cost and how the investment would be re-couped. I fear that it would require large amounts of public funds, which most of the public would see little or no benefit from as well as high fares, which would not be socially just. Further, the proposed tunnel connections would have extreme costs, have large environmental impacts, and would be of little benefit to the public. The train would also likely be untenable for non-motorized recreationists who access the Wasatch Mountains from many trailheads and access points throughout the canyons that would likely not be served by train stops. B (Bus Rapid Transit) It is unclear why this alternative is an improvement over increased bus service. The road expansion needed would have large environmental impacts in the sensitive riparian area near the creeks. The negatives of tunnels is described above. C (Aerial Transportation) Aerial transportation is not a reasonable mass transit solution. The number of people transported is small and the fares needed would likely be high. It also is ski resort expansion which is not desired as we need to protect the remaining wild lands in the Wasatch Mountains. Further, aerial transport is aesthetically unpleasing and would negatively impact the visitor experience. Lastly, construction of such a project would negatively impact the environment and water quality in the sensitive heads of the canyons. D (Management Alternatives) This is hard to comment on, since they are very few specifics. However, I think some driving disincentives, such as a reasonably priced parking fee (where you could get an annual pass) would be reasonable. Another great management alternative would be free or very reduced bus fees to incentivize taking public transit. Perhaps parking fees could be used to subsidize the buses up the canyons. E (Improve Guardsman Road) I do not actively support improvement of the road and opening it year round, however, I think it is superior alternative to tunnels or aerial transportation which would have much larger impacts. F (Increased Bus Service) I think increasing bus service and reducing fares would be a great transportation alternative. It would utilize existing resources and infrastructure and have limited new environmental impacts. Having a year-round low-cost bus service up the canyons is a very attractive proposition. It is unclear why BRT is a better option than increased bus service. G (New road capacity) This option would be unnecessary if bus capacity and ridership was increased. H (Aerial transport up LCC) This is not a transportation solution as it would be high cost, low capacity, have large environmental impacts, and be aesthetically unappealing. I (LRT or BRT up BCC) These options are likely unnecessary in BCC and would have large environmental impacts, particularly in the narrow parts of the lower canyon. Increased low-cost bus service would better meet the transportation needs in BCC.</p>		Sandy, UT	05/01/2015
<p>I would strongly oppose any aerial mode of transportation, especially for connections between Alta, Brighton, and Park City. In the Cottonwoods, I would favor only tunnels that would remain completely out of sight. The idea of shuttles in Millcreek makes sense, even though I am not thrilled at the prospect. But the canyon is too small, narrow, and winding to support auto traffic along with bicycles. The parking situation is already a major problem.</p>		Sandy, UT	02/25/2015
<p>It is VERY UNCLEAR as to what the options are for connecting PC to the canyons. Is a road one of the options being considered? I hope not! An underground railway would be best, but I guess that is the most expensive option. If a tram system is being considered, I feel it would have to be done very tactfully, and be very inconspicuous, with the corridor used for no other purposes other than moving people and their luggage (nothing on the ground!).</p>		Sandy, UT	03/14/2015
<p>No light rail anywhere. Increase bus service and expand parking areas in key, limited locations for automobiles.</p>		Sandy, UT	04/30/2015
<p>The argument is to build trains and tunnels to cut down air pollution. There has not been enough done to reduce the particulates from smoke stacks that billow out pollutants in the middle of the night while we are sleeping; stacks located throughout the valley. If air pollution is the concern, then look at a different plan to move people up and down the canyon, other than this plan. Our national parks have figured out a way to move people through the parks without cutting off accesses, building unsightly trains, tunneling through the mountain ranges, and building homes, facilities, condos and hotels. We are smarter than this from plan. We have options other than cutting off our canyons. Build a lane just for buses to transport workers to and from the resorts. Do not sell us short here! Be mindful of what is being proposed. If this is all built, we cannot go back to what it was. Our future is sealed. Please do not do this.</p>		Sandy, UT	02/28/2015
<p>These alternatives are incomplete.</p>		Sandy, UT	02/23/2015
<p>Hopefully, the legitimate needs of the ski industry can be accommodated in a way that doesn't decrease the wilderness experience.</p>		Sandy, Utah	03/03/2015
<p>no tunnel</p>		Sandy, Utah	04/27/2015
<p>Will wait for the EIS. I'm not in favor of increasing capacity in/out of Little Cottonwood Canyon unless more detail is provided.</p>		Sandy/Little Cottonwood Canyon	03/14/2015
<p>Increase bus only. Keep rail, train out of canyons.</p>		sandy/unincorporated SL county	05/01/2015
<p>I don't like the idea of any "fees" or "parking/pricing strategies" for the Wasatch. You should not have to pay a dime to access public land in the Wasatch. The good thing about having access to the Wasatch Mountains is that it is FREE recreation. I never use Mill Creek just because they charge you at the entrance. I think the tunnel idea is crazy, too expensive and too much engineering (plus were in an earthquake prone area). I think the tunnel concept in the plan disacts from an otherwise mostly good plan. The tunnels are ridiculous and should be completely taken out. I don't want my taxes to pay for tunnels and I don't want to see that much construction in the Wasatch. I do like the idea of a light rail system/train route up the canyons and to Park City though. I would prefer light rail over bus or any tram/lift connections of the canyons. I would support a light rail system to Park City and up the canyons. I think that should be the focus for the transportation portion.</p>		Saratoga Springs	04/30/2015
<p>We definitely need a far reaching train system that is economical to use. If it costs more than fueling a car, no one will make changes to use it.</p>		Saratoga Springs	04/25/2015
<p>Adding extra lanes for HOV and buses would appear to be the most feasible solution.</p>		SLC	04/30/2015
<p>Agree there should be more mass transit opportunities for the Cottonwoods, but do not agree with with tunnels connecting the cottonwoods and the wasatch back</p>		SLC	04/27/2015
<p>Are there any alternative forms of transportation considered or is this plan designed to serve the ski resorts only?</p>		SLC	05/01/2015
<p>As bad as it is car and bus transportation are the most viable options. Instead of large, infrequent, partially filled buses there should be other options. Large buses are fine for early morning and late afternoon for workers and weekends for crowds. Other times small shuttle buses ( three or four per canyon) should run continuously.</p>		SLC	04/30/2015
<p>Busses seem to have been dismissed look harder!</p>		SLC	03/16/2015
<p>Busses!</p>		SLC	04/29/2015
<p>Don't necessarily agree with the priorities of the purposes (see previous comment), but the listed alternatives do meet the listed purposes. Just keep transportation development out of the Catherine's Pass area.</p>		SLC	02/07/2015
<p>Further developing the ski resorts would add pressure to our limited natural resources and wildlife in the canyons. I don't think that the Wasatch Front and Back should be connected by anything more invasive than a hiking or biking trail. I like the shuttle idea in Millcreek, can't be implemented in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons as well? Something similar to Zion National Park. Implementing vehicle entrance fees excludes those who cannot afford to pay which can be a negative impact on our community at large. Adding a shuttle service includes everyone in our community and decreases environmental impact.</p>		SLC	05/01/2015
<p>I am opposed to the expansion of aerial transportation between canyons. Expansion of traffic on the Guardsman road will diminish the watershed, further fragment terrestrial ecosystems, and diminish the back-country qualities.</p>		SLC	04/26/2015
<p>I strongly oppose creating a transportation corridor through LCC to PC, either via tram, rail or tunnel. The beauty of the Tri-Canyon area is the ability to escape civilization by climbing, either by foot, bike, ski or other non mechanized means. PC can already be accessed by a modern four to six lane highway. I support Concept A, improving public transport in the canyons. Rail, trams or other methods would be prohibitively expensive. Make car transport expensive by allowing four person carpooling, but discourage individuals in cars - HOV access only. A fleet of CNG buses would be clean and cost effective, running every few minutes on weekends from 8 AM to 11 AM, and less frequently at other times. This concept worked well for Zion NP, for all the same reasons: a short, blind-ended canyon that was previously overrun by cars and lack of parking. Keep in mind that vehicular traffic is constant for only a few hours a day. The number of buses can be increased almost indefinitely, but train or tram has a fixed capacity. Only buses could handle the volume from 8 am to 11 AM.</p>		slc	03/02/2015
<p>I would like to see a light rail line from SLC to PC and Heber.</p>		SLC	02/13/2015
<p>Improve existing roads and mass transit/smart busses.</p>		SLC	03/18/2015
<p>Less development and destruction of the beauty and resources the wasatch contains.</p>		Slc	04/18/2015
<p>LOTS OF BUSES BIG AND SMALL</p>		SLC	03/13/2015
<p>More people, equals more environmental impact, period. Once the natural beauty is gone, the tourist dollars that were worked for through these changes will be lost. WE NEED NATURE. NATURE DOES NOT NEED US.</p>		SLC	02/04/2015
<p>No trains and no extra lanes up little cottonwood. Listen to the community that has lived in that area for decades and consider the options they have presented in attempts to save the true legacy of the Wasatch mountains.</p>		SLC	04/30/2015
<p>option A where addressing issues with existing access should be the focus. Connecting little/big and Parkcity via any kind of connection is not desirable.</p>		slc	05/01/2015
<p>People get rides with friends at worst case scenario, and there are buses that go up the canyons all the time. No need to make more transit.</p>		slc	03/27/2015
<p>Plans for the valley seem okay but I'm vehemently opposed to light rail in the canyons</p>		slc	02/05/2015
<p>Provide incentives for people to use mass transit. A test bed bus system would serve as a proof of concept before permanent investment. Ski tourists driving cars from out of town should be required to pay a fee to access the canyons or provided a voucher for use of the transit system.</p>		SLC	04/09/2015
<p>Rails and tunnels may serve their purpose in the Alps, but not here. Mountain Accord reps should not be using Europe as an example which should be replicated here. A much better alternative is to improve the existing roads up the canyons, and to improve bus service. A logical place for a train seems to be over Parley's, but not in the canyons.</p>		SLC	02/26/2015
<p>Stop doing projects until service is robust. That is what the audit said. How many times do we have to say it.</p>		SLC	05/02/2015
<p>UMA supports the Transportation System Management Alternatives solution more than the LRT or BRT, largely because of economic (high costs) and environmental degradation from building new guideways. Bus tunnels from Alta to Park City, via Brighton seem to be more beneficial than environmentally damaging. However, cost is a major concern. No additional alternatives needed.</p>		SLC	04/30/2015
<p>We all agree that the population will grow but skiing is not growing as fast as the population. Transportation needs to be year round since summer use is very high and may compete with winter but is more spread out throughout the day. The bus system is inadequate during the summer. I have heard the discussion of a bus system that goes up Big Cottonwood to Little Cottonwood canyon but I am not sure that we understand the impact a tunnel has on our watershed. I think it does solve some of the problem since the same buses could service BCLC so there would not be a duplication of services and a bottleneck at the top of the canyons. Good job getting the dialogue started. Thank you to all that have donated time during this process.</p>		SLC	04/28/2015
<p>You have to make the access and parking to any transportation system, easy and convient as possible to get people out of there cars. The same can be said as well from the Airport to the Park City area and to the Cottonwood Canyons. This being said there needs to be a minimum of stops and a minimum of transfers. The links to the current tax system and any new transportation need to be simple and minimal in number, no more than 2 and preferably only one.</p>		SLC	05/01/2015

	You should consider option F! For example, you make the ridiculous claim that option F would fail to meet 13 goals. First, the current ski bus options are insufficient and inconvenient. If buses came more than once an hour, then more people would use the bus rather than drive cars. Second, traffic is only a concern on winter weekends and some summer weekends and holidays. Drive up to Alta on a random weekday and you won't see traffic. Buses are more nimble to respond to demand and do not irreparably alter the canyon. Why not charge for parking on weekends or promote reduced bus fair as part of your lift pass? Why not include a bus pass with your season pass? Option F could then address goals 5-7. Additionally, more buses would service more of the canyon. Would light rail have stops at each hiking or snowshoeing trailhead? Unlikely. Buses could stop at more places without needing full stops and provide more options for hikers, pedestrians, & cyclists of all skill levels. All told, option F would address goals 8, 10, & 12. Let's focus on lodging in the valley and Park City with extensive bus and shuttle service to ski resorts and snowshoe routes on winter weekends. There is no need for fixed rail or a tram 200+ days a year. Period. Finally, why is goal 9 even a consideration at the same level as environmental concerns? Again, I see a focus on pimping our mountains to tourists at the expense of our own serenity and the enjoyment of future generations. Ultimately, it seems that the purpose here is to copy the Switzerland model. Uta and the Chamber continue to whittle people away to Europe to woe them. How is Switzerland has mountain farming and grazing, massive deforestation, and minuscule public land. The villages may be carless but you can take gondolas and elevators to every peak. We are not Switzerland! The Wasatch once was overgrazed and deforested but 100+ years later it has public land, wilderness, and unspoiled land. Let's not return to the past at the expense of our future. God gave us the Earth to beautify and take care of it, not exploit it for financial gain.	Slc	05/01/2015
	This will ruin what makes BCC and LCC canyon so unique. The will all but destroy the backcountry experience for those who live here and those who travel for what we have. The only ones who will seem to benefit from this plan are the corporate backers and the resort owners (who no by the way are mostly non Utah owned business's). Do Not Destroy what makes the Wasatch mountains the treasure they are	SLC ( Big Cottonwood Canyon)	05/01/2015
	Please consider a funitel or raised train, this could save the quarry trail and the homes along it in addition to creating a picturesque and functional ride up the canyon	SLC, San Francisco	04/06/2015
	It really is a shame that MA did not present themselves at all until this year, almost when it's too late! You would have had a lot more comments had you chosen to be more visible when this all started! Everything the way it is! Preserve it's natural status, do not make any more impact than it already has. Quit pushing the Wasatch like it is Europe! It is NOT! It is a small paradise that should be PROTECTED, not ABUSED! Forest Service needs to be stronger at the Ski Resorts - do not let them expand. No bagging, I see the expansion of Snowbird into White Pine EVER!! No tram to American Fork Twins EVER! Save the watershed too - all these plans are going to ruin the watershed - what are you thinking?? It is a finite resource, not to be wasted and ruined with growth and development!! No trains - just have everyone wait until the road opens - Look at this year, the road closed twice maybe! - Teach people patience, why does everything have to be go, go, go! With climate change we may not even have snow for the trains to go to. MC REALLY needs to think about that too! And what is all this talk about SLC getting ready for the Olympic bid - how much is MA involved in this?? Shame, shame. The resorts sit on public land - this is OUR LAND and we have a right to protest against all this development. How are you proving that our comments are being listened to and even read for that matter?? We have been to 3 MA public service meetings and can't believe trying to go through what we need to see presented! I mean - really ... half the questions were answered with "We can't answer that in full detail, it is still in process". To be fair, this needs a lot more time for more comments and more transparency before it goes to the Environmental studies in April!! Joni and Rob	SLC, UT SLC, UT	03/12/2015 04/17/2015
	See above.		
	I would like to see a rail system connecting from LCC resorts, to the mouth of the canyon, and continuing to the airport. I would like to see the transportation solution utilize avalanche tunnels to continually operate regardless of avalanche control work and avalanche risks. Connecting through to BCC and PC would be even better. Especially to provide a world class ski and summer destination to traveling groups and individuals.		03/12/2015
	See what they do in Europe in mountain areas. Switzerland, Austria. Eco friendly, less costly, fast, rail transportation.	Snowbird Snowbird	04/30/2015
	I think the work that you all have done so far is incredible and I am thrilled that someone is taking the initiative to try and manage the impacts from the inevitable future growth. I just wish more of the public was open-minded and willing to work with you to think creatively and enhance your ideas instead of criticize and act negatively. Please do not let their narrow-minded thinking deflate you and thank you for all your hard work on this project.	Snyderville Basin	03/26/2015
	Alternate proposals - Just provide light rail from Wasatch Blvd/6200S and Sandy area (i.e. 9400S/2000E) up Little Cottonwood Canyon - Frequent bus shuttles, hopefully electric or fuel cell, between SLC, Cottonwood Canyons and Park City.	South Jordan South Jordan	05/01/2015 04/29/2015
	Highly prefer transportation by train in the canyons.		
	The Cottonwood Canyons suffer the unfortunate melody of being located so closely to a "beehive" of people the majority of which have no regard for nature other than exploitation and personal profit. These canyons should be disconnected and preserved and underserving people should be limited from accessing them. Similar to obtaining a food handlers permit, people should be required to learn how to handle the mountains. Education, restrictions and exclusivity are the alternatives. Sad but true, the proof is written on the granite walls.	South Jordan	04/30/2015
	This is the most concerning portion of mountain accord blueprint. I do not agree with the conclusions reached regarding the disqualified or eliminated options. Increased bus service was stated as only meeting 1 of 14 purposes, but I think that it meets more than that. This options addresses 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 probably, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, and especially 14, as the character of the community would be maintained.	South Jordan	04/28/2015
	Whoever came up with this crap doesn't know anything about our canyons and what is best for them. I'm so mad right now, my blood is boiling!	South Jordan	02/08/2015
	Keep our canyon as it is. Of course, maintain the road so that all of us can enjoy the canyon. This proposal does not meet the needs of citizens of Salt Lake county. It merely enriches a few at the expense of all.	South Jordan, UT	04/30/2015
	Alternatives such as multi station twin-trams could reduce emissions and save money. A tram from the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon to Alta and over the mountain to Brighton, as well as another tram to Park City could save billions of dollars over rail.	South Jordan, Utah	03/08/2015
	The transportation alternatives are focused on the upper canyon areas (i.e. the ski resorts). Please keep in mind there are many lower canyon users (bikers, hikers, picnickers, climbers, etc) whose activities may be affected by the proposed transportation changes.	South Lake Tahoe, CA South Salt Lake	02/14/2015 05/01/2015
	As in my earlier comment, for the Little Cottonwood Canyon/Park City area, I am very much in favor of alternatives A and B, but I am very much opposed to alternatives C and D. I am opposed to the visual and that environmental impact of the aerial transportation alternative C. I am opposed to alternative D because I am quite certain that long term transportation needs cannot be met by alternative A.	South Salt Lake City	03/12/2015
	Again I will mention the system Zion has in place. Buses on existing infrastructure that run with enough frequency that a rider need only ever wait 10 or 15 minutes at the most for a ride. Very convenient.	South Salt Lake, UT	03/05/2015
	I feel this will only inundate our mountains with sound and air pollution. I feel that a train up to Park City would be beneficial, but we should not put a train up Big and Little Cottonwood. Nor should we connect those canyons with the other canyons by train. It would destroy the peace that we have in the mountains. Let's keep our wilderness wilderness.	South Weber	02/05/2015
	Over all we would propose a separate transportation for each side, the Cottonwoods and Park City. It is not shown who is paying for this and how much a family will have to pay to visit any one of the areas.	St. George, UT	03/09/2015
	I adamantly oppose a tunnel, tram, or ski lift connection between the Cottonwood Canyons and Park City/Summit County! See comments in above section. Transportation must be convenient, less expensive than driving, and take less time than driving in order to get people out of their cars. I support having a rapid bus from SLC to PC. It needs to have frequent, convenient connections to additional transit hubs in PC & especially in SLC so that it will be convenient for commuters as well as people going to/from the airport. I support a light rail or rapid bus in exclusive guideways/lanes on SR 224 & 248. I do not support using a managed lane that might be shared with bicyclists. Such transportation would need to allow for bikes, backpacks, dogs, ski gear, luggage, groceries, etc. I support using a shuttle in Millcreek Canyon, and recommend a similar approach in the Cottonwood Canyons (similar to Zion N.P.) Be bold! Close the canyons to all vehicle traffic, unless specifically permitted. Exemptions could be allowed for residents, and delivery/supply/maintenance vehicles that are necessary. There are already several park & ride lots located in close proximity to these canyons. Such transportation would need to allow for bikes, backpacks, ski gear, luggage, groceries, etc. (BTW, I would support such a method for Main St. in Park City, too) It is imperative to me that more responsibility is taken on the part of resorts & large employers in all the areas to provide shuttles for employees and guests. The major hotels in SLC provide such shuttles for guests to and from the airport. Resorts in the Wasatch front & back should be expected to do the same. These costs can be passed on to users to help alleviate taxpayer burdens for improved transportation. This would also help with the perception that "rich tourists" won't want to ride a bus to their lodges/condos	summit county	02/28/2015
	Yes considering additional, lower impact, alternatives for transportation between the ranges should be explored. I think the rail system would be expensive, take a lot of time to develop and cause more harm than good to the environment and the watershed.	Summit Park, UT	04/16/2015
	The use of high speed aerial tramways (See Leitner Group) up both Cottonwood canyons is the best choice to preserve them. I grew up in both of those Canyons and over that entire Mountain range and I see developers controlling their future and I'm losing hope that the natural beauty will remain for my grandchildren to enjoy other than in pictures of how it use to be.	Syracuse	05/02/2015
	See above comments.	Taylorville	03/17/2015
	The Blueprint has identified a very good list of alternatives, and I agree with the recommendations on which alternatives to further study and which to eliminate at this time. Further comments: Little Cottonwood Canyon /Park City area corridor: Move ahead with an in-depth study of implementing Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) between SLC and Alta-Snowbird. I also think the Light Rail Transit alternative needs to be evaluated but it will take years to approve, permit, and construct any LRT system, even if just between the mouth of LCC and Alta-Snowbird. A BRT system could be up and running long before a LRT system, and could be phased out if a LRT system is built. While I am not a proponent of alternative F C (a reintroduction of the SkiLink proposal?), it may be necessary to implement this alternative if it is determined the tunnel proposal between Park City and BCC is unfeasible (due to cost, environmental impacts, etc.) as determined by an EIS. Alternative # D should also be evaluated in depth and recommendations implemented sooner rather than later. Mill Creek Canyon: Proceed with a feasibility study for a shuttle bus transit system in the canyon as an option to accessing the canyon via one's automobile. While expanding bus service in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons may slow the increase in private vehicular traffic within the Tri Canyons area, I believe that it will be necessary to create financial incentives to persuade more people to take public transportation up into the canyons, not only in the winter but also during the rest of the year. To this end, it may be necessary to install pay booths at the mouths of both canyons, as per the mouth of Mill Creek Canyon, and charge a set fee per private vehicle (excluding residents of Alta and other developments in the public). This would encourage car-pooling rather than single occupancy trips to the resorts. Revenues collected could go toward funding mass transit, or environmental/recreation programs within the canyons. Furthermore, to further incentivize use of mass transit, resorts could offer a discount on day lift tickets when an individual presents his or her bus ticket at the time of purchase at the resort.	Taylorville Taylorville	05/01/2015 03/10/2015
	Just to continue to look into further year treats this will make to environment.	Taylorville	03/10/2015
	An electric rail system, avalanche proof, such as in Zermat, would be a great improvement in Little Cotton Wood Canyon; however, at what cost for a rail line that is essentially is a four month operation?	Toronto	03/16/2015
	Tourists in the Salt Lake valley, using dead-end rail lines up the canyons. The rail lines are tied together with a rail line on the east bench. This would serve both locals and tourists well, and keep the mountain experience primitive. Primitive should be the mountain brand. The ski resorts exist by the good graces of the public, and therefore should serve the public interest.	Vancouver, BC	05/01/2015
	I don't like the full circulation as demonstrated above	Washington, D.C.	05/01/2015
	Rather than set the light rail off for 25 years it would be wise to initiate it now.	West Bend, WI 53090	04/30/2015
	Don't add anything to our mountains.	west jordan	03/14/2015
	I think the Express bus in Parley's Canyon in mixed traffic would be good for airport to Park City, but light rail from TRAX Blue Line, up Little Cottonwood thru a tunnel to Park City would be even better in adverse weather, and provided the trip frequency were increased. Less hazards on I-80 through Parley's Canyon and less emissions too.	WEST JORDAN	05/01/2015
	I would like to see resort boundaries kept as is. I wish to see no expansion of resort activity in the Cottonwood Canyons.	West Jordan	04/26/2015
	Leave the back country alone, for the skiers skilled enough to find it is the golden treasures of the wasatch Mountains. You don't turn gold for money look where thats gotten our world	West Jordan	04/09/2015
	Like I said, Light Rail, with the circuit up one, to PC down the other. Repeat after me, Light Rail, Light Rail, Light Rail!	West Jordan	02/05/2015
	There should be an express, non-stop bus scheduled at least 4 times a day, going up and down BCC.	West Jordan	04/30/2015
	WE DONT WANT THIS MOUNTAIN ACCORD! STOP AND LISTEN TO US!	west jordan	03/27/2015
	something other than Trains,tunnels,resort expansion!!!	west jordan	05/01/2015
	Think this through I think you are being RUSHED!!	West Jordan	03/17/2015
	Aerial transportation between Brighton and Park City doesn't make sense for several reasons: 1) It will just be faster to just drive to Park City 2) It will (presumably) require a fire ticket and be inaccessible to those who are not willing to pay \$100 to take it 3) It will degrade the wilderness in this area. 4) It will (presumably) be seasonal	West Jordan, UT	02/04/2015
	It seems to me that the assumption is that all people who want access are vehicle operators. I have seen little discussion of public transportation options for the working class or the environmentally concerned individual who chooses not to operate an independent vehicle. In addition, the assumption is that only those who are "recreational skiers" deserve access to the Wasatch range. More discussion the options for hikers or occasional nature appreciators might help this proposal. Are we to assume that only skiers have need for access?	West Jordan, Utah	04/26/2015

	Just add additional parking for us to use the buses and promote the bus transportation more!!!! People still drive alot up the canyon.. how about you consider promoting what we have now more!!	West Jordan0	03/13/2015
	I am not sure what I have seen really fully explains the intent nor does it detail the things that will make it improve.	West Valley City	04/30/2015
	I believe Mountain Accord is negligent to not emphasize active transportation as a viable solution. Roads need room for bikes, bike lanes and ancillary facilities should be made part of overall transportation design and planning.	West Valley City	02/17/2015
	Less is better, the proposal is trying to do less by doing more. It will create more instead. But in reality, just less. No tunnels, no Park City access from Cottonwoods. The Rail is a possibility, clean, smallish foot print, just maybe.	West Valley City	05/02/2015
	Light rail service to canyon destinations for recreation is a most desirable alternative to building highway systems in these scenic canyon ski destinations.	West Valley City	02/12/2015
	Transportation purposes may be met, but the interests of transportation purposes conflict with other interests presented in the blueprint (interests of nature/wildlife). The environment section mentions identifying and protecting key wildlife corridors but how has this transportation system been designed to avoid obstructing or compromising these areas if they haven't yet been identified?	West Valley City	03/13/2015
	see above comments	Weston, MA	02/24/2015
	It doesn't address the daily, two way commute between Summit County and Salt Lake. The existing UTA service costs more per passenger than limo service, runs infrequently, and doesn't get people where they want to be on either end.	Woodland	04/29/2015