

Date	Comment number	Name	Comment
5/5/2018	1	Chris Poynor	<p>I am opposed to building a parking structure on the south side of LCC road where the Quarry Trail parking lot is currently. I would favor expansion of the north side parking lot. I would favor tolls and single passenger car restrictions. I would love to see noise pollution restrictions from motorcycles that use LCC road as a race course. They are incredibly loud when you are trying to hike through the canyon and enjoy nature. Parking at the Gravel Pit is a must in my opinion. I would avoid expensive construction of overhead "people movers". I would avoid widening of LCC road and construction of avalanche sheds.</p>
5/5/2018	2	Dan Arndt	<p>I'd like to submit this as a first step towards investigating the abuse of a natural resource that is near and dear to us all along the Wasatch Front. I hike along the stream there nearly 3 times a week, I am seeing terrible things along the stream that are disturbing. Seeming to be getting worse. No less than 15 fire pits in a 1 mile area. Many trees cut/chopped down for no reason left to lay. Garbage all over the place. I saw a huge bag of trash on the stream side left behind from kids I actually saw camping there on my hike a week ago. I told them to make sure they clean up. But they cut down trees and left the Garbage. No one is patrolling the Little Cottonwood Trail area at night. The kids come to drink, camp and probably engage in drug use. They will burn the forest down if this continues. The fire pits and garbage are all about not just in a certain area. I have photos of the crimes, and I want to take a crew up to film this and to show your viewers just what's happening. To prevent this in the future. To ensure that the police, DNR, Forest Service start fining and arresting to people. This forest could burn. These acts are not on the fire road, most of the destruction can't be seen from the main fire road trail. Please contact me asap to take a closer look. I'll meet the crew up there any time.</p>
5/7/2018	3	Julie Faure	<p>The use of Highway 210 is of paramount importance to our family. Both of our children train on ski teams at Snowbird and Alta and my husband works part-time in Little Cottonwood Canyon. We live in Sugarhouse.</p> <p>My husband often uses the bus at the 6200 South and Wasatch Blvd or carpools. Occasionally, due to poor bus scheduling, lack of carpool, or because he is carrying a load of equipment, he drives up on his own.</p> <p>On weekends, we mostly drive up with our kids so we have 3 or more people in our car. If my older son is going up to train on his own, we drop him off and pick him up at 6200 S. Wasatch or LCC P&amp;R which means that an adult has to drive from Sugarhouse to these parking areas, adding exhaust, congestion and waste of time.</p> <p>When the canyon is backed-up and we cannot get to the resorts, our children miss their training and my husband cannot work. The back-ups in LCC are extremely costly to our family.</p> <p><b>PUBLIC BUSES:</b> I believe that the public will not use buses unless 1) busses are faster than private vehicles; 2) schedules are convenient and 3) parking is convenient and easy to find 4) direct bus routes to Alta are established.</p> <p>Why we don't ride the bus as often as we should: When there is no traffic, I can drive to Alta in 35 minutes. If I choose to take the bus, on a light traffic day, it takes me about 15 minutes to drive to 6200 S. Wasatch and park. The fastest bus</p>

			<p>ride to Alta ski area after waiting for the 953 bus and stopping at all the entries at Snowbird is about 60 minutes, making the total trip about 75 minutes if everything goes well, the bus is on time and there is no traffic on Highway 210. That is 40 minutes slower than driving and 1hr 20 mins slower for the round trip.</p> <p>In order to solve issue 1, the construction of a third lane reserved for buses and essential vehicles only would be imperative. If the buses have to wait in the traffic with private vehicles, drivers will not use them. Bus use needs to be faster than, and as convenient as private vehicles. The</p>
5/7/2018	4	Julie Faure	<p>lane could be for uphill traffic in the morning and downhill traffic in the evening.</p> <p>Issue 2: buses should run every 10-15 mins at every stop so that riders not need to plan for a particular bus.</p> <p>Issue 3: more parking at certain stops would be necessary if more people rode the bus and they would have to drive to a bus stop. Public schools in Draper and Cottonwood Heights at the mouth of Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons are empty on weekends; perhaps these parking lots could be used as overflow?</p> <p>Issue 4: Direct buses to Alta would encourage Alta skiers and many backcountry skiers who start their tours in Alta to ride the bus.</p>
5/8/2018	5	Adam Erickson	<p>I have purchased Alta Bird passes for my family for the past several seasons. I enjoy and appreciate the differences between the two resorts. Alta is about the skiing and the history of the mountain. Snowbird placed a concrete bunker at the top of the tram that looks like it belongs in a ww2 movie. Hiking baldy is a right of passage. It keeps numbers lower. Ask Snowbird patrol how the like the cat track over the Hillary step to the Sunday saddle. Please respect the mountain and do not deface it with a baldy team.</p>
5/16/2018	6	Scott Whipperman	<p>Representing concerned neighbors, want to insure NO PARKING STRUCTURE in quarry trail area!!! In favor of bus pull out lanes, intersection (94th &amp; Wasatch) improving road to accommodate bus travel, behavior modification thru electronic scanning of license plates etc. and pull over lanes between Wasatch and electronic signs for the snow days to allow residential access.</p>
5/16/2018	7	David Hart	<p>I am very disappointed and very surprised that there was only a 3 week comment period provided. Typically on a EIS of this magnitude and with the drawing showing a parking structure at the mount of the canyon a much longer comment period would be provided for people to provide more in-depth analysis and thoughtful response. I therefore request that the comment period be extended to a more appropriate time period of 2 or 3 months. Thank you.</p>
5/17/2018	8	Tamara Young	<p>9785 Deer Brook Circle</p>
5/17/2018	9	Dee Young	<p>As a life long resident of the south end of the Salt Lake Valley and a 31+ year resident of Little Cottonwood Canyon with not intention of leaving the canyon we love (vertically at least)</p> <p>We have great concerns regarding the actions taken by UDOT, Mt. Acord, Sandy City, Cottonwood Heights, SL County, Alta township, Snowbird, Alta resorts and the US Forest Service regarding the future of this unique and environmentally sensitive area. Mismanagment by for profit entities, UDOT, the municipalities listed, and even the state of Utah have created the potential for a catastrophic future for this canyon and future generations of citizens who may not be able to enjoy this precious resource. The newly re-routed intersection at the intersection of historic Wasatch Boulevard and Highway 210 is a perfect example of the ineptitude and confused vision of all those involved in its approval and construction. Further, the de-watering of Little Cottonwood Stream by Murray City is irresponsible management of our states most precious natural resource ( water) is both appalling and the height of self vested gluttony. Murray has the right to the water. No question. But is it responsible in their sacred role as the stewards of the canyons life for future generations of Utahan's to enjoy and use, killing the trees by using 100% of the stream water instead of using the maximum they can take under the direction of the botanists who can determine what is needed to protect the foliage are both compelling examples of why more time needs to be taken by UDOT and interested parties to determine the true best course of action for the future of this amazing canyon. I hereby formally request that an extension be given for gathering of comments and other studies to be conducted to safeguard the environment, the wildlife, and the safety with long term enjoyment of this canyon for current citizens and those who will inherit what we leave behind.</p> <p>Dee Young</p>
5/30/2018	10	Peter Scott	<p>Keep baldy bald! Protect Mt. Baldy! How much does the Department of Transportation need to clear from our viable wild? I sleep here, too!</p>
5/31/2018	11	Steven Horrocks	<p>I remember as a teenager my father telling me that someday the existing transportation infrastructure for the Cottonwood Canyons would be insufficient for the area's growing population. He believed that rail service in the canyons would be the only sustainable solution. I agree. There will never be enough parking places for cars, and limiting access would only anger citizens and create other</p>

			<p>problems. It will be interesting to see just how much appetite local government, citizens and canyon businesses and resorts have to truly address the problem versus applying band-aid fixes, year, after year. We will all have to change our mindset and be prepared to compromise in order to arrive at truly sustainable and long term solutions.</p>
6/5/2018	12	Little Cottonwood Residents Group	<p>Dear Mr. Thomas,</p> <p>As members of the residential communities living near Little Cottonwood Canyon, we the undersigned individuals have a heartfelt interest in the use and potential developments within the canyon. Like everyone, we enjoy the canyon for its natural beauty, historical significance and recreational opportunities.</p> <p>However, to us it is also home. As local residents, we have a unique perspective of the day-to-day use, and have seen how the increased use, year-over-year, has impacted the area. We want to share our thoughts and ideas to help the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, not oppose it. We want to contribute to finding balanced solutions that not only affect us as nearby homeowners, but to all who use the canyon for generations to come.</p> <p>The signatories of this letter have met to discuss the current EIS process as well as in the past to discuss similar efforts such as those presented by the Mountain Accord. We have shared our thoughts with each other and are presenting this letter to efficiently communicate some of the common concerns and ideas discussed. We (signatories) do not represent all the residents in the area, and we reserve the right to comment on the EIS process individually in the future.</p> <p>We recognize the great deal of effort that UDOT and others have provided to secure transportation funding and conduct the EIS. We support these efforts. However, from our perspective, we feel there are several fundamental elements missing from the current EIS processes that, if included, would help to provide a more inclusive and balanced approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Request of Time Extension for Formal Comments: We request the timeframe for "formal comments" of the Public Scoping Period be extended. The time allotted for formal public input was not proportionate to the complexity of the issues. It did not give many individuals an opportunity to be adequately notified, understand the EIS process, consider what is important, adjust schedules, attend the open house and submit formal comments. To quickly move through the public input phase creates a perception that UDOT and other agencies have already made up their minds and are not sincere about soliciting the ideas of others. Extending the stakeholder input phase reduces the potential for costly and lengthy legal challenges. It could also be done concurrently with other phases.</li> <li>2. Broader Area of the EIS Study We request for the area (footprint) of the EIS to be increased to also include SR-209 along the south side of the canyon and west along 9400 South to the Park and Ride at 2000 East. These additional areas serve as major transportation routes funneling and concentrating traffic to Little Cottonwood Canyon. Expanding the EIS area would help to provide more comprehensive solutions that include factors such as: land use, zoning, traffic capacity, intelligent transportation systems, tolling, transit, winter traffic queuing, and summer recreation (cycling, pedestrians and trail head access).</li> <li>3. Consideration of Canyon Use Capacity (not only Transportation Capacity) We request for the scope of the EIS to be expanded to consider overall user capacity and economics of the canyon, not just transportation needs. They are inter-related. Fundamental questions need to be asked of the economic benefits of tourism, the responsibilities and needs of ski resorts, and use capacity of the natural environment. The EIS discussion needs to include both the root causes and effects of the traffic demands. As transportation improvements are made the changes become permanent along with any unintended consequences. We want the process to consider broader, long-term discussions before permanent changes are made.</li> <li>4. Clearly Defined Scope (Purpose and Need) of the EIS: We request for UDOT to more clearly define the scope (Purpose and Need) of the EIS. It is unclear the scope is aimed at short term projects such as snow sheds or the development of a long-term master plan for the canyon. UDOT's webpage lists a very broad Purpose and Need, yet already has concepts for snow sheds and multi-level parking structures located at the mouth of the canyon, creating confusion over the intent and objectives of UDOT. Most of the signatories have expressed general approval for the snow-sheds but are opposed to the parking structures. It is difficult for stakeholders to support good ideas or contribute to the discussion</li> </ol>

			<p>of what they perceive as poor ideas when the scope and objective is poorly defined. We want an opportunity to share our ideas and be included in the discussions of the possible alternatives and details. We need to know the scope of the EIS to effectively contribute. We appreciate UDOT's consideration of these requests. They are intended to improve communication and support the EIS process. We feel we have a unique perspective of the daily uses, demands, issues, and impacts to the canyon. We want to work with UDOT and other groups to share our ideas, be included in the discussions and help to find balanced solutions for all to enjoy Little Cottonwood Canyon.</p> <p>Sincerely,  David Hart  Michelle Hart  Doug Vogler  Susan Vogler  Don Halverson  Janeen Halverson  Robert Grow  Linda Grow  Mark Gessel  Debbie Gessel  Mike Day  Carolyn Day  Craig Zimmerman  Renee Zimmerman  Kent Hogan  Diane Hogan  Craig Osterloh  Kimiko Osterloh  Michael Nebeker  Nancy Neberker  Monte Yedlin  Mike Marker  Chad Duncan  Susan Marker  David Eixenberger  Susan Eixenberger</p>
6/8/2018	13	Jeffrey Gishen	<p>Just now starting to follow this - a bit late. Have travelled the LCC road for decades, and would like to submit comments. Has the 30-day Comment Period for Purpose/Need started? Please keep me posted with project updates.</p>
6/10/2018	14	Little Cottonwood Residents Group	<p>Dear Mr. Thomas,</p> <p>As members of the residential communities living near Little Cottonwood Canyon, we would like to continue our input to the Little Cottonwood Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process with the attached List of Comments. The signatories of this letter have met to discuss the current EIS process and have met in the past to discuss similar efforts such as those presented by the Mountain Accord. As a result of our recent UDOT EIS meeting we are presenting the attached List of Comments to efficiently communicate some of the common concerns and ideas discussed. We (signatories) do not represent all the residents in the area, and we reserve the right to comment on the EIS process individually in the future. The attached List of Comments document is organized into three key areas to help distinguish fundamental issues, our position on key (proposed) concepts and additional comments that we feel should be considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Section I - Fundamental Concerns: This section addresses our comments regarding key issues with the current transportation needs and the EIS process.</li> <li>2. Section II- Key Recommendations: This section summarizes our position (key recommendations) to specific alternatives that are</li> </ol>

			<p>implied as being considered with the EIS.</p> <p>3. Section III - Additional Comments: This section summarizes additional comments that include other ideas and concerns that we have identified to this point.</p> <p>Sincerely,  David Hart  Michelle Hart  Doug Vogler  Susan Vogler  Don Halverson  Janeen Halverson  Robert Grow  Linda Grow  Mark Gessel  Debbie Gessel  Mike Day  Carolyn Day  Craig Zimmerman  Renee Zimmerman  Kent Hogan  Diane Hogan  Craig Osterloh  Kimiko Osterloh  Michael Nebeker  Nancy Neberker  Monte Yedlin  Mike Marker  Susan Marker  David Eixenberger  Susan Eixenberger  Fred Burton  Marcia Burton  Scott Whipperman  Chris Poynor  Cory Clayson</p> <p>Section I: FUNDAMENTAL CONCERNS We have identified several fundamental concerns with the current transportation conditions and the approach to the Environmental Impact Statement process. We have separated these out as a specific section of our comments because we feel it is essential to understand the current issues before considering solutions.</p> <p>1. CONCERNS WITH ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS) PROCESS We support the efforts of UDOT and others to begin an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) study, approve related legislation and secure funding for future projects. However, from our perspective, we feel there are several fundamental elements missing from the current EIS processes. We sent a previous letter addressing these concerns on June 4<sup>th</sup>, 2018 (see attached) and we greatly appreciate your quick response. The following bullet points summarize our concerns with the EIS process and our understanding of UDOT's approach to address them: a) Request for Time Extension for Formal Comments: We previously requested for the timeframe for "formal comments" of the Public Scoping Period be extended. Our basis for this is that the allotted for public input is not proportionate to the complexity of the issues. In addition, many individuals feel they did not have an opportunity to be adequately notified, understand the EIS process, consider what is important, adjust schedules, attend the open house and submit formal comments. It is our understanding from UDOT's response that, even though the "formal comment" period has ended, comments will still be accepted and documented for future reference. Thank you for the clarification. b) Broader Area of the EIS Study We previously requested for the area (footprint) of the EIS to be increased to also include SR-209 along the south side of the canyon and west along 9400 South to the Park and Ride at 2000 East.</p>
--	--	--	---

Our basis for this request is that these additional areas serve as major transportation routes funneling and concentrating traffic to Little Cottonwood Canyon, which also include previously developed transit facilities. It is our understanding from UDOT's response that similar comments have been received from various groups and UDOT is considering revising the EIS boundaries. This is greatly appreciated. c) Consideration of Canyon Use Capacity We previously requested for the scope of the EIS to be expanded to consider overall user capacity and economics of the canyon, not just transportation needs. We feel they are interrelated with fundamental questions needing to be asked of the balance of transportation needs with economics, tourism, the responsibilities and needs of ski resorts and use capacity of the natural environment. It is our understanding from UDOT's response that the US Forest Service is already addressing the issue of recreational capacity and they feel there is adequate capacity remaining for recreational use. However, our concern remains that this number is not quantified, becoming an ever-moving target in the future. We would like to see quantifiable measures of the limits of both transportation and canyon use capacities. We feel there are many other groups who share this philosophy. d) Clearly Defined Scope (Purpose and Need) of the EIS: We previously requested for UDOT to more clearly define the scope (Purpose and Need) of the current EIS. We appreciate UDOT's response that additional clarification will be forthcoming in August 2018. However, we remain unclear if the scope is aimed at short term projects to spend allocated funding, or a broader evaluation of the planning for the canyon. We want to understand both short term and long-term objectives.

2. ELIMINATE GRIDLOCK and CONGESTION IMPACTING RESIDENTIAL ACCESS to HOMES Surrounding residential communities near the base of the canyon and Wasatch Resort experience difficulties accessing their homes during winter closures and heavy traffic congestion days. It is not uncommon to wait 1-2 hours to return home after a short trip to nearby schools, grocery stores, etc. This isn't just an inconvenience but a safety issue for emergency services and a logistical issue for school bus routes and mail delivery. During summer months vehicles frequently park along SR-209 and within the neighborhood limiting access to individual homes while also creating safety issues for drivers, pedestrians and cyclists. We feel there are several potential opportunities to reduce these access problems, including a variety of options such as: snow sheds, improved mass transit, tolling systems and improvements to the roadway. Additional discussion is provided in the Recommendations section of this document. Many of these may be simple operational solutions that do not require environmental clearances to implement. However, we would like to have them considered as part of the EIS process as they may reduce the need for other more intrusive alternatives.

3. ADVERSE EFFECTS of PARKING STRUCTURE at Mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon: The majority of nearby residents are opposed to the proposed multi-level parking structure at the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon. A primary justification of parking lots and structures should be to promote the use of mass transit. Fundamentally, parking facilities are transfer points. As a result, transit and parking need to be considered together. We feel locations at the 2000 East Park and Ride and Big Cottonwood Gravel pit are better locations (see recommendations section). We feel a multi-level parking structure at the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon is a poor choice for the following reasons:

- a) Functional Need: A multi-level parking lot at the mouth of the canyon would primarily be used to support bus transit ridership up Little Cottonwood. The existing parking lot already serves this purpose. This lot is only full during 10-20 peak winter days per year. There simply is not enough year- round demand (functional need) to justify an additional parking structure at this location.
- b) Parking Capacity: The area at the mouth of the canyon is limited and the number of stalls that can be added are a few hundred at most. The demand for ski resorts is estimated to be up to 12000 people per day. There are much better alternative locations with greater capacities that would serve this purpose.
- c) Concentration of Traffic: A parking structure at the mouth of the canyon would further concentrate traffic to an already congested. Alternate locations that disperse traffic need to be considered.
- d) Air Quality: Placing a parking structure in the mouth of the canyon will increase idling emissions, impacting air quality as cars exit and enter the garages from a single roadway.
- e) Residential Access: The increased use of the parking structure would further increase traffic demands limiting access to the nearby residential communities.
- f) Canyon Characteristics: A multi-level parking structure at the mouth of the canyon would permanently change the character of the canyon and disrupt nearby trail systems.

		<p>g) Traffic Safety: The traffic turning movements in and out of the parking area creates potential for more accidents with higher severity.</p> <p>h) Increased Crime: A multi-level parking structure would create a nuisance in a residential area attracting criminal activity such as drug use, graffiti and theft.</p> <p>i) Open Space: Constructing a large parking garage at the mouth of the canyon would be at the expense of current open space. Once used it is gone forever. We believe the lands at the mouth of the canyon would be better served for trails, city view parks and recreation.</p> <p>Section II: KEY RECOMMENDATIONS UDOT's webpage implies that several concepts and alternatives are already being considered. Of greatest importance to us are the proposed avalanche snow sheds, tolling systems, and a need for mass transit. In response, we have provided this section of our comments to specifically address our thoughts on these issues with the following Key Recommendations:</p> <p>1. Avalanche Snow Sheds We support and recommend the use of avalanche snow sheds at the top three avalanche risk areas on SR- 210. We believe the snow sheds have the potential to increase the flow of traffic (level of service), improve avalanche related safety, reduce closure wait times and reduce winter operational costs to UDOT. We think that the EIS should make the construction of snow sheds a top priority as the benefits of the snow sheds have the potential to reduce traffic congestion and reduce the need for other roadway improvements such as parking facilities or roadway widening. The effectiveness of the snow sheds remains in the details. We want to be involved in the concepts, design, and aesthetic choices. Consideration needs to be given to future roadway widening and cyclists. We also feel strongly that the snow sheds need to have a good fit with the natural environment and historic characteristics of the canyon. There are opportunities to blend the exterior of the snow sheds with the natural canyon environment while using the interior wall faces to portray the rich history of the canyon (mining, rock quarries, recreation, etc).</p> <p>2. Variable Priced Electronic Toll Systems We support the use of Variable Priced Tolling systems with Innovative Traffic Management Technologies and Policies that encourage mass transit and the efficient use of automobiles. Currently over 90% of traffic in the canyon is personal automobiles. Tolling systems could be used as leverage to encourage transit ridership while also generating revenues to help manage transportation needs in the canyon. Tolls could also be combined with HOV and transit exemptions. The State Legislature and UDOT recently approved the use of tolling in HOV and high demand areas such as the Cottonwood Canyons. Tolling systems are low cost to implement and have minimal impact on the environment. The technology is proven will likely continue to improve with time. The tolling systems should consider the following:</p> <p>a) Variable Tolls Fees: Toll fees should be variable, based on congestion (demand), with higher prices at peak times. Higher toll fees could be charged to gain a "Early Access" benefit, generating higher revenues from those willing to pay. Disney theme parks use this concept.</p> <p>b) HOV – Transit Exemption: Tolls should be reduced or eliminated for transit and High Occupancy Vehicles (4 plus) as added incentives to use of these options. Consideration should be given to commercial (private) shuttle services during peak days, or to smaller, more frequent shuttle (Flex Transit) rather than large buses. Part of the problem is nobody wants to wait 30 minutes to ride a large crowded, slow UTA bus.</p> <p>c) Toll Reinvestment: Toll Revenues should be reinvested back into the operational management and maintenance of the canyons instead of going to general funding.</p> <p>d) Incentives: Tolls will likely be considered as a penalty. UDOT should also consider positive incentives that encourage transit use and HOV use. Incentive examples might include working with resorts to offer tram rides, room discounts, restaurant discounts, etc.</p> <p>3. Development of a Transportation Station (94th South an 20th East) We request for the EIS to evaluate the concept of further developing the existing Park and Ride near 2000 East and 9400 South. This includes the potential of a larger parking structure at that location, if justified. UDOT and UTA promoted the development of this site several years back. Consideration should be given to reviewing what works, what doesn't, and how to improve on it. We recognize that mass transit and parking need to be considered</p>
--	--	--

together. Promoting a multi-level parking structure at the mouth of Little Cottonwood without questioning the feasibility of existing facilities or mass transit does not lend to the credibility of UDOT or the EIS process. A primary objective of the EIS should be to find ways to increase the efficiency of the existing transportation system. The goal should not be to increase the number of cars going up the canyon but rather to find more efficient ways to move people up and down the canyon. We also believe there are opportunities to look at the behavioral aspects of why people will or won't ride mass transit. There are numerous factors that support improvements at the existing 2000 East Park and Ride:

a) Previous Studies and Approvals: UDOT and UTA (previous studies) recommended, funded and built the Park and Ride site at 2000 East and 9400 South. This site does not require the same level of environmental clearances to improve as the Cottonwood Canyons.

b) Credibility: The entire credibility of the EIS and new alternatives (parking structures) would be in question if UDOT/UTA does not address previous improvements that were studied, justified and built including the 2000 East Park and Ride.

c) Existing Property: This existing Park and Ride site already does not require additional property (Right of Way) purchases or zoning changes. This will reduce design and construction costs.

d) Innovative Technologies: The existing site could be improved to accept innovative technologies, message boards, tolling information, waiting areas along with other communication tools providing incentives to ride Flex Vans or carpool up the canyons.

e) Other Transit Uses: The existing Park and Ride could be expanded to not only provide bus service to the canyons, but also become a TRAX access point downtown, airports, universities, sporting events, etc.

f) Traffic Dispersion: The 2000 East site disperses traffic away from the canyons rather than concentrating it.

g) Flex Shuttles: The 2000 East Park and Ride could easily handle a larger frequency of smaller Flex Shuttles and commercial shuttle buses rather than large buses and cars.

e) Information Waiting Area: Similar to vehicle waiting areas at the airport, this site could be used with message boards that give updates on the closures of the canyons. Notices could also be given to first priority transit and HOV up the canyon for those who ride buses/shuttles.

f) Transit Oriented Development: The 2000 east location could be improved to promote a more transit friendly development whereas the mouth of the canyon site can't. Concepts such as indoor waiting areas, food trucks, restaurants, coffee shops, could all be used to encourage transit ridership.

Section 3: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FOR CONSIDERATION We have identified several ideas that we would like to share as Additional Comments. These are in addition to the previous sections that provide Fundamental Concerns and Key Recommendations:

1. Widening of the Existing Two-Lane Roadways We support the discussion of alternatives to improve the existing roadway geometry to provide additional capacity, safety and residential access. Available options include: center (median) lanes, multi-purpose shoulders, and climbing/passing lanes, and that could be used in key areas. These options should be considered individually and collectively. We feel the characteristics and needs at the mouth of the canyon (SR-209) are different than those within the canyon (SR-210). Alternatives and solutions need to be considered as individual segments, spot improvements, and collectively as they influence each other. The roadway widening approaches should consider related factors such as peak traffic demand/capacity, vehicle storage during closures, and minimizing impacts to the canyon itself. We support roadway improvements that also consider, promote, and encourage transit usage. For example, roadway geometric improvements could include a dedicated lane reserved for bus, UTA Shared Van and other HOV travel. It could be further leveraged in conjunction with express tolling during early mornings of prime ski days. The outside uphill lane could be used to stage private cars during closure periods. Priority access should be considered to bus and van movement prior to releasing staged cars.

a. 14 ft Wide Median Lane (Express/Bus/HOV): We support the consideration of a 14 ft wide median center lane that could be used in the canyon and the roadways approaching the canyon. This lane could potentially be used as an HOV, express, toll, bus, or reversible lane (am/pm peak demand days). Specifically, we feel that consideration should be given of an additional center lane

		<p>capacity up to Gate B, if not further. This would allow for vehicle storage on closure day backups, while also allowing local residential access.</p> <p>b. Multi Use Shoulders: We support the consideration of adding shoulders along SR-209 (segment from Wasatch Blvd to the intersection with SR-210). This section of roadway experiences mixed residential, bicycle, pedestrian and trail access use. We feel the shoulders could be improved and used for winter vehicle storage during closures, and as bike lanes during the summer months. Sections of the roadway have already been set aside as development has occurred, but lack continuity. Consideration of multi-use shoulders could be considered without or without other alternatives such as center median lanes.</p> <p>c. Passing/Climbing Lanes: There are areas within the canyon that have steep grades, reducing the speed of buses and heavy delivery trucks. If other alternatives such as a median lane and shoulders are not selected, then consideration should be given to spot improvements with passing/climbing lanes, guardrail and other improvements. These could help to improve overall traffic flows and safety, reducing congestion at the bottom of the canyon.</p> <p>2. Traffic Management Systems UDOT currently uses law enforcement, variable message signs and traffic cameras as a few of the available tools to manage traffic in in the canyon. We recommend that improvements be made to enhance these systems with additional and innovative technologies. These systems help to gather and share "real time" traffic information. Additional traffic cameras, message signing, radio, text messaging, and cell phone GPS location data offer potential improvements. Specific ideas include:</p> <p>a) Additional Message Signing: could be placed at intersections and in advance of where traffic backups occur so that drivers can make decisions before they reach the gridlock.</p> <p>b) Larger Areas Radio Notifications: could be used to notify drivers earlier.</p> <p>c) Improved Cell Phone and Texting Apps: to notify drivers and residents.</p> <p>d) Pilot Cars: We the use of pilot cars winter during road closures could be used to help access the affected residential areas. Pilot cars have proven to be effective in construction work zones, and should be considered for closures and incident management situations.</p> <p>e) Law Enforcement – Incident Management Logistics: We feel the placement of additional law enforcement or UDOT Incident Management crews at the beginning of the traffic queues could be used to screen and manage traffic (traffic screening) at beginning of traffic queues rather than just at the bottom of canyon. Currently residential users have no way of communicating with law enforcement to access their homes, and also the recipients the frustration of other motorists who perceive them as cutting in line.</p> <p>f) Help Number: Provide local residences with a dedicated contact phone number. This number could be tied in with existing UDOT Incident Management and Traffic Operations Center to improve access for local residents, school buses, and emergency services.</p> <p>g) Innovative Technologies: UDOT should consider the use of innovative technologies such as vehicle electronic recognition GPS Identification and tracking systems that could be used to gain access.</p> <p>h) Roundabouts to Manage Traffic: We recommend the use of roundabouts at key locations. The roundabouts could be beneficial in helping law enforcement to redirect traffic during closures and emergencies, while also improving the safety of the intersections. The roundabouts could also become visual landmarks (gateways) separating urban areas with the environmentally sensitive canyon. Specifically, we feel roundabouts should be considered at the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Intersection of SR-209 and SR-210.</li> <li>- Mid-Canyon (Gate B).</li> <li>- Intersection of SR-201 and Wasatch</li> <li>- Intersection of SR-209 and Wasatch.</li> </ul> <p>3. Existing Bridge Improvements In addition to the transit, roadway, and other improvements, we feel there are needed</p>
--	--	---

			<p>improvements to the bridges in the canyon. The funding set aside by the Legislator should be considered for these needs, and therefore should be reviewed under the EIS, so that separate clearances are not needed. We recommend improvements to following bridges in the canyon.</p> <p>a) Old Stone Bridge: The old stone bridge at the mouth of the canyon should be preserved as a historical feature. However, it is narrow and does not allow for safe pedestrian and cycling traffic. We would like to see pedestrian bridges (that match) to the sides of the existing stone bridge.</p> <p>b) Wasatch Resort Bridge: The bridge crossing Little Cottonwood Creek into Wasatch Resort has extensive scour, load capacity, and geometric issues. Consideration should be given to the rehabilitation or replacement of this bridge.</p> <p>c) Pedestrian Under crossings: There are numerous areas in the canyon, where pedestrian traffic crosses the roadway, creating safety issues. An example of this is at the existing parking lot, where people cross the road to access the Quarry Trail. We recommend the consideration of pedestrian under-crossings at the mouth of the canyon and elsewhere up the canyon.</p> <p>4. Open Space Boundaries There are remaining open space areas at the mouth of the canyon are quickly being developed for residential and other uses. Once developed, the open space is gone forever. Part of the EIS process should include broader land use and zoning discussions. Establishing natural boundaries for open space should be a priority. In particular, the land at the north side of the bottom of the canyon should be considered for open space, city view parks, trails, or recreational use.</p> <p>5. Environmental and Historical Fit: We recommend that all improvements to the canyon infrastructure and transportation systems to include consideration for unique natural, historical, and wildlife characteristics of the canyon.</p> <p>6. American Fork Canyon should be opened up for access to the ski resort More and more traffic is coming from Utah County to the ski resorts. At the same time, the ski resorts are expanding use into American Fork canyon. Consideration should be given to providing transportation access to the ski resorts through American Fork Canyon. This could include consideration for cars, gondolas, rail. etc. The EIS, UDOT, ski resorts, Utah County, and Forest Service should be exploring the issue.</p> <p>8. Development of Parking Structures at Alta and Snowbird. There has been some suggestion for building larger parking capacity at the ski resorts rather than the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon. This does nothing to reduce congestion in the canyon funnel. The ski resorts need to take responsibility in helping to solve the transportation problems by continuing to advocate and incentivize public transit and car pooling use. Further, we are opposed to spending public funds that directly benefit specific private business who should be shouldering impact of their marketing efforts to bring more people to their destinations.</p>
7/6/2018	15	Keith Griffall	Wasatch Blvd has to be tackled first so that the traffic during peak periods is manageable. Having an alternative way to get to housing in the Bell Canyon area, possibly through Highland Drive seems to be the only solution.
7/7/2018	16	Beth Artman	If the plan is to continue to rely on buses for transit to reduce congestion, the resorts should provide more lockers, season lockers for storage to make riding the bus easier and other incentives to encourage locals to take the bus.
7/9/2018	17	Rebecca Turville	Toll Road. Winter-season pass holders, employees, or carpooling 3+ no fee. Summer- employees or carpooling+3 no fee. Monthly pass (like Millcreek). Regulate #of vehicles in the canyon. Bigger carpool lot / parknride lots at the bottom. Better control over type of vehicles entering the canyon during the winter
7/11/2018	18	Tyler Waterhouse	The current bus system is hindered by the inability of the buses to run "on-time" as they sit in the same lanes as regular vehicles, there are too many stops, so getting on to go down canyon at Snowbird is almost impossible on busy days as buses are full from prior stops. I would recommend either dedicated bus lanes, or closing the canyon to down traffic between say 8-10 and buses use those lanes to travel up, and then the opposite, i.e. close up-travel for bus use going down from 3:30-5:30. I want to use public transit, but with small children and the current system it is not feasible.
7/19/2018	19	Merrill Ford	Hi There, let's not do anything with canyons if the state government does anything it will cost the public. The state wants and always looking to get money. The public needs to know if they have to go on the weekends it will be crowded. I think that the forest service could expand some of the parking areas it would help a little.. Most of the traffic is people for recreation it not like our freeways that become parking lots at busy times. Again the state will want to make money and nothing will improve. Thanks
7/19/2018	20	Holly Josephson	Please contact me when recreation hotspot comments are available

7/19/2018	21	Mark Allen	Why is the government providing a solution for the private sectors business? Let the resorts buy transit solutions, buy parking lots in the valley and figure out how to get their clientele to their mountains respectively.
	22	Jeff Grover	The long-term solution for getting people into the mountains and foothills along the Wasatch Front absolutely cannot be more lanes for private cars and more parking in the canyons. Wasatch Boulevard and the Canyons are very popular biking routes, but they mix with distracted, fast-moving recreational traffic... my neighbor was fatally struck a few years ago biking in Millcreek Canyon. I believe a separated bike path is needed along Wasatch Boulevard. In addition, I would very much like to see a tram/gondola lift or perhaps a steep-incline railway/tunnel like in Europe in the canyon. This could be a revenue stream and attraction in and of itself, servicing cross-country ski descents, summer mountain biking and hiking trails, and of course the ski resorts. I would also welcome car restrictions and increased quality of bus service in the short term.
7/25/2018	23	Jeff Gishen	Regarding your request for comments, widening Wasatch Blvd. makes no sense to me. It will not increase flow up the canyon, because the canyon road itself is the bottleneck, not Wasatch Blvd. It will also not eliminate congestion caused by cars queued up waiting to enter the canyon, since that problem includes other roads, such as 9400 S, not just Wasatch Blvd.; staging the queue of cars in a large parking complex at the base of the canyon would be a better approach.
7/25/2018	24	Jeff Gishen	Regarding your request for comments, I am skeptical that a Zion-style transportation system will work in LCC. During ski season, virtually EVERYONE wants to get up or down LCC at the same time, based on start & stop times for the ski lifts, as well as avalanche control closure times. I would think that the traffic in Zion spreads out a bit more during the day. How many buses would need to be waiting to get everyone up the canyon quickly when it opens after avalanche control?
7/26/2018	25	Teresa Gray	health . departmente
7/26/2018	26	David Young	email list
7/26/2018	27	Jody Gonzalez	very against tolls and looking for more info all around.
7/26/2018	28	Laurie Hilyer	Needs a toll booth!!!!
8/1/2018	29	Martin Ritter	"The EIS should ensure that the development of a modern, efficient, electric rail line be included in the EIS. A rail line would be more environmentally sensitive than more autos and significantly more cost effective than a comparable bus system (over the 30 year life cycle cost). Current Public-Private Partnerships (as recently passed by the Utah Legislature) would stretch any public investment and maximize benefit to the community. Concurrent auto policies could assist in achieving a favorable return from the farebox. These systems in Europe having proven their value" e.g. <a href="http://zermatt.com/how-to-reach-zermatt/">http://zermatt.com/how-to-reach-zermatt/</a> Best Regards
8/3/2018	30	Judi Gooding	I am a part time employee at Alta in the winter. Last winter I was very happy that I could utilize the employee shuttle that goes up 9800 S. In the morning. Taking a UTA bus takes much longer as they all go through Snowbird, and on a busy day if they stuck behind a Snowbird Parking lot shuttle vehicle it takes considerably longer. They are also packed, standing room only, which is a hazard if you are standing or if you are sitting as you have to contend with back packs, ski boot bags, snowboards etc banging into you. More buses, better, schedules, and better service to Alta necessary. Alta offers a car pool incentive for employees, this should be expanded for better ride sharing opportunities for more individuals.
8/7/2018	31	Philomena Keyes	I support a bus system similar to Zion. There seems to be land for sale at the bottom of Little Cottonwood that would be suitable for extra park and rides. Unless you live in canyon, you should have to take a shuttle. I did it all season in Big Cottonwood. The only issue was all the other drivers not taking the bus slowed the trip down drastically. Zermat Switzerland is a good example of a successful change. The sooner we shift the better.
8/28/2018	32	Jonathan Fay	build tunnel to big cottonwood
9/20/2018	33	Michael Raddon	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Impacts to fragile Albion Basin ecosystem need to be considered regardless of the transportation solutions determined for the highway.</li> <li>2. Snowshed at major slide paths will help alleviate the miles-long queue of idling/polluting cars that occurs after avalanches. (Plan well for deliver trucks to haul supplies to the resorts. Yes, there will be an aesthetic impact, but not nearly as bad as 1000s of idling cars and the pollution they bring to the canyon.</li> <li>3. If a fee or toll system is enacted it should discount full cars. For example a car with 4 or more people should pay less than a car with 2 or 3 people.</li> <li>4. In a toll/fee situation, all canyon employees should be allowed up for free or given an annual pass. We shouldn't punish the people in the hospitality industry (who typically don't make a lot of money) or the who keep the canyons safe for us (ski patrol, etc.)</li> <li>5. Local SL County residents should get a significant discount in a fee/toll situation. For many of us who grew up here, the Wasatch</li> </ol>

			<p>and especially the Cottonwood Canyons are the reason we chose to stay here and raise our families. The people who love this special area the most should not be punished for using it.</p> <p>6. Chain-up area/inspection area where enforcement of Chain/4x4 requirements can occur at mouth BEFORE unprepared drivers cause additional delays up-canyon.</p> <p>7. Education is needed: How to put on chains? Does UDOT recommend a kind of chain system? What's the difference between 4x4 and AWD and Front Wheel Drive? How about visitors...work with rental car companies to supply chains in their two-wheel drive vehicles with clear instructions on how to install them. (Travelers just don't know what to expect if they haven't lived in or near mountains.)</p> <p>8. Electronic informational billboards and current road conditions on feeders like Wasatch Blvd, 9400 S, I-215, 9000 S., I-15.</p> <p>9. SMS text or other updates with ACCURATE and CURRENT info pushed to those who opt in. Also, this is only as good as the service that can be guaranteed. Is there a way to make cell providers upgrade their towers and systems so signal strength is maintained anywhere on LCC highway?</p> <p>10. I imagine that a light rail or trolley is cost-prohibitive, but quite honestly NOTHING is going to stop more and more people from trying to get up the canyon. I don't see a toll/fee from inhibiting the number of trips on the highway significantly. But a CONVENIENT mass transit system certainly would. I would support one with an increase in taxes if it meant that the number of cars was DRASTICALLY eliminated from the canyon. I love Alta the most and I admire townspeople's love for this special place, but I just don't see anything stopping more and more cars from coming, except for rail service. I suppose BRT might work if it is exceptionally CONVENIENT and service is frequent and regular. Right now, we're packed into buses like sardines and it is terribly uncomfortable and it isn't exactly cheap, either.</p> <p>11. Someone needs to stop Snowbird's expansion. Those concrete 1000-room buildings are a blight. I was so sad when they opened up Mineral Basin.</p>
9/28/2018	34	Mark Allen	<p>Why are the privately owned resorts, not creating their own parking lots in the valley, and providing transportation solutions for their customers? Why is a precedent being set for this EIS wherein the problem entities are the resorts and their over promotion of the natural resources. Time to let the private companies figure out a solution. Then in 5 years lets see what impact that has made. Its my belief adding more people to these limited resources is foolishness. We see that in Arches, Canyonlands, Zions National Park. The Mighty Five campaign should also be ended, the resources are finite, not infinite.</p>
10/2/2018	35	Jen Clancy	<p>In light of Commissioner Bradley's recommendation that the SL County Wasatch General Plan update consider scientific investigations to guide analysis of the canyons carrying capacity in order to protect our watersheds, I would like to echo the recommendation to the LCC EIS process. This is something we have included in our submitted comments. I would like to submit the attached rapid assessment of Alta that was conducted this summer for you and your team to consider. Bradley's recommendation was introduced after the County's presentation on the plan update and summary of its 19 goals. Most pointedly, Goal #1 Recreation Management and Maintenance: Improve the quality of recreation for visitors and residents while meeting the needs for anticipated demand. The key word being "meeting" the needs for future demand. Whether intended as written or not, this language promotes unchecked access for anticipated future demands which depending on the timeframe include startling growth. With a great deal at stake to protect our drinking water supply do you have any thoughts on how the LCC EIS might integrate and evaluate the question of a "watershed" capacity as roadway improvements are designed and considered? It's certainly a big question and one that's important not only for SL County's planning process, but the CWC, LCC EIS etc.</p>
10/23/2018	36	John Knoblock	<p>Hi Bri and John- I believe you probably have gotten input on the Little Cottonwood Canyon downhill mountain bike trail. The concept is to have a trail continuous down the canyon, and on the lower part have a downhill only bike flow trail on the south side of the creek. That would improve hiker safety and enjoyment and be nice for mountain bikes. The upper part down from the White Pine Trail would be located in the wilderness adjustment area in the CWNCRA legislation. See the attached conceptual alignment kmz.</p>
10/24/2018	37	David Warnock	<p>It is time to take a serious look at providing real transit solutions up the canyons, and particularly Little Cottonwood. Every year we have more news stories about how congested the canyons are but we have made no recent serious progress toward a viable, sustainable, environmentally friendly solution.</p>
10/25/2018	38	Cindy Smith	<p>Please get rid of the congestion on little cottonwood canyon road which is especially bad when occ is closed. We cannot get to our house in granite oaks. If there is a fire we can't get service</p>
10/26/2018	39	Jeremy Moore	<p>I'm a big skier, 175 days last season. I took the bus for over 100 of them(Alta/Bird). The resorts can't handle more people with keeping a good experience. I'd much rather pay more to ski. Either through a tax or tolls. If anything, we need more park and ride parking. And maybe some sort of a tram up the canyon. Lifted to make avalanche issues not a thing. Rail would be great too... it wouldn't be a first for ski resorts. Building a village does nothing for the ecosystem.</p>
11/5/2018	40	Jeff Gishen	<p>Hi,</p>

			<p>I think the LCC EIS project team has made a very wise choice in dividing the LCC EIS into two explicit phases, one to address immediate needs for LCC, the other to address longer term needs of a more regional nature. The ambitious nature of some of the solutions that were being considered could take a long time to implement, at great expense, and might only have the unintended consequence of moving the problems someplace else: from LCC to BCC, from roads to parking, from parking to lifts, etc. A more limited immediate phase can be implemented sooner, at less expense, and might help inform the longer-term plans.</p> <p>My recent experience driving in LCC has been in the winter, so I will confine my comments to that season only. I think that the two immediate and obvious things that can be done to improve winter traffic patterns on the LCC road are: 1) to always check that all vehicles meet the restrictions when the road is posted for 4x4 and/or chains; and 2) to do road avalanche control earlier in the morning.</p> <p>Regarding the first suggestion above, I have seen these restrictions violated frequently, with drivers spinning out and blocking traffic as a result. Drivers need to take these restrictions more seriously. The honor system has not worked; every car needs to be checked. If a small toll is necessary to pay the people who do this work, so be it.</p> <p>Regarding the second suggestion, LCC traffic is usually at its worst on a powder morning when road avalanche control is necessary. This means that the LCC road will be closed until at least 8 am. Of course, everyone wants to arrive at the ski resorts before 9 am (when the lifts start) to get first tracks. This leaves less than an hour for all of the traffic to travel up the canyon. If, on the other hand, avalanche control were completed by 7 am, the same number of cars would now have two hours to get up the canyon, thereby cutting average traffic densities in half!</p> <p>I have made both of these suggestions primarily for emphasis. Others have made the same suggestions before me. I think it is incumbent on the LCC EIS project team to either implement these suggestions, or to publicly state some very compelling reasons as to why not.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Jeff Gishen</p>
11/10/2018	41	Wally Lee	Consider adding a 3rd lane so that 2 lanes can be used for up traffic in the mornings and down traffic in the afternoon.
11/14/2018	42	Jesse Dean	I love what you are doing with the EIS! Want to stay involved. K thx bye.
11/21/2018	43	Kurt Hegmann	Plaudits for seeking inputs. Transportation is the largest challenge. Currently, the primary foci are on solutions like parking lots, car pooling and tolls. Those are not long-term solutions, as the volumes are rapidly exceeding relatively recent projections. The only realistic Long-term solution to date has been the train up LCC and then tunnel thru to Brighton to Park City. Tied into the airport lines, the synergies are amazing. True, very expensive, yet a long-term solution with lowest impacts. World class solution for world class skiing etc. How to pay? The best I can think of as the primary source is a surcharge on ski tickets. I'd gladly pay that one. Possibly plus a SLCO parks/rec type of tax/surcharge approved by voters in the past that has funded the other projects such as the bike trails.