

## Little Cottonwood EIS Virtual Public Meeting Chat Questions and Comments – June 22, 2020

1. **David Stein:** If none of the three draft alternative satisfy all the Level 1 Criteria, will other proposals such as the one documented in <https://www.dropbox.com/s/g0bjoposmk30a1g/Little%20Cottonwood%20Canyon%20-%20Boring%20Company%20tunnels%20proposal.pdf?dl=0> be evaluated for it meeting those criteria?
2. **Ellen Birrell:** UDOT's LLC EIS Summary shows the whole route from Ft. Union Blvd to Alta yet strictly addresses Preferred Alternatives for SR 210 within LLC. This has confused the public who reads the Summary and thinks that the "Two to Three Lanes and Enhanced Busses" applies to the Wasatch Blvd corridor through Cottonwood Heights. Will you amend that to end that confusion?
3. **Marvin Lorica:** Why is a gondola under consideration if the estimated travel time is longer than the two bus options? Is a rail option similar to ones in Switzerland a viable option?
4. **Mcones:** What analysis had been done on the impact of climbing with the plans? Doesn't increase road ways only decrease times for a short time?
5. **Chris Mahoney:** How were the 105 alternatives screened? Can you outline that process or the criteria for including or excluding them in the final 3?
6. **Ellen Birrell:** Without a formal capacity study from the Forest Service, UDOT cannot ascertain the maximum number of persons that should gain mobility into LCC in winter or summer. Basing the widening of Wasatch Blvd and thousands of additional parking stalls for recreationalists upon projected population growth in SL and Utah Counties is not the correct metric. Likewise, the ski resorts know their slope capacities and this should appear within the LCC EIS. Please comment.
7. **Mcones:** What were the reasons tolls are not one of the three?
8. **Dave Fields:** My concern with expanding the road and building massive concrete tunnels stretching 3,100 feet in upper LCC is that does not address one of the largest factors in travel delays in the canyon: traction. When it snows 2-3" per hour, all vehicles - bus, car, van - are not compatible with LCC. Gondola addresses safety, efficiency, air quality, operates in all weather conditions and reduces the dependencies on vehicles. Snowbird's Tram is almost 50 years old and that lifespan should be factored into the gondola pricing as compared to the 15-yr lifespan of a ski bus
9. **Mcones:** I am concerned with how much of the canyon the gondola would destroy, how much acreage would need to be touched to build the gondola? How would you get people down WHEN the gondolaa goes down?
10. **Deborah Case:** I believe the gondola utilizes towers, very similar to the Tram at snowbird. Not too invasive...
11. **AIC Jackson Conference Room:** What other options are available for the base station besides the parking lot at the bottom of the canyon?

12. **Megan Anderson:** I am concerned with the miles of natural land the extra lane will take up. I am also concerned about the watershed. The extra lane will create slides, which negatively impact the watershed.
13. **Deborah Case:** Is there any option that doesn't require expansion of Wasatch Blvd?
14. **Craig Osterloh:** Two questions concerning the gondola option and how it will help solve traffic congestion at three mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon. Why weren't the snow sheds included in this option? The other two options include the snow sheds which will protect the enhanced buses as well as the private car traffic. Since it is not included in the gondola option, it seems that the safety issue will still exist under this option, and canyon closure will be necessary. What is your plan in this regard?  
It seems that the gondola option at the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon will lead to additional traffic from parking and drop offs at the mouth. How do you plan to address this additional traffic?
15. **Chris McCandless:** There has been an alternate proposal to locate the gondola base station with a parking structure at that station increasing the uphill loading capacity to over 3500 passengers per hour using both bus and car parking on-site. An gets the gondola out of the canyon and provides a direct access to the resorts and side country without the additional bus trip time from the mobility stations. Will that be addressed?
16. **Megan Anderson:** I am also concerned about keeping Little Cottonwood Canyon wild. The gondola will not help with this. I am concerned about wildlife migration patterns being negatively impacted by the gondola and the extra lane.
17. **HPCBrad:** what is the total travel time for riding the Gondola? I read people have to ride a bus to get to the Gondola .. some estimates putting total travel time at 2 hours once you arrive at the first bus lot ...
18. **Trina Sheranian:** Why is N. Little Cottonwood road being widened in all 3 options. Why is it considered part of Wasatch?
19. **Craig Osterloh:** can you get on the gondola at the base of Little Cottonwood Canyon?
20. **Mcones:** The gondola is an eye sore to the canyon
21. **David Stein:** Tourists don't want to be stuck on a gondola for 45 minutes with no real way to carry luggage and/or gear bags.
22. **Brendan:** Of course bikes should be allowed
23. **Chris McCandless:** Can you amortize the costs of admin and overhead based upon the life cycles of each options - bus and surface road costs versus gondola and its reduced costs and increased life cycles.
24. **Megan Anderson:** I also have contacted UDOT several times with no response about a for sure path for the gondola. I want the extra buses option because we have so little natural land. I don't want to see it carved away for a profit.
25. **Natalie Thompson:** How will these huge construction projects be financed? In other words, who will pay the majority of the costs? The taxpayer? How about the ski resorts paying the majority since they will benefit the most?
26. **Ellen Birrell:** Widening of WSB are based on insufficient and incorrect assumptions:

27. **Chris McCandless:** How does the present format inform those about the alternative location for the gondola with parking providing a ride to Snowbird of 27 minutes and 35 minutes to Alta?
28. **Chris Mahoney:** All these options seem to build infrastructure to allow more cars up the canyon... where are the proposals for inducements for the use of these new forms of transportation?
29. **Chantal Papillon:** My daily commute goes through Wasatch blvd from 215 to junction of North little cottonwood and I rarely see real traffic jams. How did you acquire your data stating there is a problem 365 days a year?
30. **Mcones:** With more people in the canyon how do you plan on getting them down in an emergency?
31. **Katharina Schmitz:** I'd like to clarify that the maximum speed of current technology monocable and 3S gondolas exceeds the maximum speed stated in the report. Monocable gondola maximum speed is 7 m/s (15.66 mph) with capacity up to 4,400 passengers per hour per direction (pphpd) and 3S gondola maximum speed is 8.5 m/s (19 mph) with capacity up to 5,500 pphpd – this would result in lower travel times.
32. **Marvin Lorica:** If the lanes are widened, it makes sense to alternate the lanes for AM/PM.
33. **Chris Mahoney:** yes, where is the data on traffic issues on wasatch? I live right on it, and the biggest traffic delays are when it snows a ton and the canyon is closed.
34. **Ellen Birrell:** 1. Population growth in central and western SL Valley will not bear greater usage of WSB. 2. With Covid pandemic, home-officing trends and the expansion of a major biz center where the prison once stood will change commuter traffic in future decades. Current service levels for automobiles is sufficient. A wider WSB through residential Cottonwood Heights will be counter to UDOT's stated goal of improved air quality and focus on transit and Active Transportation to improve public health.
35. **Viktor Simovski:** Is there going to be any sort of questioning regarding the second screening? There's a lot of cost/environmental/congestion/economic positives of Cog Rail 4B that weren't discussed in the report that I have highlighted in detail
36. **David Stein:** The Cottonwoods Express proposal could access all these mobility hubs with spurs from a single dual-tunnel route. <https://www.dropbox.com/s/g0bjoposmk30a1g/Little%20Cottonwood%20Canyon%20-%20Boring%20Company%20tunnels%20proposal.pdf?dl=0>
37. **Shane Moreno:** Widening of Wasatch does not solve the parking problems in the canyon. Nor does it solve the slow down when it runs into the canyon and Sandy (commuters). We don't need more cars traveling 50 plus miles per hour through Cottonwood Heights. More lanes and more traffic doesn't lend well to the aesthetics or health of our citizens.
38. **Mcones:** How many trails will be impacted by snowsheds?
39. **Brian Hutchinson:** The reference "peak period" is based on archaic ski resort pass models. The volume represented in bimodal "peaks" could be evenly 'distributed' throughout the day if resorts would provide midday 3-hour passes. This would alleviate undue pressure and cost on the system.

40. **Ellen Birrell:** A goal of only 30% drivers to transit by 2050 will exacerbate air pollution. 30% private cars to transit by 2030; 60% private cars to transit by 2040 and 90% private cars to transit by 2050 is necessary to improve air quality.
41. **Mcones:** How much climbing access will be impacted by the snow sheds?
42. **Megan Anderson:** The gondola and extra lane options seem to just be to pack more people in the canyon. I know the resorts would make more money, but is the environment being considered?
43. **Mcones:** We are trading the Wasatch world class climbing for skiing.
44. **Megan Anderson:** Rock climbing access will be limited with the extra lane because it will eliminate all roadside parking.
45. **Marvin Lorica:** Is that total time including overnight hours?
46. **Brianhutchinson:** The snowshed drawing had 3 lanes! (Non-starter)
47. **Kelli A:** What about year round recreational activities? The extra lane and gondola it would seem take those out.
48. **Megan Anderson:** This study seems like it did not consider year round recreation. The canyon is for residents too.
49. **Carson:** How will snow sheds impact access to trails, climbing areas, and backcountry skiing that aren't served by the Gate Buttress, Lisa Falls, or White Pine parking areas?
50. **Brianhutchinson:** Transit service should eliminate trailhead parking.
51. **Shane Moreno:** Snow sheds are a great idea and work well in CO and Europe but where do the cars park? In Europe they push mass transit with trains, gondolas and Trams rather than adding more cars to the road. Its long term thinking and investments in the future. Adding more cars creates more pollution to boot and lets face it our air quality is one of the worst in the nation/world.
52. **David Stein:** The Cottonwoods Express proposal could have exits at all the trailheads, so people wouldn't need to park at all.  
<https://www.dropbox.com/s/g0bjoposmk30a1g/Little%20Cottonwood%20Canyon%20-%20Boring%20Company%20tunnels%20proposal.pdf?dl=0>
53. **Mcones:** What is the impact of climbing with the different "improved parking "
54. **Eric:** Too many cars already in the canyon. all we hear about is environmental concerns in LCC which is why we can't have new mtn bike trails, dogs, etc. but widening the road and jamming more cars and busses into the canyon is a good idea? be progressive and get rid of cars and busses. no more wasted money on band aids
55. **David egbert:** How much are the resorts paying for these improvements?
56. **Natalie Thompson:** It seems to me alternative #2 and #3 involve the most disruptions/impacts to the canyon's environment? Any chance on developing Alternative #1 to be the least impacting on the environment? Why are we so bent on getting so many people into the canyon? Again, all of this seems terribly geared toward ski resort profits!
57. **Brianhutchinson:** It is time for Year round Transit to trailheads. (Equitable access) They are always taking

58. **Mike Christensen:** It is disturbing that so much taxpayer money was wasted on such an ill-conceived process. It's clear that UDOT lacks the institutional capacity to do anything other than add lanes to freeways.
59. **David Stein:** The Cottonwoods Express proposal is for year-round access and making it totally unnecessary to drive into LCC. <https://www.dropbox.com/s/g0bjoposmk30a1g/Little%20Cottonwood%20Canyon%20-%20Boring%20Company%20tunnels%20proposal.pdf?dl=0> while improving access.
60. **Mike Kimball:** I like eliminating roadside parking adjacent to the resorts. It is a hazard and impacts drivers speed and visibility.
61. **Dave Fields:** The ski resorts have historically paid for the ridership of season passholders and employees to ride the bus. According to UTA, that was 85% of the ridership last year. We pay 80% of what the customer pays so this year a roundtrip cost the resorts \$7.20. Snowbird is committed to continuing this model of paying for our passholder and employee ridership, which I see growing significantly in increased bus or gondola.
62. **Marvin Lorica:** Backcountry skiers will want bus stop options if you remove the roadside parking, which it should be removed in my opinion.
63. **David Stein:** For backcountry are there popular spots to park to access the backcountry?
64. Megan Anderson: I don't understand how a road building entity was entrusted with the future of the canyon.
65. **Gary's Iphone:** I don't think any of these options have gone far enough.
66. **Mike Kimball:** Could a toll be considered like Millcreek Canyon? You can purchase an annual pass.
67. **Natalie Thompson:** Alternative #1 could include huge disincentives for driving private vehicles—like hardly none—make everyone take mass transit and dramatically increasing the amount of buses up and down the canyon. Shuttle vans could be used for trail users, thus eliminating the need to enlarge trailhead parking areas.
68. **Brianhutchinson:** Why, in the time of COVID-19, are we increasing 'peak capacity'? (This is backwards)
69. **David Stein:** Gary, I agree, check out <https://www.dropbox.com/s/g0bjoposmk30a1g/Little%20Cottonwood%20Canyon%20-%20Boring%20Company%20tunnels%20proposal.pdf?dl=0>
70. **Ellen Birrell:** Larger parking lots encourages more cars into LCC. This is not environmentally sound. LLC EIS needs to analyze value of fleet of buses operating throughout anticipated peak hiking days. This should be in conjunction with a regionalized busing system that operates both on historically peak days year round. This should have bus service from various bus stops around SL Valley that gives recreational riders DIRECT service to the Highland/9400 S AND BCC Gravel Pit intermodal hubs. Riders then board a "BCC" or "LCC" that will stop at trailheads (upon demand), and in winter they'd board an express bus to either Solitude, Brighton, Alta or Snowbird.

71. **Rewikstorm:** Has there been any discussion of additional day lockers at resorts to further help entice people into mass transit over their own vehicle?
72. **David egbert:** I'm concerned about your focus on getting more people in the canyon. Was limiting skiers at the resorts considered?
73. **Trina Sheranian:** Why is environmental impact not part of the study?
74. **Iphoneb:** Watershed is so fragile I can't bring my dog up the canyon. This makes no sense and only serves ski resorts. all three options widen north little cottonwood. they are openly deceiving us.
75. **David Stein:** The Cottonwoods Express proposal addresses if limits on day tickets is implemented. <https://www.dropbox.com/s/g0bjoposmk30a1g/Little%20Cottonwood%20Canyon%20-%20Boring%20Company%20tunnels%20proposal.pdf?dl=0>
76. **Trina Sheranian:** Dave, WHY IS N. LITTLE COTTONWOOD considered part of WASATCH? That is part of the canyon.
77. **Brendan:** Will you have to pay to park at mobility hubs?
78. **Kelli a:** The traffic up the canyon is only bad about two weeks out of the year. why do we need to widen the road or add a gondola to shove more people up the canyon to the ski resorts. Options #2 and #3 add more pollution by adding more lanes and therefore cars. They also take away from other year round recreational activities. More buses and more incentives to take buses seems like the way to go. I want to protect this canyon. #2 and #3 seem to destroy it.
79. **Ellen Birrell:** Why isn't advanced technology being considered to meet objectives?
80. **Brendan:** Please use swamp lot (and/or BCC mouth park & ride) as a bus pickup location (even if you can't park there)
81. **Sam Weintraub:** While they handle crowds better than Northeast resorts, Alta and Snowbird sometimes suffer from crowd flow issues. How would any of these proposals prevent these issues from getting any worse?
82. **Ellen Birrell:** Vince did not answer my question about amending Summary. It will be too late when the next EIS comes out. Unsatisfactory.
83. **Molly:** How has safety been addressed for pedestrians and bikers to utilize and cross Wasatch blvd as a mode of transportation to reach schools, shopping, parks, restaurants, and bus stops? I am concerned about the safety of our active community of Cottonwood Heights residents and visitors if the road is widened.
84. **Marvin Lorica:** what's the construction time table
85. **Brendan:** Can the gondola run in wind?
86. **Thesaurus:** Kolff: What are the vehicle emission levels related to each option? This is an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT study, correct?
87. **Mike Kimball:** Will the gondola be able to operate under heavy winter conditions? If the road closes because of weather (extreme snow or road clearing), will the gondola still operate?
88. **Viktor Simovski:** When the Level 2 Screening was conducted and Cog Rail 4B was eliminated due to relocation, was cog rail using existing streets considered?

89. **Amy Ortega:** I haven't heard how these three alternatives impact the wildlife living in the area. Has a study been done? What is the result of that study?
90. **Megan Anderson:** Is there any chance of the government regulating the Ikon pass? That and snowsheds would probably solve the traffic problems alone.
91. **Shane Moreno:** People come to SLC for an experience. Doesn't additional traffic and lane widening on Wasatch deter from the experience? Doesn't facilitating more cars just add to the pollution in the valley? Have you considered extending the Gondola to Park City connecting both valleys to one another? Doing so would provide access for both valleys without the need for additional traffic and pollution. Think of the skiing opportunities it would provide... almost like the Tres Valles in France.
92. **Paul's Ipad:** What ultimately will any of these options have for a lifespan? Is the goal to reduce congestion & provide environmentally friendly transportation?
93. **Kelli A:** Why isn't a model like Zions National Park not being considered?
94. **Iphoneb:** anyone know a good environmental lawyer. all three options will destroy the canyon. all three options widen the canyon road to 4 lanes. They want to make Wasatch as wide as a freeway. what happens to those cars when the lanes end?
95. **Rick.Hayward@octanner.com:** Will the Gondola towers require maintenance roads?
96. **John and Dana:** This project seems to be designed to meet some determined demand for how many bodies are moved up LCC per day. Who is setting the target for how many people should be moved per day, and is there a ceiling to the number? Is UDOT making the decision on this growth target, or just supporting growth projections?
97. **Deborah Case:** Good question Rick
98. **Mike Kimball:** What is the construction timeline for each of the 3 options? How long will they take and will travel be impacted during heavy winter traffic?
99. **David Stein:** The Cottonwoods Express proposal addresses climbing. The AEVs can exit their tunnel then navigate to the desired climbing access spot on 209. An app on your phone could call for pickup after climbing and an AEV would come pick you up. <https://www.dropbox.com/s/g0bjoposmk30a1g/Little%20Cottonwood%20Canyon%20-%20Boring%20Company%20tunnels%20proposal.pdf?dl=0>
100. **Acrumbofcake:** Being on a fault line the gondolas need to be designed for seismic criteria. Has this been included in the cost?
101. **Megan Anderson:** Has the negative impact of construction alone been considered for the extra lane or the gondola? These are huge environmental footprints. We can't sacrifice the canyon to ski resorts.
102. **Therus Kolff:** Has 1 bus lane, vs 2, been discussed? Uphill travel in am, downhill travel in pm? LESS ENVIRONMENTAL impact!
103. **Megan Anderson:** If you oppose slicing up the canyon for a profit you can join Save Little Cottonwood Canyon on FB.
104. **Mark Raming:** The IKON pass has increased crowding and skier days at Snowbird and Alta. These alternative are really about increasing customer satisfaction for the resorts. Why is this not included

in the project purpose? How are the resort's exempt from NEPA in their decisions process to implement the pass system?

105. **David Stein:** The Cottonwoods Express proposal addresses traction during heavy snowstorms issues. <https://www.dropbox.com/s/g0bjoposmk30a1g/Little%20Cottonwood%20Canyon%20-%20Boring%20Company%20tunnels%20proposal.pdf?dl=0>
106. **Megan Anderson:** Is all of the funding for this project public?
107. **Marvin Lorica:** How about no private vehicles during peak travel times once the enhanced bus or gondola is implemented?
108. **Megan Anderson:** Snowbird said in 2015 they would never force anyone to take public transit.
109. **Ellen Birrell:** Building of the 20 towers would damage acres of canyon to get excavation and other big equipment into each tower base location.
110. **Dan:** Please widen the road with bus only lanes. The gondola would be an eye sore on our beautiful canyon. Plus the bus lanes would discourage car traffic. A gondola will keep the car traffic the same, but add people to the resorts.
111. **Megan Anderson:** The road widening will carve away miles of natural land and threaten the watershed.
112. **Ellen Birrell:** Evacuation of persons off a "out of commission" gondola car does NOT answer the question of how you evacuate as many as 12,000 stranded skiers within Alta & Snowbird. This does not include the roughly 3,000-4,000 lodging guests who could simply go back to their lodging room within Snowbird or Alta.
113. **Megan Anderson:** How do you intend to protect the watershed through adding the other lane and when it's there?
114. **Dave Fields:** Ellen, Current evacuation system - both summer and winter - doesn't exist whatsoever as we saw with landslide and 2.5-day winter closure this year.
115. **Thessiuss:** Congestion on SR-209 is just as bad, if not worse, as it is on Wasatch Blvd. Will SR-209 be looked at with a separate study, especially as it relates to the parking structure on 9400 S and Highland Dr?
116. **Marvin Lorica:** If road widening is shot down or during construction, could bus only up the canyon be an option at least during peak hours?
117. **David Stein:** The Cottonwoods Express proposal does not require widening Wasatch Blvd. since it could also help with commuters. <https://www.dropbox.com/s/g0bjoposmk30a1g/Little%20Cottonwood%20Canyon%20-%20Boring%20Company%20tunnels%20proposal.pdf?dl=0>
118. **Megan Anderson:** Zion's National Park didn't add a lane or a gondola. Is it possible to have busses only without widening the road?
119. **Acrumbofcake:** Will the residents be excluded from paying tolls?
120. **Nancy Peterson:** If the main parking points are the gravel pit and 9400 S and Highland. Whats the need to widen the north fork of little cottonwood off of Wasatch drive. Buses coming up 9400 South



to the mouth of the canyon. Are you looking to expand that road? What is the fix for the Sandy Bell canyon trail head parking. This is growing beyond control.

121. **Shane Moreno:** Please comment on why Wasatch is the only commuter road for Draper / Sandy when there are other roads that are already wide enough like 1300E, 700 E and I-15?
122. **Rhon Bell:** why does roadside parking near the resorts need to be eliminated in all of the efforts?
123. **Snowbird Host:** Why only one mobility hub with the gondola option?
124. **Mike Kimball:** Could a ski trail be developed and maintained that would allow downhill ski traffic from the resorts to the mouth of LCC? This could either be adjacent to the road or along the existing river trail.
125. **Sam Weintraub:** How are you going to enforce people not dropping each other off at the base of the gondola? Doesn't it seem a little unintuitive at first glance to have to go all the way to the mobility hub to take a bus to get on the gondola?
126. **John:** being that user safety is part of the forest service directive, why is limiting pass sales not included as an option seeing as it already appears to be compromised?
127. **Nicole Pirringer:** Are the resorts going to provide free lockers to people who take public transit? Taking public transit is a hassle in ski boots especially if you're coming from within the city. Having to pay for a locker on top of that seems it would discourage people from taking a bus.
128. **Megan Anderson:** The sure path comment is because every time I call UDOT or UTA they are not clear if it will follow the road or not. I want to know where the gondola is going. What is the path?
129. **TWARNER:** The draft EIS will have a more defined alignment for the gondola
130. **Trina Sheranian:** The road above Wildcreek Rd. Is part of N. Little Cottonwood road. From your drawings, I see that that road is being widened in all three alternatives. I hope this clarifies my previous question. Why is the road above Wildcreek Rd being widened? Why is a huge portion of my property and the noise wall we installed 2 years ago (after getting approval for the city) being torn down to make way for a 4 lane road. This is a huge impact on the residence that live on the north side of little cottonwood stream.
131. **Therus Kolff:** Can you describe the phase-in plan for any of these options? Was a phase-in plan for 5 years or 10 years looked at?
132. **Megan Anderson:** If you are doing projected growth for your information are you considering the watershed as projected growth as well? Are you considering wildlife as projected growth?
133. **Megan Anderson:** I am worried that extra lane may get skiers up there, but we won't have anything to drink.
134. **David Stein:** The Cottonwoods Express proposal could handle 48,000 passengers an hour, this could handle rapid egress in an emergency. Tunnels are safer than surface structures in an earthquake and not affected by earthquake induced land, snow, or mud slides. <https://www.dropbox.com/s/g0bjoposmk30a1g/Little%20Cottonwood%20Canyon%20-%20Boring%20Company%20tunnels%20proposal.pdf?dl=0>

135. **Sportsmans:** The 2050 planning horizon for traffic on Wasatch may be less of a concern since there isn't mass building of new homes on that corridor. There just isn't a lot of space to build like they are on the south west side of the valley.
136. **Nancy Peterson:** As an avid snowboarder to snowbird who lives right at the mouth of the canyon, I never have had a desire to take the bus when I could Walk to the bus stop because the current bus routs takes too long to get up and down the canyon. So why are we focusing on building a gondola when we should expedite canyon shuttles to get people in and out of the canyon as fast as possible to nearby park and ride lots. I would love to take the bus if it didn't take me hours to get home
137. **Dan:** a bus only lane seems like the best option for that to me
138. **Mike Kimball:** Vince: I think you mis-spoke the cog-rail system would eliminate trail heads, but you said gondola.
139. **Therus Kolff:** How do each of the plans limit the congestion at Snowbird entrances and limit to Alta patrons going downhill?
140. **Megan Anderson:** Why was a road building entity entrusted with the future of the canyon?
141. **Tomdiegel:** I came in late so maybe this has been covered, but will a gondola offer summer/shoulder season transit as well as winter?
142. **Michael Nebeker:** How will you handle congestion at the mouth of the canyon this coming winter?
143. **Lane:** Has the impact of powder day traffic on Little Cottonwood Rd and 9400 S been consiered. Even on week day powder days traffic backs up past 2300 E restricting access to neiborhoods. This happens on mid week snow days.
144. **John:** I understand the concern regarding single occupancy vehicles, however how would you address individuals who ski/board prior to work and need the quicker commute time to be able to make that a viable practice
145. **Joespataro:** With regard to widening Wasatch Blvd, the summer recreational use of the road seems to be have been overlooked somewhat. How will UDOT integrate the key concepts from the October Cottonwood Heights design charrette into the widening plan?
146. **Michael Nebeker:** Buy Shopco on 9400 South, tear it down and build a massive parking garage and bus depot!
147. **Tomdiegel:** so NO money from the resorts?
148. **David Stein:** The Cottonwoods Express proposal could have individual resorts' exits minimally funded and if any resort wants a fancier exit/entrance facility they could pay to have their station enhanced. minimally funded by the Legislature
149. **Andrew Gruber:** There is no guarantee that the state Legislature (or anyone) will fund whatever approach comes out of the EIS. How work will be paid for is an unresolved and key question.
150. **Sam Weintraub:** Why isn't advanced technology, such as a boring tunnel such as the one David Stein mentioned here  
<https://www.dropbox.com/s/g0bjoposmk30a1g/Little%20Cottonwood%20Canyon%20-%20Boring%20Company%20tunnels%20proposal.pdf?dl=0> being considered?

151. **Danielle Mariott:** Is there a plan that evaluates maxing out our current system with advanced tech...like electric and more busses...without road widening...before jumping to more elaborate options that introduce more unknowns....e.g. Gondola.
152. **Ellen Birrell:** Having extra lockers in the ski resorts that can be rented by locals at low pricing throughout the ski season would fantastically reduce space normally taken by gear in buses and, Josh's example of a young family struggling with children and gear. Let's collaborate and think innovatively in the future. Clinging to old luxuries of 70% of people in their private vehicles causes air pollution, long travel times, traffic and monstrous costs of widening roads and maintaining them.
153. **Danielle Mariott:** Also, what about summer usage for climbers/hikers that want to stop before resort parking...
154. **David Stein:** The Hyperloop doesn't exist yet (vacuum tunnel) but the Las Vegas Loop will be in operation by January.
155. **JP:** Has road biking been addressed?
156. **David Stein:** The Cottonwoods Express proposal would result in a large decrease in emissions, especially in the winter when temperature inversions combined with emissions lead to the worst air pollution in the country.
157. **Danielle Mariott:** According to this article gondolas can withstand 60 KM/hr = 37 mph  
<https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2007/12/071216142011.htm>
158. **Deborah Case:** What plans do you have for running the gondola during the summer?
159. **David Stein:** The Cottonwoods Express proposal would have zero impact on wildlife since no roadway widening would be needed.
160. **Apompeo:** Have you considered adding another mobility hub south of LCC? And how will parking access at the bottom of BCC be impacted? I assume parking will have to be expanded at the BCC Park and Ride
161. **Ellen Birrell:** An example of Advanced Technology is developing a comprehensive phone app that drivers can select their mobility preference (private car, transit, etc), destination, time/date and the app makes best suggestions. It also operates in real time to suggest most efficient mobilities, parking lot(s) availability, etc. Currently, private apps by Snowbird and Solitude are commendable but do not give drivers adequate alternative options and "best air quality" suggestions. If UDOT can spend 100s of millions to build roadways which still have are a financial burden to maintained annually, yet they aren't/won't spend 10s of millions to hire a Technology Department to alleviate the need for widened roads, more lanes, more traffic, more pollution.
162. **Matt Rocha:** if a gondola ends up being the option how often are we expecting is it to be shut down due to wind closures? since gondolas and trams seem more sensitive to wind
163. **Chris McCandless:** How do we get a copy of the present comments that have been submitted - even an abbreviated summary?
164. **Matt Rocha:** if the gondola is down due to wind what alternative is there for travel people up the canyon

165. **David Stein:** The Cottonwoods Express proposal provides access to both Big Cottonwood Canyon (Solitude/Brighton) and Park City/Deer Valley. <https://www.dropbox.com/s/g0bjoposmk30a1g/Little%20Cottonwood%20Canyon%20-%20Boring%20Company%20tunnels%20proposal.pdf?dl=0>
166. **Sam Weintraub:** Did you do any studies about a gondola from Brighton/Solitude? Would this be similar to the Park City option?
167. **Marvin Lorica:** Has the potential for zero emission busses in the future been considered?
168. **David Stein:** The Cottonwoods Express proposal uses 1-million mile vehicles that would be good for decades.
169. **Megan Anderson:** If maintenance for the gondola will increase drastically over time, why is that not listed in your summary?
170. **Megan Anderson:** Why do we need to load and unload busses so fast? Whose interest is at heart? Tourists will come. We have the best snow on earth. I feel that a model like Zion's should be considered.
171. **Ellen Birrell:** RE Wasatch Blvd Expansion: Communities do not want widened roads and 40+ mph speeds within residential areas. Examples: SignTheVine.com — 900 residents against Vine Street in Murray RE straightening and 4-lanes; Sego Lily east/west road in Sandy is being expanded putting more cars and traffic on the road; Park City stopped the 4-lane widening of road between Hwy 40 and Prospector in Park City because they want shuttles NOT more cars. Residents do NOT want more lanes which only invites more cars. If UDOT is serious about reducing cars on the road, they need to think Technology, Transit & Active Transportation. The Utah Legislature needs to fund UTA at 75% of transportation budget instead of UDOT at 75% if UDOT is going to cling to road-widening, wider lanes and fast speeds.
172. **Gary's iPhone:** Accessing LCC from American Fork Canyon via Snowbird's property. Shouldn't greater effort be made to bring those parties back to the table?
173. **David Stein:** The Cottonwoods Express proposal would not affect S.R. 209 in any way during the tunnels construction. <https://www.dropbox.com/s/g0bjoposmk30a1g/Little%20Cottonwood%20Canyon%20-%20Boring%20Company%20tunnels%20proposal.pdf?dl=0>
174. **Steve Glaser:** Which trails/summits would the gondola be visible from?
175. **Danielle Mariott:** "Which trails/summits would the gondola be visible from?" I am also curious about this. Keeping the canyon natural and beautiful outside of the "use case" for people riding said gondola need to be considered.
176. **Marvin Lorica:** Why do you need barriers? There could be LED signage on the road itself informing of the direction on the middle lane. You don't have that many cars going in the opposite direction during peak times.
177. **Danielle Mariott:** So somehow a gondola or widening a road has less impact on a scenic byway than 65 gantries?

178. **Ellen Birrell:** If we don't want to "see reverse-lane gantries" for aesthetic reasons in a scenic byway, why do we think that looking at huge, metal gondola towers and wires which criss-cross the mountain views considered more aesthetically pleasing?
179. **David Stein:** During heavy snowstorms drivers without chains or snow tires should be guided to use the Cottonwoods Express. I will update the proposal to include all the Mobility Hubs and communicate it to The Boring Company. I've sent them details and they estimate 1 week to come back with an estimate. They prioritize municipality and state DOT RFQs.
180. **David Stein:** The Cottonwoods Express proposal would be invisible in the Canyon since they are tunnels.
181. **Danielle Mariott:** Also, is it odd we're ONLY discussing LCC?
182. **Brendan:** Can gondola run during interlodge and when Avy work is being done in LCC?
183. **Danielle Mariott:** Or is LCC the pilot program for hoe to handle the traffic in BCC too? Or when the mobility hub of BCC will also be used for LCC
184. **Jordanromero:** Are there any other geographically similar areas (say, European alps) that provide an efficient model to consider adapting to LCC or BCC?
185. **Theruss Kolff:** With as little truly environmental investigation done so far - why are you calling it an "environmental impact statement" rather than an 'economic development statement"
186. **Danielle Mariott:** I second this: With as little truly environmental investigation done so far - why are you calling it an "environmental impact statement" rather than an 'economic development statement" Are comments in this chat collected as official "comments" ?
187. **Robert Schafermeyer:** It seems parking at trail heads is at a premium during the summer months. The plan calls for an additional lane to be used by mass transit during the winter months. What is the possibility of having mass transit with stops at trail heads extended to year round?
188. **David Stein:** Ski trail also wouldn't work well due to reduced snowfall as you lose elevation.
189. **Molly:** Would mobility hubs eliminate current bus stops along Wasatch?
190. **Mason:** If the gondola option is chosen, would there still be bus service? I would still like the option to take the bus from the 9400/Highland stop.
191. **Megan Anderson:** Danielle, no these comments are not official.
192. **Danielle Mariott:** Thanks Megan! <http://udot.utah.gov/LittleCottonwoodEIS> This URL doesn't seem to work. Can you confirm?
193. **Little Cottonwood:** LCC EIS Website: <https://littlecottonwoodeis.udot.utah.gov/>