Growth

- 1970 - Salt Lake County Population = 45,500
- Wasatch Cache National Forest Visits = 2.6 million
- 2018 - Salt Lake County Population = 1.14 million
- Uinta Wasatch Cache Forest Visits = 10 million
- Central Wasatch SL Ranger= ~6 million visits
## Visitation Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Unit</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Visitation (annual)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Wasatch Unit - UWCNF</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arches National Park</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>1.65 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teton National Park</td>
<td>310,000</td>
<td>3.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yosemite National Park</td>
<td>749,000</td>
<td>4.01 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowstone National Park</td>
<td>2.22 million</td>
<td>4.12 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zion National Park</td>
<td>146,600</td>
<td>4.32 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Canyon</td>
<td>1.217 million</td>
<td>6.38 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately $0.30 / visitor
Visitation Stats

Figure 1: Summary of Tri-Canyon Usage
- LCC Dispersed 32%
- BCC Dispersed 26%
- Solitude 4%
- Brighton 9%
- Snowbird 9%
- Alta 8%
- MC Dispersed 12%

Figure 2: Percentage of Use by Canyon
- LCC 49%
- BCC 39%
- MC 12%

Figure 3: Percent of Dispersed and Resort Use
- Dispersed 70%
- Resort 30%
Figure 7a: Central Wasatch Recreation Activity Overview: Number of Respondents and Frequency of Visitation (N = 318)
Figure 7b: Central Wasatch Recreation Activity Overview: Number of Respondents and Frequency of Visitation (N = 318)

- Backcountry skiing
- Backpacking
- Rock climbing
- Sledding and/or tobogganing
- Nature study
- Fishing
- Resort snowboarding
- Gathering forest goods
- Riding OHV / ATV
- Snowmobiling
- Ice climbing
- Hunting
- Trail running
- Horseback riding

Legend:
- 1-4 times
- 5-9 times
- 10-14 times
- 15-20 times
- More than 20 times
- Number of respondents
What motivates people to visit the CWM?

❖ Observe scenic beauty
❖ Enjoy the sights and smells of nature
❖ For the adventure
❖ Experience peace and tranquility
❖ Improve physical health
❖ Be with friends enjoying activities
Recreational Amenities

Satisfaction and Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of Signage</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Conditions</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenery</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Conditions</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenue of Parking</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot Condition</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of Restrooms</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of Developed Facilities</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Condition</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Signage</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of Safety</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness of Forest Personnel</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive/Educational Displays</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Fees</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Recreation Information</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Repetitive Terms: Natural Environment

- Preservation
- Watershed
- Wilderness
- Protect
- Keep it wild
- Development
Support:
- Trails
- Parking lots
- Public transportation

Opposition:
- Housing/Hotels
- Ski area expansion
- Additional lifts
- Connections

Development Continuum

Development Threshold: Biocentric
Collision course

- Between recreational pursuits, mainly the intensity of use, and other values (ie. Wildlife, watershed, solitude)
- Even between respective recreational interests
  - Hiking vs biking
  - Resort vs Backcountry skiing
Losses of native fauna

- brown (grizzly) bear--extirpated
- Canadian lynx--reduced numbers and distribution, if not extirpated
- wolverine--reduced numbers and distribution, if not extirpated
- northern river otter--reduced numbers and distribution
- (American bison--uncertain former distribution in the area, depending on how area is defined, maybe reduced numbers and distribution)
- yellow-billed cuckoo--formerly nested in SL County and SLC, now extirpated as a breeding species
- Lewis' woodpecker--formerly nested in SL County and SLC, now extirpated as a breeding species
- purple martin--formerly nested in SL County and SLC, now extirpated as a breeding species
- veery--formerly nested in SL County and SLC, now extirpated as a breeding species
- gray catbird--formerly nested in SL County and SLC, now extirpated as a breeding species
- American redstart--formerly nested in SL County and SLC, now extirpated as a breeding species
- Columbia spotted frog--formerly common in SL County and SLC, now extirpated
- western toad--formerly in SL County and SLC, now extirpated
- Great Plains toad--possibly formerly in SL County and SLC; if so, now extirpated
- least chub--formerly in SL County and SLC, now extirpated
- western pearlshell--formerly in SL County and SLC, possibly common, now extirpated
- winged floater--formerly common in SL County and SLC, now extirpated
Additions of non-native fauna

- house mouse--now nearly ubiquitous
- black rat--low elevations
- Norway rat--low elevations
- mountain goat--high elevations
- European starling--now ubiquitous
- house sparrow--now ubiquitous
- rock dove (or pigeon)--now ubiquitous
- New Mexico whiptail--low elevations
- pond slider--now in most low-elevation waters
- common snapping turtle--now in most low-elevation waters
- American bullfrog--low elevations
- too many non-native fishes to list (various non-native trouts, whitefish, minnows, shiners, chubs, carp, suckers, killifish, bass, sunfish, catfish, mosquitofish, etc. ad infinitum)
- New Zealand mudsnail--now in all high-gradient streams
- Asian clam--now in most low-elevation canals, streams, etc.
- brown garden snail--low elevations
- giant slug--low elevations
- other mollusks
Needs

❖ Protection of places and values needs administrative authority and greater permanence
❖ Identify values of place and capacity thresholds
❖ Behavioral shifts - Change behaviors over changing the land
  ❖ Landscape ethic needs to accompany recreational pursuits
❖ More funding for land managers
MOUNTAIN ACCORD

THE PROPOSED CENTRAL WASATCH BLUEPRINT
Mountain Accord Actions

- Enact protective land and water overlay for Wasatch
- Recreation plan
- Commence comprehensive transportation EIS
- Environmental Dashboard
- Central Wasatch Commission
... proceeds from the issuance of bonds shall be provided to the Department of Transportation to pay all or part of the costs of the following state highway construction or reconstruction projects: (b) $100,000,000 to be used by the Department of Transportation for transportation improvements as prioritized by the Transportation Commission for projects that:

(i) have a significant economic development impact associated with recreation and tourism within the state; and

(ii) address significant needs for congestion mitigation.

SB 277 authorized the $ for the LCC EIS...
2019 Legislative Session

UDOT... shall use bond proceeds and the funds provided to it under Section 72-2-124 to pay for the costs of right-of-way acquisition, construction, reconstruction, renovations, or improvements to the following highways:

(xvii) $13,000,000 for corridor preservation and land acquisition for a transit hub at the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon;

SB 268 - authorized $ for the BCC Parking garage
Remember CCTAP?

This was initially a complimentary effort co-lead by UDOT and the Central Wasatch Commission. UDOT cancelled this project, despite promises to be more holistic, then abruptly resigned from the Central Wasatch Commission.

The current EIS only looks at SR 210, not even comprehensively at Little Cottonwood Canyon, let alone the root of our transportation woes.
Fast Forward to Today...

- LCC EIS: “Substantially improve transportation related safety, reliability, and mobility on SR210 from Ft. Union Blvd through the Town of Alta, for all users on SR 210”
- Scoping, Re-Scoping, Screening Criteria
- Alternatives Development
- Central Wasatch Commission doing regional transportation plan
- Utah Governor and Congressional Delegation won’t protect Wasatch until transportation is “finished”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Initiative</th>
<th>UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement</th>
<th>CWC Mountain Transportation System Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year Initiated</td>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>January 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Year</td>
<td>Spring 2022</td>
<td>End of 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Scope</td>
<td>S.R. 210 (including Wasatch Blvd from the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon to Alta)</td>
<td>S.R. 190 (Big Cottonwood Canyon), S.R. 210 (Little Cottonwood Canyon), Salt Lake Valley, and the Wasatch Back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended Outcomes</td>
<td>The final EIS will be a decision document for final design and construction of specific improvements on S.R. 210</td>
<td>A consensus recommendation for transportation modes for a regional mountain transportation system serving the Wasatch Front and Back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Maker</td>
<td>UDOT</td>
<td>CWC, including member jurisdictions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Mountain Transportation System (MTS) initiative is a regional transportation plan led by the Central Wasatch Commission (CWC) and member jurisdictions. The Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement (LCG EIS) is an environmental study led by the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Each study is following an independent and separate process and differs in intended outcomes, geographic scope, timeline, and the decision makers involved.
Reminder on NEPA processes

❖ NEPA is a public participation and decision making framework
❖ NEPA works best when all jurisdictions of relevance collaborate
❖ The most important work for NEPA, happens before NEPA begins
❖ UDOT’s discretion is the highway and does not encompass the canyon - which is a huge problem
❖ UDOT is a highway agency, not a transit agency, thus we should not expect good transit analysis or evaluation, as the priority is SR 210
❖ When in doubt, just submit your comments
❖ Not a magical machine... Garbage in, garbage out!
## LCC Alternatives

### Alternatives Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Proposed Travel Concept</th>
<th>Travel Time</th>
<th># Vehicles/Peak Hour</th>
<th># People/Peak Hour via transit/personal vehicle</th>
<th>Widen Wasatch Boulevard</th>
<th>Mobility Hub(s)</th>
<th>Snow sheds</th>
<th>Address trailhead parking</th>
<th>Elimination of winter road-side parking adjacent to ski resorts</th>
<th>Tailing or management of vehicle occupancy</th>
<th>Add roadway capacity in S.R. 210 from North LCC Road to Alta</th>
<th>Relocations</th>
<th>Section 4(f)</th>
<th>Capital Costs</th>
<th>O&amp;M Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Bus</td>
<td>24 Buses</td>
<td>54 Min</td>
<td>1,000 (Transit)</td>
<td>3,387 People</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>1 Residential</td>
<td>9 Sites</td>
<td>$283</td>
<td>$9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Bus with roadway widening for P&amp;R (shoulder lane)</td>
<td>24 Buses</td>
<td>36 Min</td>
<td>1,000 (Transit)</td>
<td>3,387 People</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>1 Residential</td>
<td>18 Sites</td>
<td>$470</td>
<td>$6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gondola with 30 Gondolas</td>
<td>30 Gondolas Every 2 minutes</td>
<td>63 Min</td>
<td>1,060 (Transit)</td>
<td>3,299 People</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>1 Residential</td>
<td>9 Sites</td>
<td>$393</td>
<td>$4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gondola - 3s

- 20 Towers
- 3 stations (Base, Snowbird, Alta)
- 1 angle station at Tanners Campground
- Doesn’t serve any destination but resorts.
- No parking at gondola base
- Massive visual & environmental impacts for little, if any, benefit
Gondola - 3s

- 1,000 people/hr in gondola
- UDOT says demand is about 22,000 people
- 3 hr window
- About 3,000 people on gondola & 18,000 in cars on road!?!
Bus + Sheds

- Buses are great!
- But why the additional infrastructure.
- Snowsheds would take us from a 10 day canyon closure average to a 6 - 4 day closure average
- Huge costs: price tag, environmental and visual not to mention recreational displacement
Bus + 3rd lane and sheds

- Again, more buses, great!
- 3rd lane accommodates more vehicular volumes
- The goal should be reducing the number of vehicles on the roadway so that we lessen our development footprint (1 bus removes about 20 - 30 cars)
- UDOT calls it a shoulder but the cut/fill slopes will be significant and many miles
Tolling

- Tolls were thought to also accompany the 3 alternatives
- In a discussion with UDOT last month they discussed the toll being assessed from White Pine to the top of the canyon not having tolls the entirety of the canyon
- Occupancy based tolls could incentivize carpooling and transit use (assuming transit serves your destination)

Infrared Sensors for tolling
Parking

- Expanding parking lots and closing road side parking
  - Gate Buttress - 21
  - Bridge - 15
  - Lisa Falls - 41
  - White Pine - 144

- Why are we continuing to accommodate cars?
# TRAILHEAD AND ROADSIDE PARKING ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Canyon Parking Study Alternatives*</th>
<th>Screening Results (Red=Eliminated, Green=Pass)</th>
<th>Alternatives A</th>
<th>Alternatives B</th>
<th>Alternative C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gate Buttress</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Proposed – 25 spaces</td>
<td>No Alternative B concept was developed</td>
<td></td>
<td>No parking area expansion at any trailhead, and eliminate roadside parking from the intersection of I-80 to Snowbird Entry 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Trailhead</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Proposed – 15 spaces</td>
<td>No Alternative B concept was developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expanded existing parking lot (35 spaces), expand Cottonwood south pullout (25 spaces) and improve shoulder parking (25 spaces).</td>
<td>Proposed – 40 spaces</td>
<td>Proposed – 40 spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expanded existing parking lot (10 spaces) and improve shoulder parking (25 spaces).</td>
<td>Proposed – 144 spaces</td>
<td>Proposed – 144 spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No design figures were provided as part of the Canyon Parking Study

Grit Mill parking expansion scheduled for 2020

Alternatives A and B can support elimination of roadside parking within 1/4 mile of the trailhead and from the intersection of S.R. 200/S.R. 210 to the entrance to Snowbird Entry 1.
Wasatch Blvd

- Two Options - N LCC Road to Bengal Blvd
  - Imbalanced Lane - 1 N-bound lane and 2 S-bound lanes
  - Five-Lane - Add 1 lane in each direction
- Widening Wasatch Blvd, just accommodates more cars
Other Ideas

- Alta Ski Area & Ski Utah Proposals - Lift Connection to Park City
Other Ideas

- Alta Ski Area Proposal - Lift Connection to Park City
- La Caille Resort Development Gondola Base Proposal
Other Ideas

- Alta Ski Area Proposal - Lift Connection to Park City
- La Caille Resort Development Gondola Base Proposal
- “Zion National Park” Shuttle
Other Ideas

❖ Alta Ski Area - Lift Connection to Park City
❖ La Caille Resort Development Gondola Base
❖ “Zion National Park” Shuttle
❖ ....or...
❖
Save Our Canyons option

Connect people to canyons without needing cars

We have to stop incrementally accommodating cars and get to a real solution.
Save Our Canyons Conceptual Transportation Plan. More work needs to be done to identify transportation and parking nodes in the urban area. However, this concept utilizes existing road widths, provides express service to resort destinations using buses in the canyons. An east side light rail along Wasatch and Foothill Bivds should be analyzed, which would bridge the existing University lines and a possible Canyon Visitor and Transit hub at the gravel pit. Heavy rail could connect Park City and the Airport with a similar transit hub near Parleys Mouth. Improves access and protects land!
Enhanced regional connectivity

❖ Serves all users, all seasons
❖ Designs a system around values we seek to protect
❖ Gives everyone an option other than cars well before Canyons
❖ Would also benefit other trips and commuting
❖ Truly benefits the broader public warranting public investment
❖ Wouldn’t require massive development in/near Canyons
Conclusions

❖ This EIS serves 2 resorts and doesn’t benefit the Wasatch
❖ It is predicated on meeting the State’s economic development priorities, rather than goals of the Wasatch
❖ $300 - $500 Million gets us 5 fewer canyon closures
❖ Transit/Transportation should be a tool in realizing environmental, recreation and watershed goals
❖ The LCC EIS is not a solution rather an end run around comprehensive landscape level efforts and will induce visitation, not manage it. Induced visitation = $ to the state.
❖ There is nothing supportable in the current alternatives in the EIS as packaged
There’s an inherent risk and reality of living, visiting and doing business in these mountains - nature happens. That risk was workable when these resorts were permitted, now they and the state want more.

When Snowbird opened, they pledged “man and nature in harmony.” There is nothing harmonious about altering the very nature of these canyons with more steel, asphalt or cabled contraptions.

The risks are part of the reward, if you need reliability, Park City is up what once was a beautiful and wild canyon, but is now little more than an Interstate freeway.

We should fight like hell to ensure that fate isn’t foisted upon our other Wasatch Canyons.
Thank you & ?’s

Save Our Canyons is a 501c3 non-profit dedicated to protecting the wildness and beauty of the Wasatch Mountains. We exist because of passionate members, local foundations and the support of those in our community.

Please consider making a donation to support our work at saveourcanyons.org