

# Meeting Notes

## Stakeholder Meeting with GOED

June 4, 2020 – 2:30pm

### 1. Attendance and Location

#### a. List of attendees:

Josh Van Jura, UDOT	Bri Binnebose, Penna Powers	Vince Izzo, HDR
Val Hale	Bianca Lyon	Pitt Grewe
Flint Timmons		

#### b. Little Cottonwood Canyon

### 2. Introductions

### 3. Discussion

- a. Josh Van Jura provided an overview of the project background and purpose, which is to improve safety, reliability and mobility on S.R. 210.
- b. There are three primary alternatives that have been advanced for further evaluation: enhanced bus service, enhanced service with a bus lane and a gondola.
  - i. The goal with transit alternatives is to remove 30% of vehicles out of the canyon to improve reliability and mobility.
  - ii. Bus service in each alternative is direct service to each resort.
  - iii. In no-action scenario, by 2050 travel time is expected to be 80-85 minutes.
  - iv. What is the cost of enhanced bus service?
    - (1) \$283 million. The other bus alternative is \$470 million. Gondola is about \$383 million.
- c. There are five elements that are a part of the primary alternatives, which include Wasatch Boulevard improvements, mobility hubs, snow sheds, trailhead parking, roadside parking restrictions and travel demand management.
- d. Val – what about the budget? Senator Neiderhauser earmarked about \$66 million for LCC as part of SB 77
  - i. Some of the money is currently being used on the EIS but the remaining would go towards the preferred alternative. A preferred alternative needs to be determined before we can figure out how much is needed.
  - ii. Do you anticipate legislative support? How would it be funded?
    - (1) We anticipate some support due to the fact that the study was funded but don't know at this time beyond that.

## Meeting Notes

- e. Pitt – much of these are geared towards the resort community but how do backcountry skiers' factor into this? What sort of data is being collected on those users? How will summer gondola use being factored into this? It would be important to see how many of the total traffic is part of each of user group.
  - i. Some users who are going to backcountry still may drive but if we can get the 30% reduction in the resort traffic, that would improve traffic for the other users.
  - ii. The gondola numbers are based on winter service but since there are other potential recreational opportunities in the summer so we're looking for public input on summer operations. looking for feedback/comments on operations, hours, restrictions.
- f. Pitt – the transit travel times are still fairly high for the locals and that might be difficult for them to swallow. Biggest concern from this office is that this is part of a longer term, master plan of transportation. There is a lot of discussion happening around connectivity and expanding into areas like Grizzly Gulch. When it comes to continue to build infrastructure, this alternative should be able fit into other solutions, so we are not cutting off access to other facilities or recreational opportunities. Goal is to have seamless travel up and down each canyon, it could be a mixture of trail systems and infrastructure or whatever combination, but we need everything to work together. Maintain access to the canyons for the residents of Utah in a safe way.
  - i. Josh – these are excellent points. For this study, we are focused on LCC but do want a transportation network to be successful but planning studies are a different than this environmental study.
- g. Bianca – what other stakeholders are involved and where does CWC work fit into this?
  - i. Josh - this study is completely independent of the CWC study and the EIS needs to follow a process. We do coordinate on the timeline to best use stakeholders time
- h. Pitt – would like an overview of the comments and to have him and Bianca be the contacts for GOED. Glad to see action is being taken. Can we get together
- i. Bianca/Pitt – can coordinate in the future on better communications, Pitt follows winter accounts and it has been
- j. Flint – what is the hourly capacity of passengers on all the alternatives?
  - i. They're about the same, 1000 people/hr uphill
- k. Flint – how the shoulder lanes work?
  - i. Similar to how it works in Park City. The LCC alternatives would be signed on the side, not overhead
- l. Where would the gondola drop people off?
  - i. Snowbird stop is over the bypass and in between the two main lots at Alta.
  - ii. Vince – if the gondola would be selected, there would be much further discussion with the resorts on where to precisely locate it.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:41 pm.

These minutes were prepared by Bri Binnebose.