

ENVIRONMENT SYSTEM GROUP POLLING QUESTIONS

OVERALL ENVIRONMENT SYSTEM

1. I support advancing the Idealized Environment System to the Executive Board for consideration in the analysis of combined scenarios, with the understanding that there are still some unresolved topics without consensus (federal land protection mechanisms).

FEDERAL LANDS PROTECTION MECHANISMS

The Environment System Group has proposed that USFS lands that are eligible for federal Wilderness designation be considered for additional protection beyond current Forest Plan coverage. The following statements are intended to identify the level of support for various types of protective measures on those lands.

The following statements have 5 response options: (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) undecided/neutral, (4) disagree, and (5) strongly disagree:

1. The existing Forest Plan provides the protection needed for these lands to meet the Environment System goals
2. To meet the Environment System goals, it is necessary to provide Wilderness designation to all lands that are eligible for wilderness.
3. A legislative or presidential designation (such as Wilderness or Special Management Area) is needed for these lands to meet the Environment System goals
4. A blend of different levels of federal protection (Forest Plan, Wilderness and Special Management Area) on those lands is needed to achieve the Environment System goals

Following the polling on these questions, you will have the opportunity to briefly summarize how your choice, compared to the other options, would best advance the Environment System goals (up to one minute per person).

CONSISTENCY OF OTHER SYSTEM GROUP ACTIONS

The following statements refer to actions being considered by the other system groups. You will be asked to indicate your level of agreement with each statement – i.e., the consistency/inconsistency of those actions with the Environment System vision and goals. The following statements have 5 response options: (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) undecided/neutral, (4) disagree, and (5) strongly disagree.

Following the polling on each group of questions, you will have a chance to briefly summarize the following:

- For those who agree or strongly agree, are there conditions that need to be attached to the proposed action to achieve that level of agreement; and,
- For those who disagree or strongly disagree, what are the threats to the Environment goals?

POTENTIAL TRANSPORTATION ACTIONS

1. Providing a bus or rail line up LCC and BCC (without connections between the canyons or across to Park City) could be consistent with the long term Environment System vision and goals.
2. Connecting the valley, LCC, BCC and Park City area with a rail line or buses using tunnels, could be consistent with...
3. Connecting LCC, BCC and Park City area with an aerial gondola could be consistent with...
4. Connecting the valley and Park City with a rail line or buses via Parley's Canyon and SR 224 could be consistent with...
5. Opening Guardsman Pass to year round automobile access could be consistent with...

OTHER POTENTIAL ACTIONS

1. Adding ski lift (s) to connect Park City Mountain Resort and Brighton (as proposed by One Wasatch) could be consistent with the Environment system vision and goals.
2. Adding ski lift(s) to connect Solitude and Alta over Twin Lakes Pass (as proposed by One Wasatch) could be consistent with...
3. Adding base area development at Alta and Brighton, within the existing disturbed area and within existing water restrictions, could be consistent with...
4. Adding ski lift(s) to expand the existing skiable area in LCC and/or BCC (separate from One Wasatch) could be consistent with...
5. Completing key non-motorized urban and mountain trail connections to provide a more robust trail network could be consistent with...
6. Designing and managing branded recreation areas to attract high levels of use by supporting many activities and user groups could be consistent with...
7. Providing year round public transit service to connect users with recreation destinations could be consistent with...
8. Designing and managing key recreation areas for increased use while maintaining existing character and recreation opportunities could be consistent with...
9. Any one proposed action could be consistent with the Environment system vision and goals; however, the cumulative impact from multiple proposed actions must be considered.

RECREATION SYSTEM GROUP POLLING QUESTIONS

OVERALL RECREATION SYSTEM

1. I support advancing the Idealized Recreation System to the Executive Board for consideration in the analysis of combined scenarios, with the understanding that there are still some unresolved topics without consensus (i.e., land preservation mechanisms, transportation connection, One Wasatch).

OTHER POTENTIAL ACTIONS

The following statements refer to potential actions for implementing the Recreation System goals, as well as actions being considered by other System Groups that could have relevance to the Recreation System goals. You will be asked to indicate your level of agreement with each statement. The statements have 5 response options: (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) undecided/neutral, (4) disagree, and (5) strongly disagree.

Following the polling on each group of questions, you will have a chance to briefly summarize the following:

- For those who agree or strongly agree, are there conditions that need to be attached to the proposed action to achieve that level of agreement; and,
- For those who disagree or strongly disagree, what are the key threats to the recreation goals from that proposed action?

POTENTIAL FEDERAL LAND PRESERVATION ACTIONS

1. The existing USFS Land Use Plan or an amendment to the plan is sufficient to protect recreation areas in the in the Central Wasatch. Congressional or executive designations are not needed.
2. Additional congressional or executive designations (e.g., Wilderness, National Conservation Area, National Recreation Area, National Monument) should be used to provide additional long-term protection against development while maintaining flexibility for recreation.
3. Pursuing a congressional or executive action would require additional discussion to identify the appropriate designation and allowed uses in each area.
4. Wilderness is an appropriate tool for protection of some but not all recreation areas in the Central Wasatch.
5. Wilderness modifications should be made to accommodate completion of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.

POTENTIAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM ACTIONS

1. Public transit should promote accessibility and connection of recreation areas in the Central Wasatch.
2. A public transportation connection (either rail, bus or gondola) between Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons and the Wasatch Back is desirable to promote recreation connectivity and to reduce roadway congestion.
3. The impacts of a Little Cottonwood/Big Cottonwood/Park City connection on recreation are highly dependent on mode.
4. An underground connection (e.g., rail tunnel) would have fewer adverse impacts on recreation than an above ground connection (e.g., gondola).
5. Providing transit service to new ridgetop locations that do not currently have transit or roadway access (e.g., Twin Lakes Pass) is undesirable.
6. Recreation crowding and induced demand are my biggest fears regarding a Little Cottonwood/Big Cottonwood/Park City connection.
7. Change of existing community character and loss of undeveloped landscapes are my biggest fears regarding a Little Cottonwood/Big Cottonwood/Park City connection.

ONE WASATCH

1. One Wasatch is desirable because it will create a new and unique recreation experience and expand opportunities to manage for high density recreation at the resorts.
2. One Wasatch could be acceptable if the design is developed and refined through stakeholder involvement to limit unintended consequences (e.g., appropriate boundary management to limit side-country access, allowances for uphill traffic in Grizzly Gulch, etc.) and to negotiate potential trade-offs (e.g., permanent public access to Flagstaff Ridge).
3. Impacts to or loss of backcountry terrain are my primary concerns with One Wasatch.
4. Potential visual impacts on undeveloped landscapes and potential loss of opportunities for solitude and restorative nature experiences are my primary concerns with One Wasatch.
5. One Wasatch would have the largest impact on recreation at this location:
 - a. Grizzly Gulch (connection between Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons)
 - b. Guardsman Pass (connection between Big Cottonwood Canyon and Park City)

OTHER POTENTIAL ACTIONS

1. Some new development (e.g., restaurants, restrooms, shops) within resort base areas could support the vision and goals of the Recreation System Group provided that the character of the area is preserved.
2. Parking fees and access restrictions are tools that I would support using to manage recreational use in the Central Wasatch and achieve the vision and goals of the Recreation System Group.
3. Opening Guardsman Pass to year round automobile access would help meet the goals of the Recreation System Group.

ECONOMY SYSTEM GROUP POLLING QUESTIONS

OVERALL ECONOMY SYSTEM

1. I support advancing the Idealized Economy System to the Executive Board for consideration in the analysis of combined scenarios, with the understanding that there are still some unresolved topics without consensus (i.e., best use of certain lands adjacent to ski areas, scale and type of future development in the Alta/Brighton areas, and over the snow ski area connections (One Wasatch)).

OTHER POTENTIAL ACTIONS

The following statements refer to potential actions for implementing the Economy System's own goals, as well as actions being considered by other System Groups that could have relevance to Economy System goals. You will be asked to indicate your level of agreement with each statement. The statements have 5 response options: (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) undecided/neutral, (4) disagree, and (5) strongly disagree.

Following the polling on each group of questions, you will have a chance to briefly summarize the following:

- For those who agree or strongly agree, are there conditions that need to be attached to the proposed action to achieve that level of agreement; and,
- For those who disagree or strongly disagree, what are the key threats to the economy goals from that proposed action?

LAND ADJACENT TO EXISTING SKI AREAS

1. Preserving land adjacent to existing ski areas for backcountry skiing and viewshed/aesthetic purposes, rather than expanding the ski areas, will best serve the economy system goals.
2. Targeted ski-area expansions, rather than land preservation for backcountry skiing, will best meet the economy system goals.
3. A balance of ski area expansion and land preservation will best meet the economy system goals.

ALTA/BRIGHTON BASE AREA DEVELOPMENT

1. At Alta/Brighton, existing water rights should be transferrable within the Cottonwood Canyons from their current defined sources and destinations to a base area village in support of future transit stations.

2. Any future development around a transit station in Alta or Brighton areas should be strictly limited to the water currently available through the areas' existing water contracts.
3. Future development at these two locations should be intensified to ensure functional base villages can be designed.

ONE WASATCH

1. One Wasatch will create a new and unique marketing opportunity that will help meet the economy system goals.
2. One Wasatch will cause visual and other impacts on undeveloped landscapes that will detract from meeting the economy system goals.
3. A "mitigated" One Wasatch design, developed and refined through stakeholder involvement to limit unintended consequences (e.g., appropriate boundary management to limit side-country access, allowances for uphill traffic, etc.) and to negotiate potential trade-offs (e.g., permanent public access to Flagstaff Ridge), would best meet economy system goals.
4. If there is a quick rail or gondola connection between LCC, BCC, and the Park City ski areas, then adding One Wasatch would do little to further the economy system goals.

VARIOUS POTENTIAL ACTIONS

1. Parking fees and access restrictions are tools that I would support using to manage use in the Central Wasatch and achieve the vision and goals of the Economy system.
2. Opening Guardsman Pass to year round automobile access would help meet the Economy system goals.
3. If there is a quick rail or gondola connection between LCC , BCC and the Park City area, then opening Guardsman Pass to year round automobile access would do little to further the Economy system goals.

VOTE ON SPECIFIC GOALS AND QUALITATIVE METRICS VOTE

1. The Idealized Economy System, as deliberated today, would achieve Goal 1: Grow the year-round destination-based TTR Economy.
2. The Idealized Economy System, as deliberated today, would achieve Goal 2: Maximize the financial resources available to reinvest in improving and protecting Central Wasatch assets.
3. Rate each of the following for "Quality of Experience", taking into account visitor use & conflict, spectrum of recreational opportunity, and visual & natural qualities:
 - a. "Existing Conditions" in 2014.
 - b. "2040 Trend" with increased use but without our investments or policies in place.
 - c. "Idealized Scenario" with investments and policies in place.

4. Rate each of the following for “Quality of Life”, specifically considering the extent to which people will want to live here and the Central Wasatch will continue to be an asset that supports attraction and retention of employers/employees:
 - a. “Existing Conditions” in 2014.
 - b. “2040 Trend” with increased use but without proposed investments or policies in place.
 - c. “Idealized Scenario” with investments and policies in place.

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM GROUP POLLING QUESTIONS

The following statements have 5 response options: (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) undecided/neutral, (4) disagree, and (5) strongly disagree. Following the polling on these statements you will be asked to briefly summarize any caveats or conditions you would place on your polling choices (up to one minute per person).

OVERALL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

1. I support advancing Transportation Concepts A & D to the Executive Board for consideration in the analysis of combined scenarios.

OTHER TRANSPORTATION ISSUES

The following statements are intended to clarify the group's level of support for including or not including selected actions with the Idealized Transportation System. Indicate your level of agreement (1-5) with these statements:

2. Moving skiers and others with chairlifts/ski lifts is not part of the proposed Idealized Transportation System.
3. Opening Guardsman Pass to year round automobile access is not part of the Idealized Transportation System.

QUALITATIVE TRANSPORTATION METRICS

1. I concur with the qualitative scoring of Metric # 2 (see attached scorecard): Provides access to a range of destinations (activity and development centers as well as dispersed recreation)
2. I concur with the qualitative scoring of Metric # 4 (see attached scorecard): Reduce system susceptibility to risks caused by avalanches, rockslides, inclement weather, and incidents
3. I concur with the qualitative scoring of Metric # 5 (see attached scorecard): Flexible capacity to accommodate daily and seasonal fluctuations in demand
4. I concur with the qualitative scoring of Metric # 6 (see attached scorecard): Positive influence on high-accident locations
5. I concur with the qualitative scoring of Metric # 7 (see attached scorecard): Ability to provide evacuation alternatives
6. I concur with the qualitative scoring of Metric # 8 (see attached scorecard): Accommodate and encourage bike and pedestrian use of transportation corridors
7. I concur with the qualitative scoring of Metric # 10 (see attached scorecard): Mitigates the need to expand surface parking in sensitive natural areas
8. I concur with the qualitative scoring of Metric # 11 (see attached scorecard): Avoids negative impacts to priority environmental areas

Transportation

Metric	Existing Conditions	A	B	C	D	Notes
<p><i>Goal 1: Provide integrated multimodal transportation choices for residents, visitors, and employees.</i></p>						
1. Increase percent of trips to-and-from mountain destinations accommodated by alternate modes (i.e., non-SOV, mode split)	Work in progress	Work in progress	Work in progress	Work in progress	Work in progress	
2. Provides access to a range of destinations (activity and development centers as well as dispersed recreation)	Work in progress	●	●	●	●	A, B, C, D – Improved transit would increase access to destinations. Improved bus service and rail service provide access equally well.
3. Provides benefit within the regional transportation system (e.g. reduces demand or provides an alternate choice on congested corridors)	Work in progress	Work in progress	Work in progress	Work in progress	Work in progress	
<p><i>Goal 2: Ensure the transportation experience is reliable and facilitates a positive experience.</i></p>						
4. Reduce system susceptibility to risks caused by avalanches, rockslides, inclement weather, and incidents	○	◐	●	◑	●	A, C – Bus systems in canyons are impacted by weather and incidents. Assumes avalanche sheds for more frequent avalanche paths. Risk is reduced, but not eliminated. B, C – Rail is not impacted by weather. Avalanche sheds required to protect overhead catenary system is much more extensive than sheds required for roadway/bus, therefore avalanche risk is virtually eliminated. Separate guideway in Little Cottonwood Canyon would not be impacted by traffic incidents. Furthermore, rail is not exposed to traffic incidents since it is protected from traffic flow.
5. Flexible capacity to accommodate daily and seasonal fluctuations in demand	○	◐	●	◑	●	A, C – Can add or remove buses from routes by increasing frequency of service to accommodate peak demand. B, D – Can add or remove light rail vehicles from consists and increase frequency of service to accommodate peak demand. Capacity of rail is higher than bus, so system is more flexible.


 Worse <<< >>> Better

Transportation

Metric	Existing Conditions	A	B	C	D	Notes
<i>Goal 3: Ensure the transportation experience is safe and promotes health.</i>						
6. Positive influence on high-accident locations						A, C – Higher use of transit reduces congestion leading to fewer accidents. B, D – Higher use of transit reduces congestion leading to fewer accidents. Additionally, the separate guideway for the rail eliminates potential for automobile collision from all rail patrons. If the rail were adjacent to the roadway, shoulder and barrier improvements resulting from the rail infrastructure would improve the safety of the motorists.
7. Ability to provide evacuation alternatives						B, D – Rail connection between Wasatch Front and Wasatch Back eliminates the dead-end at the Cottonwood Canyons
8. Accommodate and encourage bike and pedestrian use of transportation corridors						A, C – All concepts include network of pedestrian and bike paths throughout the study area. B, D – All concepts include network of pedestrian and bike paths throughout the study area. Rail connection between Wasatch Front and Wasatch Back facilitates use of bike and ped facilities in the canyons and in the Wasatch Back.
9. Reduce VMT to improve air quality and provide other environmental benefits						
<i>Goal 4: The transportation system supports the natural and intrinsic values of the Central Wasatch.</i>						
10. Mitigates need to expand surface parking in sensitive natural areas						A, C – Improved transit availability would decrease need for parking in sensitive areas. However, the high capacity transit end of line in Park City which may generate parking demand in Park City. B, D – Improved transit availability would decrease need for parking in sensitive areas.
11. Avoids negative impacts to priority environmental areas						A, C – Transit system stays within existing roadway prism within the canyons. Improved transit use would decrease vehicle use, reducing environmental impacts to canyons. B, D – Transit system may require enlarged footprint in canyons. Improved transit use with rail would significantly decrease vehicle use, reducing environmental impacts (emissions, noise, parking impacts, etc.) to canyons.


 Worse <<< >>> Better