

## Decision Memo #6

To: Mountain Accord Executive Board  
From: Laynee Jones, Program Manager  
Date: December 15, 2014  
Re: Milestone Approval of Idealized Systems, Framework for Combined Scenarios

Attachments:

- Framework for Combined Scenarios - Revised During November Executive Board meeting
- Idealized Systems, Polling Results, and Summary of Public Feedback – summary is here <http://mountainaccord.com/idealized-systems/>

### APPROVAL

The Executive Board reviewed the above items during its November 10<sup>th</sup> meeting at Salt Lake County. Attendees included John Park for Mayor Cullimore, Carl Fisher, Chris Robinson, Andy Beerman, Laura Briefer for Mike Wilson, Mayor Dolan, Linda Gehrke, Steve Capson, Dave Kallas for Mike Allegra, Mayor Becker, Nathan Rafferty, Mayor McAdams, Dave Whittekiend, Alan Matheson, Ivan Marrero, Justin Jones, Nathan Lee, and Mayor Pollard.

### Decision on Accepting Idealized Systems

- Mayor McAdams invited comments from the audience on the idealized systems. No comments were made.
- Claire Woodman summarized public comments to date received on the website. Andy Beerman requested that comments collected at the Park City open houses also be included in the next report.
- Mayor McAdams made a motion to accept the idealized systems developed by the co-chairs and system groups as recommendations for the Executive Board to consider in evaluating combined scenarios. Laura Briefer seconded the motion. All voting Executive Board members voted in favor.
- The Executive Board took time to thank the system groups and co-chairs for all their efforts in creating the idealized systems.

### Decision on Combined Scenario Framework

- There was extensive discussion on the Framework for Combined Scenarios and revisions are captured in the attached document. Mayor McAdams requested consent by a show of hands. All voting members except 3 consented with the document. Peter Metcalf expressed concurrence via email before the meeting.

- Several Executive Board members had not received the proposed language beforehand due to an email problem and substantial changes had been made since the last version at the retreat. Specific areas of concern have been noted in the document.
- Mayor Becker consented with conditions that he has previously expressed related to certain options that are unacceptable.
- Andy Beerman consented under condition that he needs to review the document with his council.
- Carl Fisher consented but expressed concern that we have not narrowed options. He suggested that we narrow our transportation options before we go to the public.
- The Framework for Combined Scenarios will be a living document will serve as the foundation for a Program Charter amendment at the end of Phase I.

### **SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR IDEALIZED SYSTEMS**

The technical leads and Co-Chairs for each system group have undergone an extensive process with the system group members to arrive at the attached idealized systems, including 8 system group meetings from March to October 2014, additional workshops and meetings in between system group meetings, sub-committees, and email and phone coordination. The process has involved over 200 people. The transportation idealized system was not finalized – however, a white paper was produced and concepts A, B, C, and D in the memo were recommended for further evaluation.

### **DECISION LOG**

<b>Decision Memo</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Date</b>
Decision Memo 1	Structure and Process	December 2013
Decision Memo 2	Systems Approach and Funding Needed (Change Orders #1, 2 for Parametrix for \$159K)	January 2014
Decision Memo 3	Existing Conditions and Future Trends	June 2014
Decision Memo 4	Parametrix Scope/Budget (Change Order #3 up to \$350K depending on funding)	August 2014
Decision Memo 5	Vision, Goals, Metrics	August 2014
Decision Memo 6	Idealized Systems, Combined Scenario	November 2014

## FRAMEWORK FOR COMBINED SCENARIOS

Version 3a: November 12, 2014

## AREAS OF COMMONALITY

- **Quality of Life**
  - *it is important both on the Wasatch Front and the Wasatch Back that our solutions are attractive to residents (they cannot be focused merely on tourists)*
- **Preservation and Watershed**
  - *preservation of natural ecosystems, specifically watershed, water supply, and water quality was a strong theme from all system groups*
  - preservation can be accomplished through:
    - USFS land trades
    - private land acquisition or trades with willing sellers
    - additional protections on USFS lands through federal land designation or Forest Plan amendments
  - environmental restoration of contaminated soils, lands with invasive weeds, and impaired streams
  - ongoing environmental monitoring and adaptive management plan
  - avoid fragmentation of core conservation areas – this could be a conflict with transportation alignments (different impacts depending on mode, above-ground/ under-ground) or trail alignments
- **Broadly Shared Economic Growth**
  - brand that is high quality, convenient, and unique in the world
  - *we have the opportunity to create economic value through high-quality transit investments paired with high-quality, unique development in strategic areas*
  - we can grow the economy through total spending (not volumes of people) and increasing hotel utilization
  - we can invest more into the Central Wasatch if we increase annual tourism-related tax revenue and assessed value of property
- **Nodal Development**
  - focus development in urban areas and existing development nodes in the mountains, and protect solitude and naturalness in other areas
  - improve the experience for residents and visitors in summer and winter, and accommodate the growth with high-quality development at the base of the resorts

- small increases in development at the base of Alta and Brighton where there are fewer base facilities. The development would be focused around transit stations, within existing disturbed areas, and within existing water contracts.
- additional high-use recreations nodes with flagship trails at thoughtfully designed locations with convenient access (transit stops, restrooms, trail maps, etc.)
- connect nodes with high-quality transit, make transit investments that shape future land use and create economic opportunity
- additional protections may be needed to ensure transit investment does not induce development where we do not want it in the future
- ***on a broad scale, there is good overlap on where the development nodes should be, and where areas of preservation should be (see map)***
- **Transportation**
  - strong focus on year-round transit solutions and reducing private vehicle use and the growth in VMT (vehicle miles travelled) – this is a uniting theme and is foundational to our efforts
  - high-value transportation infrastructure - attractive, sustainable, dynamic, fast, unique, marketable
  - specific needs:
    - connect to the regional transit network and serve a range of destinations (resorts, airport, dispersed uses)
    - serve residents, visitors, and employees
    - reduce traffic in Park City ([SR-224](#), [SR-248](#)) and the Cottonwood Canyons
    - provide evacuation alternatives and improve reliability (avalanche paths, rock slides) in Cottonwood Canyons
    - create new opportunities for loop hiking and biking
    - enhanced bike and pedestrian infrastructure
    - a comprehensive parking strategy integrated with the transportation solution
  - ***although there is good overlap of corridors that need transit investment – there is not consensus on modes, alignments, priorities, and connecting the Cottonwood Canyons to Park City. Some modes and alignments may conflict with environmental preservation or restoration areas.***
- **Interconnected Trail Network**
  - ties in well with economic and transportation goals but may have environmental impacts

- Some of these trails (e.g., Parley's trail) have been master planned and designed and are waiting for funding. Others are currently under study or would require a feasibility study and design work to get ready for NEPA or implementation. A briefing paper will be developed that outlines potential next steps. Funding would be needed for any new trails.
- Governance and Funding
  - there is a general theme of needing to address governance and funding on a variety of levels
  - for example, the environment and recreation groups identified initiatives that would require more nimble governance - the complexity and number of jurisdictions operating in the study area can make project implementation challenging
  - funding is needed for environmental restoration or monitoring, additional purchase of lands, trail network, and transportation solutions
  - economic growth and potential taxing mechanisms would be needed to support these initiatives

## COMBINED SCENARIO

- **land management** actions to preserve watershed, recreation and ecosystem values (including protecting wildlife corridors and reducing fragmentation):
  - added protection on federal lands per Environment and Recreation idealized systems
    - this would require federal action
    - maintain current uses- helicopter skiing, maintenance of private water supplies, avalanche control, mountain biking, motorized use on Mineral Fork
    - provisions for transit routes and trail network
    - specific designation and boundaries to come from task force that includes USFS representation
  - USFS land trades to secure private land on Superior and Flagstaff and to provide additional private land for Alta and Snowbird, per detailed negotiations
    - this would require a USFS NEPA process
    - do not trade away roadless or wilderness quality lands unless recommended by task force for environmental benefit

- implement an environmental restoration program and an ongoing monitoring and adaptive management plan for environmental resources (as a legacy – beyond what is required by NEPA) pending funding sources
- coordinated, comprehensive program for acquisition of private lands with willing sellers for the entire study area
- conduct additional analysis of environmental impacts prior to selecting preferred scenario (specifically transportation)

- **Transportation**

- connect nodes with ~~high-quality~~ transit and make transit investments that shape future land use, create economic opportunity and help reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and other pollutants
- evaluate multi-modal options, including bus and rail, on the following corridors:
  - 7200 S and 9400 S
  - Little Cottonwood Canyon
  - Connections from top of Little Cottonwood to Big Cottonwood
  - Connections from top of Big Cottonwood to Park City
  - ~~Connections from the airport to Park City via I-80 corridor~~ ~~Parleys Canyon~~
  - ~~Circulator “loop” in Summit County (I-80, US-40, SR-248, SR-224)~~
  - Proposed transit improvements would be evaluated with other improvements already ~~proposed~~ ~~included in the~~ ~~Long~~ ~~Range~~ ~~Transportation plans~~
- ~~pending implementation of other transportation actions, m~~ maintain current seasonal usage of Guardsman Pass Road per evaluation memo to be developed (specific to Bonanza Flats to Big Cottonwood).
- advance transit improvements in Mill Creek Canyon as an immediate action
- evaluate options for transit incentives and ~~single occupancy vehicle~~ automobile disincentives, and develop a comprehensive regional parking and pricing strategy (this may require state legislative action)
- ~~In Park City and Summit County, identify and agree upon (Park City, Summit County, and UDOT) traffic and parking impacts in Summit County and advance implement scenarios that increase transit mode share and minimize mitigate such parking and traffic impacts.~~
- ~~implement transit improvements on corridors in Park City and Summit County (for example, SR-224, SR-248 or other local roads) in advance of as part of Cottonwood Canyon connections, if needed to avoid parking and traffic impacts unless otherwise agreed upon by Park City and Summit County.~~

- **Economic/ Development**
  - conduct detailed economic study that identifies the economic benefits and impacts regionally, and to each community
  - advance scenarios that generate economic growth and new revenues for environmental restoration, monitoring and adaptive management, additional purchase of lands, trail network, and transportation solutions
  - allow limited development at Alta and Brighton focused around transit stations, within existing disturbed areas, and within existing water contracts
  - plan and design infrastructure to be compatible with the character objectives of communities
- **Recreation**
  - direct a task force to negotiate details of One Wasatch, ski area boundaries, and how they relate to transportation proposals (the task force will ~~report back~~make a recommendation to the Executive Board)
  - implement recommendations from the recreation system group to manage and develop future recreation infrastructure using identified high, medium, and low use nodes (plan these with an understanding of capacity & thresholds)
  - implement the trail network concept proposed by the recreation group pending additional funding sources (additional funding sources could be available through scenarios that generate economic growth)
  - direct a task force to explore sustainable user fee options using partnerships, existing tools and study recommendations.
- **Governance and Decision-Making Process**
  - understanding that the actions proposed by the System Groups and by many of the individual entities on the Executive Board are inter-related and require approval or coordination by other entities on the Mountain accord Executive Board, we agree to take an integrated approach to making decisions
  - Mountain Accord decisions are consensus based and do not supersede federal, state, and local jurisdictions' authorities.
  - explore options for better multi-jurisdictional coordination to implement Mountain Accord scenarios
  - for the Wasatch Front, maintain current municipal watershed regulatory authority and a regional approach to land use jurisdiction within the mountainous area (~~with the exception of the Town of Alta's current municipal land use authority~~excluding existing municipal boundaries)

- ~~○ Summit County and Park City Agreement by Summit County and Park City (and if applicable Wasatch County) is needed to advance for a transportation connections between the Cottonwoods and Park City Wasatch Front and the Wasatch Back to be advanced. In the event Summit County and Park City (and Wasatch County if applicable) disagree on such the connections, a conflict resolution process will be invoked.~~
- ~~○ after a scenario is finalized and agreed-upon by the Mountain Accord Executive Board, the affected jurisdictions shall seek to implement municipalities will implement the scenario through zoning, general plan, and other tools available at the municipal level~~
- ~~○ The Mountain Accord proposal will serve as a basis for proposed federal actions.~~
- **Fees**
  - ~~○ direct a task force to explore and implement sustainable user fee options using partnerships, existing tools and study recommendations.~~
- **Other Idealized System Actions**
  - Advance additional actions identified in the Idealized Systems as the Preferred Scenario is refined

## Outstanding Issues for Further Discussion

- Consider a discussion on employee workforce movements and Financing Options
- Transportation alignments, modes, and priority corridors (to be discussed in December Executive Board meeting)
- Per conditions expressed by Park City in the Executive Board meeting and follow up conversations, the following two statements need additional vetting and will be re-visited in the December Executive Board meeting. Pursuant to conversations with Summit County after the meeting, Summit County's concurrence to the Combined Scenarios Framework document is predicated on these statements being included. Without these Summit County does not concur.
  - The Agreement by Summit County and Park City (and if applicable Wasatch County) is needed to advance transportation connections between the Wasatch Front and the Wasatch Back. In the event Summit County and Park City (and Wasatch County if applicable) disagree on such connections, a conflict resolution process will be invoked.
  - In Park City and Summit County, identify and agree upon impacts and implement scenarios that increase transit mode-share and mitigate such impacts as part of

[Cottonwood Canyon connections unless otherwise agreed upon by Park City and Summit County.](#)