

Meeting Notes

Transportation System Group Meeting #2

April 2, 2014

This meeting included:

- Presentation and discussion on the Existing Conditions report
- Member poll regarding that report
- Presentation and discussion on draft information on Future Trendlines
- Member survey on goals for the future.

Existing Conditions Report Summary and Discussion

The Existing Conditions for the Transportation System Group were presented and the draft existing conditions report was used to guide the discussion. Laynee Jones addressed “One Wasatch,” indicating it is not directly related to Mountain Accord. This project may or may not recommend over the snow connections; those options will be independently evaluated by respective system groups. Individual idealized systems could conceivably arrive at different conclusions for such a system. Jon Nepstad led discussion about the Recommendation *on Existing Conditions* technical memorandum. The key points of that discussion are summarized below in the Survey section. To follow up on discussion about travel forecasting from Meeting #1, Jonathan Larsen led a discussion about travel demand forecasting, and the Mountain Accord travel demand model currently in development. The travel model will contain addition of geographic area and representation of the recreational travel market. Essentially the model will be to evaluate the impacts of land use and transportation scenarios in the context of the region.

There was a group discussion regarding there information and whether any categories of transportation were missing.

- Motorcycles. Is there a way to control noise and speed on motorcycle use in the canyons? *This is likely an issue for the environmental group.*
- Helicopter traffic may increase
- Data too focused on winter. We need better representation of summer conditions. Seasonality. Parking.
- Trailhead parking. How are users moving in the canyons?
- Great data on SR-224 and SR-228. Need more information on primary canyon approaches, major highways, and bike traffic on those. Can we add?
- How are dispersed recreational users traveling? More information about parking and how users are utilizing the transportation system?

- More clearly define things that really impact travel (e.g. road closures, travel restrictions). Duration, type, and frequency of road closures, safety restrictions (i.e. 4x4 required) for LCC/BCC. What is the road capacity?
- Capacity issues are only really a problem at specific locations, times, and seasons, and this should be characterized in the narrative.
- 1100 vehicles per hour seems too high for specific segments of the canyon roads (e.g. S-curve in Big Cottonwood Canyon)
- How many skiers can the ski areas accommodate at one time? How is that planned to change?
- Per Ski Utah survey, 12% accessing ski areas via public transit (Table 2) - seems like numbers are unrealistically high. Unclear if the responses include only resort areas, and destination or resident skiers. Need to go deeper into this data.
- Do we know crash data and time delay for canyons? Unified Police will provide estimates for incidents, closures, delays. Some thought avalanche control work contributed to the most closures.
- Need to include occupants per vehicle. Carpooling and ridesharing seems like a realistic solution based on low vehicle occupancy. *Team will add vehicle occupancy information.*
- Study limit boundary— should be expanded to include influence of Richardson Flat Park-n-Ride.
- Report should note generally lack of communication infrastructure (e.g. ATIS, social media, etc). We need to distribute good and consistent data to public for canyon management.
- Maintenance should be addressed.
- Third leg of “triangle” (SR-209) at base of Little Cottonwood Canyon is left out of study area.
- Emigration Canyon is left out? *Yes, Emigration Canyon will not be included in the project boundaries.*
- Would like to see the report address road capacity, including planned capacity. *In “Trends” discussion.*

Poll, Results and Discussion:

The members of the System Group were polled on their level of concurrence with the Existing Conditions report, plus the recommended changes. They were asked to indicate their level of concurrence with the following statement (results in parentheses):

This Report (plus recommended changes) accurately represents currently available information on existing system conditions to inform my vote on a future Idealized System.

- 1) Concur (56%)
- 2) Concur with minor point of contention (26%)
- 3) Disagree with outcome but consent to move forward (12%)
- 4) Dissent (0%)
- 5) Waive or Abstain (6%)

Comments from members that dissented or that disagreed with outcome but consent to move forward:

- Concerned with the process. Would rather see the changes incorporated prior to approving report. Does not have high level of trust that changes will be made. Preference would be polling next time. Consent to move forward.

- Appears very skier/winter oriented. Need more data in canyons for peak conditions that are represented year-round. Be more careful with the project boundary.
- Need clarification on sources of the data; make sure there is a clear reflection of data sources. Are surveys done too locally?
- Concerned with process and how fast we are moving. Concerns with how the team will interpret the comments/concerns of the members into the report. Want to see revisions.

Future Trendlines Summary and Discussion:

There are four categories proposed for characterizing future transportation trends. These are: 1) population and employment growth, 2) traffic, 3) policies and planning, and 4) travel forecasting. Details on each of these areas are included in the PowerPoint presentation. An overview of travel demand forecasting was presented. The WFRC travel model is currently being expanded to include Summit and Wasatch counties, as well as Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons.

Which of these changes/trends would be the most critical for the future of this system? Why? Are there other, more important TRENDS to understand? What existing data have we missed?

- Need to include the major upgrades at the SLC airport. Do we anticipate an increase in traffic as a result of the upgrades? *The airport renovation is replacing facilities, not expecting new growth due to expansion. Expected growth is due to normal growth in travel.*
- Need to add nodes up the canyon (e.g. Millcreek Canyon)
- Remember that travel in summer and winter is different. Recreationalists and workers have distinctly different travel patterns/needs. *We may not have perfect models for everything – be prepared to use judgment and qualitative assessment.*
- What is the question we are asking? If we ask the question in terms of automobile delay, then the answers we get will be in terms of automobiles. This is how we end up with larger roadways and more automobiles that enable more travel as opposed to a multimodal approach. *This will be key when we get to the metrics portion of the process.*
- Can model give us person delay? *Yes.*
- Need to account for special events- policies and planning
- Future trends for avalanche/closures
- How do we define capacity? Who has the authority to expand capacity? *For roads, UDOT.*
- Related to metrics and different tolerance of capacity - how we define it will depend on the situation
- What happens if there is a strategy to draw more visitors, through marketing or other (e.g. One Wasatch). Increase in visitors could have an impact.
- How do you account for changes in recreation? The BCC path is attracting more users, how will that trend in the future?

Survey

For the Central Wasatch, what should be the key GOALS for an ideal future system?

- green infrastructure
- meet needs for the future vision

- economically sustainable (difference of opinion on taxes vs. no tax increase to do this)
- preserve canyon/wilderness experience
- less vehicles
- efficient
- respectful of all users
- healthy canyons
- direct PC-SLC airport connection
- convenient public transp.
- alter behavior
- no impact to base of canyon
- transportation behavior altering
- all in this together
- sustainable
- economical public transportation for all uses
- green
- sustainable
- safety for users
- emergency evacuation year-round
- incentives to auto alternatives
- protect quality of life
- reduce auto traffic
- eliminate avalanche path
- reduce traffic volume weekends/holiday
- get folks out of auto
- balance land owners/varying interests
- reliability
- decrease traffic and parking congestion but enhance experience
- safety in balanced decision
- multimodal
- public transportation
- reduce auto dependency
- preserve/improve mountain experience
- cost effective solutions

Decisions

Revise Existing Conditions report. Move forward to fully characterize Future Trendlines.

Action Items

No.	Action Item	Responsible	Note
1	All comments to consulting team by EOD Monday April 7	SG Members	
2	Additional data provided to Tech lead, eg delay and crash data	SG Members	



4/2/14 Transportation

MOUNTAIN ACCORD

Name	Organization	Email	Phone
Todd Leeds	Wasatch backcountry	Toddeo.Leeds@gmail.com	801 541 4326
Nyle Cook	Fahr & Peers		
Liza Simpson	PCMC	LIZA@parkcity.org	
Kent Cashel	"	CASHEL@PARKCITY.ORG	
Don Desj	BCCA	solid@qwestoffice.net	
TOM RYAN	SOC	Kon_Tom@vadoo.com	801-633-5720
Travis Skinned	UPD	Tskinned@UPDS.ORG	801-386-3945
Claire Wapman	Team of Alta	Claire@townofalta	801 301 6156
Gordon Cummings	ARG	GORDON-ARE@gmail.com	435 640 5995
Buck Boley	ALTA	BUCK@ALTA.COM	801-231-2348
JEN SMITH	SUMMIT CO.	jsmith@summitcounty.org	
Mike Murey	ACTA	mmurey@townofalta.com	801-530-1811
ALLEN MCCANDROSS	SLC AIRPORT	allen.mccandross@slc.gov	801 575-2231
Ellet Soka		ellet@ellet-soka.ni.gov.ni	801 803 5418
ELLEN ROSSI	ALTA RESIDENT	Ellen.e.rossi@gmail.com	
Dave Fields	Snowbowl	dfields@snowbowl.com	801 933 2041
Jenni Smith	PCMC	JENNIS@PCMC.COM	
Patrick Pute	Summit Co.	PPUTE@SUMMITCOUNTY.ORG	435 655 5224
Peter Liu	MT ACCORD	PETER.LIU321@COMcast.net	605-645-9214
Chad Mullin	Bike Ubi	chadmullin@summitcounty.org	801 277-7220
Roger Armstrong	Summit Co. County	roarmstr@summitcounty.org	801-207-1411
Robin Hutchinson	SLC Transportation	robin.hutchinson@slc.gov	1535 2146
Naver Jensen	UTA	njensen@rideute.com	801-608-7482
Andrea Pullos	SLCO eng	apullos@slco.org	385 468 6600
Mary Young	Granite Comm Coop	maryyoung@xmission.com	801-942-
Doug Hatten		dougshatten@28370.com	249, (801) 268-2511
Dave Kallas			
Roger Bj Borgaricht			
Jan Larson	WFBC		
Ryan Kump	Sandy	rkump@sandy.chh.gov	801 565 2962
Brad Gilson	Cottonwood Heights	brad@gilsonengineering.com	
Kenee Flanagan	Utah-Wasatch-Cache National Forest	kflanagan@fs.fed.us	801-368-5107
Todd Draper	SLCO	tldraper@slco.org	385 468 6701
R. Mills	UPOT		
Kate Cashe			
Phillips	Ladner	sphilips@hulob.com	801 918 6766
Mike Attegen	UTA		
Kevin Wilkerson	Summit County	kwilkerson@summitcounty.org	435 330 3284