

## Transportation System Group Meeting #6 Summary August 20, 2014

### Presentations/Discussions

- Laynee Jones presented the outcome of the last Executive Board meeting and reviewed issues associated with cost and the use of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as a metric.

### Mapping Exercise

- **Mapping Exercise for Idealized System**
  - Goal of the exercise was to:
    - Review the Concept A and B maps
    - Develop 2-5 scenarios for evaluation in developing an Ideal Scenario
  - Members self-selected into groups which focused on either Concept A (two groups) or Concept B (three groups).
- **Summary of Scenario(s) Presented**
  - Concept A: Relatively limited capital investment, particularly in canyons. No new connection between Cottonwood Canyons and Summit Co. (Guardzman is considered an existing corridor)
  - Concept B: More robust capital investment connecting Salt Lake and Summit County. Includes new connection between Cottonwood Canyons and Summit Co.
  - Both concepts consider a range of transportation modes including: Fixed guide way (rail, bus rapid transit, aerial) and road improvements.
- **Feedback from System Group members—Major themes**
  - Concept A: East Bench is an important commuter corridor, improve transit connections to and from valley, improve transit service in canyons.
  - Concept B: Create a transit service which creates a loop, overall impartial to modes (“transit”) however there appears to be a preference for rail when cost is not considered, phasing.
- **Points of Conflict**
  - The biggest discrepancy between members at this point is whether there should be a transportation connection between the Cottonwood canyons and Summit Co.
  - Role of Guardsman Rd.
- **Common Elements**
  - Cost controls used to encourage transit/discourage driving, phased/incremental strategies to transit service, constrain parking supply at destinations, include cycling infrastructure, user experience (e.g. transfers, scenic ride)