

Transportation System Group Meeting #7 Summary September 23, 2014

Other System Groups' Idealized Systems (Presented by Laynee Jones)

- Comments: Recreation Group is focused on non-automobile mobility through improved connectivity of regional trail network. Environment Group discussed the notion of “car-free” canyons. Economy Group has suggested that additional development intensity is necessary at Alta and Brighton to support major transit hubs.

Update on Scenario Refinement and Consolidation for Evaluation (Jon Nepstad)

- Jon introduced several Concept Scenarios that will be evaluated. He noted that they represent distinctly different concepts, but are generic enough to have numerous possible permutations.
- Concept A: bus based. Incorporate existing light rail/transit system. No new connection between LCC/BCC/PC.
- Concept B: Connect/loop, and various permutations. Options include BRT, rail, and aerial. Train in LCC would require tunneling.
- Concept AB: hybrid – primarily bus-based transit, with aerial connection between Alta and Park City

Presentations/Discussions

- **Transportation Modes (Newell Jensen)**
 - Transit modes 101, associated costs, travel times, typical station spacing, capacity, suitability of options in the project area
- **Modes and Corridors (Newell Jensen)**
 - Newell presented a sample evaluation of mode assessment for transit between SL Airport to Kimball Jct.
 - Discussion: Who are we trying to serve? Two segments are important: tourists and residents. The system needs to have two components by accommodating express resort-oriented travel, and also local-scale travel.
 - Discussion: UTA used to allow request stop bus service in the Cottonwood Canyons, but have since discontinued this practice. Re-entering the vehicle flow is a challenge for buses when vehicle flow is heavy. From this perspective, exclusive lanes are a major advantage for dispersed access because transit vehicles (rail or bus) operating in their own lane have the ability to stop anywhere. There was concern expressed about how the transit corridor could create a barrier.

Idealized System--Open Discussion

Comment themes: Mill Creek isn't adequately represented; timing of construction/phasing approach; cost, difference of opinion on the intended customer (resident/tourist, central valley/destination centers) and priority of improvements; and connectivity to Wasatch back via Parley's Canyon improvements including train in Parley's.

Environmental impacts could be major barriers to implementation, depending on the modal technology and alignment. There is a concern about advancing options that will be inordinately expensive, and thereby not implementable. Cost is important with respect to mode, phasing, and timing. Are we jumping to mode discussion too quickly before we nail down preferred corridors? Funding doesn't have to be all public – funding can come from public.

There are other important elements in addition to passenger travel, such as freight, garbage, mail/UPS, etc.

American Fork Canyon and Provo Canyon are considering improvements – may warrant consideration on Grand Loop concept that also extends to the South.

Action Items/Wrap Up:

- Not trying to force a decision at this point
 - Willing to host interim technical workshop between now and end of October
 - Haven't provided the group with adequate time and detail for evaluation
 - Need to include modified version of B
 - AB is not really a standalone, aerial is an alternative to rail connection between canyons
 - Other alt would look at more intensive capital investment in Parleys
 - Could reframe A as a initial stage of a phased approach
- Send out today's presentation and orders of magnitude cost
- Schedule interim technical meeting—revise options based upon input from today
- To report card: add a column for Notes
- System Group Meeting 8: Objective: narrow focus and make decisions.