

2019 Scoping Summary Report

Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement Wasatch Boulevard to Alta

Lead agency:
Utah Department of Transportation

September 27, 2019

This page is intentionally left blank.

Contents

1.0	Introduction	1
1.1	Purpose of This 2019 Scoping Summary Report	2
1.2	Summary of Scoping Activities	3
1.3	Notice of Intent.....	3
1.4	SAFETEA-LU Process and Agency Scoping	4
1.4.1	Cooperating Agencies	4
1.4.2	Participating Agencies	4
1.4.3	Agencies Consulted.....	5
1.4.4	Agency Scoping Meeting	7
1.5	Public Scoping	7
1.5.1	Notification	8
1.5.2	Public Scoping Meeting	8
1.5.3	Scoping City Council Presentations	9
1.5.4	Other Meetings	9
2.0	Guide to Comments.....	9
3.0	Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS Scoping Comments	10
3.1.1	Purpose and Need.....	10
3.1.2	Alternatives – Avalanche	11
3.1.3	Alternatives – Parking.....	12
3.1.4	Alternatives – Tolling	13
3.1.5	Alternatives – Roadway	14
3.1.6	Alternatives – Transit.....	17
3.1.7	Alternatives – Other	19
3.1.8	Alternatives – Screening and Evaluation.....	21
3.1.9	Air Quality	21
3.1.10	Community Impacts	22
3.1.11	Cultural Resources	22
3.1.12	Cumulative Impacts	22
3.1.13	Economics	22
3.1.14	Ecosystems.....	23
3.1.15	Indirect Impacts.....	23
3.1.16	Environmental Justice.....	24
3.1.17	Land Use.....	24
3.1.18	Noise.....	24
3.1.19	Recreation.....	24
3.1.20	Health and Safety	25
3.1.21	Sections 4(f) and 6(f)	26
3.1.22	Study Area	26
3.1.23	Visual	26
3.1.24	Water Quality, Resources, and Floodplains	26
3.1.25	Other	27
4.0	Next Steps: Screening Analysis and Environmental Analysis	27

Tables

Table 1. Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS Cooperating and Participating Agencies6

Appendixes

- Appendix A – Revised Notices of Intent
- Appendix B – Agency Scoping Meeting
- Appendix C – Notifications of Scoping
- Appendix D – Public Open House Meeting Materials
- Appendix E – Scoping Comments

Acronyms and Abbreviations

EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
HOV	high-occupancy vehicle
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NOI	Notice of Intent
S.R.	State Route
SAFETEA-LU	Safe, Accountable, Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users
SOV	single-occupant vehicle
UDOT	Utah Department of Transportation
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture

1.0 Introduction

On March 9, 2018, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) issued a Notice of Intent (NOI) on behalf of the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) stating that UDOT is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to study proposed improvements to State Route (S.R.) 210 from Fort Union Boulevard to the town of Alta in Little Cottonwood Canyon in Salt Lake County, Utah. The NOI explained that improvements are needed to reduce traffic congestion and improve safety in the S.R. 210 corridor. Publication of the NOI in the U.S. Federal Register initiated the scoping process for the EIS, and it continued through May 4, 2018.

At the time the NOI was released, UDOT was contemplating alternatives that included multiple, combined actions, including the following:

- Implementing Transportation System Management
- Making operational improvements
- Introducing demand-management measures
- Implementing tolling and/or high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) programs
- Facilitating implementation of improved public transit service
- Enhancing safety, access, and mobility in the area through improved information-sharing and adding designated parking areas
- Making roadway improvements

Following the 2018 scoping period, UDOT gathered comments from the public and agencies in a scoping summary report and released it to the public on July 12, 2018. The scoping comments helped UDOT define the purpose of and need for improvements to S.R. 210 and determine the scope of the EIS. In that process, UDOT recognized the following primary issues that would change the focus of the EIS:

- Closing S.R. 210 for avalanche control affects traffic beyond the S.R. 210 corridor and often occurs when road conditions are poor due to snowfall. Road closures for avalanche control also cause safety concerns, substantial congestion, and travel delays, and cause traffic to back up into residential neighborhoods, thereby reducing access to local neighborhoods.
- Limited parking at U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service trailheads and popular access points in the canyon leads drivers to park vehicles on S.R. 210, which creates safety conflicts with on-road cyclists and other vehicles traveling in the canyon.
- On-road parking causes roadside damage, which increases sedimentation into Little Cottonwood Creek, a primary drinking water source for Salt Lake City.

With these issues identified as primary concerns for agencies and the public, FHWA issued a revised NOI on March 5, 2019, on behalf of UDOT to notify the public that the EIS would focus on the following elements:

- Implementing Transportation System Management
- Enhancing safety and improving wintertime mobility by using avalanche mitigation
- Enhancing safety, access, and mobility in the area through improved designated parking areas at existing USDA Forest Service trailheads and popular access points
- Improving the segment of S.R. 210 known as Wasatch Boulevard from S.R. 190/Fort Union Boulevard to North Little Cottonwood Road

After releasing the revised NOI, UDOT learned that the Wasatch Front Regional Council's draft *Wasatch Front Regional Transportation Plan* for 2019–2050 identified roadway capacity improvements in Little Cottonwood Canyon, including an additional lane from Wasatch Boulevard to Alta. UDOT then decided to include roadway capacity improvements in the Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS in order to evaluate the environmental impacts of alternatives that improve mobility. That led to FHWA issuing a new NOI on May 15, 2019, to notify the public of the expanded scope of the EIS.

The intent of the EIS is to develop and evaluate alternative solutions that address the need for the transportation improvements on S.R. 210. Through transportation improvements, UDOT intends to mitigate congestion on S.R. 210 and improve recreation and tourism experiences for all users of the canyon. In providing these improvements, UDOT will consider the character, natural resources, watershed, diverse uses, and scale of Little Cottonwood Canyon.

Because UDOT has received National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Assignment from FHWA, the environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being or have been carried out by UDOT pursuant to 23 United States Code Section 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated January 17, 2017, and executed by FHWA and UDOT.

1.1 Purpose of This 2019 Scoping Summary Report

Scoping is the first step in the NEPA process. It involves using public and agency participation to develop possible solutions and identify issues regarding a proposed project. Scoping also helps determine needs, objectives, resources and constraints, potential alternatives, and any additional requirements for alternatives-screening criteria. The first scoping period lasted from March 9 through May 4, 2018, and UDOT documented the comments it received from agencies and the public in the July 2018 *Scoping Summary Report*. Comments provided in the July 2018 *Scoping Summary Report* remain part of the project record and inform the scope of the Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS.

This 2019 *Scoping Summary Report* summarizes public and agency input gathered during the second scoping period, which followed the revised NOIs of March 5 and May 15, 2019, and lasted from March 5 to June 14, 2019. Comments provided in the July 2018 *Scoping Summary Report* remain part of the record and inform the scope of the Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS. All comments received and summarized in this 2019 *Scoping Summary Report* and the July 2018 *Scoping Summary Report* are used to focus the efforts of the EIS on the appropriate issues.

1.2 Summary of Scoping Activities

Public and agency input plays an important role in identifying issues and ideas regarding future improvements to S.R. 210. Throughout the environmental review process, UDOT will facilitate and encourage involvement from the residents, visitors, businesses, and agencies that have an interest in transportation in the S.R. 210 corridor to help identify issues and develop solutions. The project team will continue to work with the public to provide information regarding the alternatives that will be evaluated in detail and why other proposed solutions are eliminated.

Since the release of the July 2018 *Scoping Summary Report*, UDOT continued to receive comments on the scope of the Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS. Those comments and all public and agency comments received during the March 5 through June 14, 2019, scoping period for this project are included in this report and will be considered during the development and evaluation of alternatives. As stated in Section 1.1, Purpose of This 2019 Scoping Summary Report, comments provided in the July 2018 *Scoping Summary Report* remain part of the project record and also inform the scope of the Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS. The scoping activities prior to July 2018 are summarized in that report.

Comments received after the March 5 through June 14, 2019, scoping period and before the development of the Draft EIS will be reviewed by UDOT and considered during the development of the Draft EIS.

1.3 Notice of Intent

The second scoping period for the Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS began on March 5, 2019, with a revised NOI to prepare an EIS advertised in the Federal Register. That notice, which is a requirement of NEPA, alerted federal agencies and the public of UDOT's intent to focus its study of improvements to S.R. 210 on avalanche mitigation, trailhead parking, and Wasatch Boulevard. The comment period for the second scoping process was extended with issuance of a revised NOI on May 15, 2019, that identified increased capacity in Little Cottonwood Canyon as an element of the EIS. Because increased capacity was included as a project element in the initial scoping period in 2018 and discussed at the agency and public scoping meetings in April 2019, UDOT did not hold additional scoping meetings following release of the May 15, 2019, revised NOI. Copies of the Federal Register revised NOIs are included in Appendix A, Revised Notices of Intent, of this report.

1.4 SAFETEA-LU Process and Agency Scoping

In accordance with Section 6002 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), UDOT is coordinating with local, state, and federal agencies that oversee the management of natural resources in the Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS project area. It is important to include these agencies during the scoping activities of the EIS to identify issues early so that they can be properly considered and, if necessary, avoided, minimized, or mitigated as the project progresses. More discussion regarding the agencies that have been consulted is included in Section 1.4.3, Agencies Consulted.

What is SAFETEA-LU?

SAFETEA-LU—the Safe, Accountable, Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users—is a 2005 federal law that established new provisions and requirements for transportation projects, including the environmental review process. Under SAFETEA-LU, state, local, and tribal agencies with jurisdiction or interest in a project have an opportunity to formally participate in the environmental review of that project.

1.4.1 Cooperating Agencies

The regulations that implement NEPA define a *cooperating agency* as “any federal agency other than a lead agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in a proposal (or a reasonable alternative) for legislation or other major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment” (Code of Federal Regulations Title 40, Section 1508.5). A state or local agency of similar qualifications—or, when the effects of the project would occur on a reservation, an Indian tribe—may by agreement with the lead agency become a cooperating agency. Typically, federal agencies with resources in an area that could be affected by a proposed federal action or project are contacted early in the scoping process and asked to participate as cooperating agencies in the environmental review process for the project.

A cooperating agency has a high level of involvement and responsibility for the project and works with the project team to develop solutions. Being involved as a cooperating agency allows a resource agency to better protect its resource areas but requires a commitment to remain involved and accept some responsibility for activities during the environmental review process.

1.4.2 Participating Agencies

SAFETEA-LU introduced a level of agency involvement known as a participating agency. Participating agencies do not have the same level of responsibility for the project as a cooperating agency but are expected to perform the following activities in coordination with the project team:

- Attend agency coordination meetings
- Develop an agency coordination plan
- Comment as early as practicable on the project’s purpose and need and the range of alternatives
- Evaluate the environmental and socioeconomic resources in the project area and the general locations of alternatives
- Identify as early as practicable any issues regarding the project’s environmental and socioeconomic impacts that could substantially delay or prevent the granting of a permit or other approval

1.4.3 Agencies Consulted

The following agencies and federally recognized tribes were sent letters on March 7, 2018, requesting their involvement as a cooperating and/or participating agency. No new agencies have been identified as having jurisdiction or special expertise in the project area since that time.

- Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
- Bureau of Indian Affairs
- Cedar Band of the Paiute Indians
- Central Wasatch Commission
- Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation
- Cottonwood Heights City
- Eastern Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation
- Governor’s Office, Public Lands Policy Coordinating Office, Resource Development Coordinating Committee
- Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake and Sandy
- Murray City
- Northwestern Band of Shoshone Nation
- Salt Lake City Department of Public Utilities
- Salt Lake County, Planning and Development
- Salt Lake County, Regional Transportation, Housing and Economic Development
- Salt Lake County, Transportation Engineering
- Sandy City
- Shivwits Band of the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah
- Shoshone–Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation
- Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians
- Town of Alta
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Utah Division of Air Quality
- Utah Division of Drinking Water
- Utah Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands
- Utah Division of Indian Affairs
- Utah Division of Water Quality
- Utah Division of Water Resources
- Utah Division of Water Rights
- Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
- Utah Office of Tourism
- Utah State Historic Preservation Office
- Utah Transit Authority
- Ute Indian Tribe of Uintah and Ouray Reservation
- Wasatch Front Regional Council

Of the agencies and federally recognized tribes that were contacted, 5 agreed to be cooperating agencies and 18 agreed or were assumed to be participating agencies (Table 1). In a letter dated February 27, 2019, UDOT invited the agencies to reconfirm their involvement as cooperating and participating agencies and opened the invitation again to the other agencies to consider involvement as a participating agency. No other agencies expressed interest in accepting status as a participating agency.

Table 1. Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS Cooperating and Participating Agencies

Cooperating Agencies	Participating Agencies
Salt Lake City Department of Public Utilities	Central Wasatch Commission
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Cottonwood Heights City
U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service	Governor’s Office, Public Lands Policy Coordinating Office, Resource Development Coordinating Committee
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake and Sandy
Utah Transit Authority	Murray City
	Salt Lake County Public Works and Municipal Services Department, Planning and Development Services Division
	Salt Lake County, Regional Transportation, Housing and Economic Development
	Sandy City
	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
	Utah Division of Air Quality
	Utah Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands
	Utah Division of Indian Affairs
	Utah Division of Water Quality
	Utah Office of Tourism
	Wasatch Front Regional Council

1.4.4 Agency Scoping Meeting

SAFETEA-LU requires that the project team hold an agency scoping meeting. The initial agency scoping meeting for the Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS was held on April 9, 2018, and is described in the July 2018 *Scoping Summary Report*. Following the revised NOI of March 5, 2019, a second agency scoping meeting was held on April 3, 2019, at 1:00 PM. The following agencies attended the April 3, 2019, meeting:

- Central Wasatch Commission
- Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake and Sandy
- Murray City
- Salt Lake City Department of Public Utilities
- Salt Lake County
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service
- Utah Division of Air Quality
- Utah Office of Tourism
- Utah Transit Authority

A brief presentation was given that included a project overview as well as the requirements of being a cooperating or participating agency. The items that were discussed at the meeting included the anticipated release of a new NOI identifying the need for increased capacity in Little Cottonwood Canyon; the preliminary alternatives for avalanche mitigation, improvements at trailheads, and improved mobility on Wasatch Boulevard; the purpose of and need for the project, which remains the same as presented in previous scoping activities; alternatives screening; intersection improvements that UDOT can make in the near term, outside the scope of the Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS; and UDOT's initiation of a *Transportation Action Plan* for Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. The group also reviewed the environmental checklist prepared at the 2018 agency scoping meeting and determined that no new issues would need to be added (see Appendix B, Agency Scoping Meeting).

1.5 Public Scoping

Public scoping is a key component of the environmental review process. Scoping helps UDOT prepare a comprehensive and focused EIS that will help inform the decision-making and permitting processes. UDOT relies on public comments to help identify issues, gather input on a reasonable range of alternatives, and gauge public sentiment about the proposed improvements. A combination of measures was taken to ensure that the public was notified about the project and invited to participate in the process. This section focuses on the scoping period from March 5 to June 14, 2019.

1.5.1 Notification

The second scoping period was initiated with the Federal Register notice on March 5, 2019, and ended on June 14, 2019. The following methods were used to notify the general public of the public scoping meeting and activities:

- Advertisements were placed in the following publications:
 - *Deseret News*, March 26 and April 2, 2019
 - *The Salt Lake Tribune*, March 26 and April 2, 2019
- Information regarding the public meeting and the scoping period was posted on the Little Cottonwood EIS Project website and UDOT social media sites (Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter) on March 18; April 8, 9, 10, 23, 25, and 26; May 17, 21, and 29; and June 7, 11, 12, 13, and 14, 2019.
- Email notices were sent to the UDOT mailing list on April 23, May 15, and June 14, 2019.
- A UDOT press release was sent to local media outlets on April 9, 2018, as a reminder of the public meeting on April 9, 2019.

Copies of the notification materials listed above are included in Appendix C, Notifications of Scoping.

1.5.2 Public Scoping Meeting

UDOT held a public scoping meeting on April 9, 2019, at the Cottonwood Heights City offices in Cottonwood Heights, Utah. The meeting was held in an open-house format with an interactive workshop from 4:00 PM to 8:00 PM.

The public scoping meeting included the following elements related to the EIS:

- The public was encouraged but not required to sign in at the registration desk.
- On entering the meeting room, each participant was given a brief explanation of the meeting format, information about how to submit comments, and details about where to find additional information about the project.
- Comment sheets were made available to each participant.
- Participants were encouraged to leave their comments.
- A project video summarizing the project was running continuously.
- Project staff members were available to answer questions and provide information.
- Four stations were set up with scroll maps of the project area. The scroll maps presented preliminary concepts that would address identified needs related to mobility, avalanche risk, and trailhead parking. Meeting participants were encouraged to make notes of issues and concerns related to the study area and the preliminary concepts.
- Two computer stations were available for commenters to identify specific areas on a map and record their comment.
- Commenters could give comments via a video interview.

About 400 people attended the public scoping meeting. Copies of the material presented at the meeting are included in Appendix D, Public Open House Meeting Materials.

1.5.3 Scoping City Council Presentations

During the second scoping period, the project team presented at Sandy, Cottonwood Heights, and Salt Lake City council meetings and an Alta Town Council meeting. UDOT presented to the Cottonwood Heights City Council on April 2 and May 21, 2019; the Alta Town Council on April 11, 2019; the Sandy City Council on April 23, 2019; and the Salt Lake County Council on June 11, 2019. The presentations included information regarding the change in project focus, alternatives development, the *Transportation Action Plan*, UDOT funding for a transit hub (a separate project), and near-term improvements in Little Cottonwood Canyon that can be developed without analysis in the EIS. UDOT encouraged the councils to submit scoping comments.

1.5.4 Other Meetings

During the second scoping period, and in advance of the public scoping meeting, UDOT met with owners of property near the Kings Hill Drive and Wasatch Boulevard intersection to discuss design improvements and potential effects on their properties. Also during the second scoping period, UDOT met with individuals and non-governmental organizations, including a meeting with representatives from the Granite Community Council on April 10, 2019, and a meeting with the Climbing Alliance on May 1, 2019, to discuss the status of the project and encourage participation in the scoping process through submitting comments.

2.0 Guide to Comments

The public will continue to have opportunities to provide input throughout the Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS review process, and public comments will continue to be solicited throughout the project. The second scoping period for the Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS concluded on June 14, 2019. All comments received after the release of the July 2018 *Scoping Summary Report* and before the conclusion of the second scoping period (June 14, 2019) are included in this 2019 *Scoping Summary Report* in Appendix E, Scoping Comments.

Each comment was reviewed by the project team as it was received and was assigned a number. Appendix E includes a list of commenters presented alphabetically and the corresponding comment number. A single comment might have contained several issues. A summary of the issues raised in the scoping comments is included in Section 3.0, Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS Scoping Comments. Comments received after the scoping periods and before the development of the Draft EIS will be reviewed by UDOT and considered during the development of the Draft EIS. All issues raised will be considered in the EIS.

3.0 Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS Scoping Comments

During the second scoping period, UDOT received more than 1,100 individual comment submissions from the public and agencies. The majority of the comments were related to alternatives for reducing congestion, improving the transit system, providing parking, and increasing safety for motorists and cyclists. Several comments expressed concern for natural resources and water quality in Little Cottonwood Canyon. Many commenters were concerned about impacts to neighborhoods along Wasatch Boulevard.

The following sections summarize the comments that were received.

3.1.1 Purpose and Need

- Ski resorts should pay most of the cost as they are the beneficiaries.
- Why is the government providing a solution for private-sector business? Let the resorts buy transit solutions.
- The purpose is to increase the speed and the numbers of visitors to recreate on the national forest. UDOT mistakes the objective of safety as the purpose of the project. Instead, safety is the objective driven by the purpose of putting more visitors at higher rates of speed onto the federal land to recreate.
- The timelines in the *Wasatch Front Regional Transportation Plan* are too far in the future. Dates for construction should be more aggressive.
- UDOT says the project is necessary to address increased traffic from projected growth in Salt Lake and Utah Counties; however, there is no clear evidence that a significant portion of this growth will come from the area served by Wasatch Boulevard (i.e., Cottonwood Heights, Sandy, and Draper are largely built up).
- Improving regional mobility is a creative way to describe urban sprawl: UDOT is negating concerted efforts by nongovernmental organizations, municipalities, state agencies, and individuals to improve air quality and reduce other negative social impacts from urban sprawl.
- Getting more cars up the canyon should not be the goal.
- The goal should be to minimize the impact to the canyon by reducing cars in the canyon.
- Additional lanes on S.R. 209 are needed to improve traffic flow from Sandy to the mouth of the canyon.
- The project should be looking at short- and long-term options.
- The purpose and need should describe specific locations where “there are roadway elements that do not meet current design standards; for example, shoulders that are too narrow, and horizontal and vertical curves that are too steep and/or sharp” and explain the significance of these issues. What is the impact of Little Cottonwood Canyon Road failing to meet these standards? It is a road in a steep canyon and is largely used for recreation – perhaps the design standards that are applied to the

Wasatch Boulevard portion aren't applicable here. If falling short of design standards has been a problem, it should be documented.

- Safety concerns for pedestrians/bikes forced to walk on the roads because of cars parked on the shoulders should be documented. Have accidents occurred? Have complaints been filed? How frequent are these occurrences? Simply stating there is a safety hazard is not sufficient.
- Provide detail on how erosion from the road is affecting water quality in Little Cottonwood Creek, if this is used as a need for the project.
- The transportation action plan should precede the EIS.
- UDOT must prepare a programmatic EIS for the entire set of interrelated Wasatch transportation projects that are identified in the transportation action plan, then prepare separate, tiered EISs for the individual component projects.
- The best solution must be time-efficient and predictable to all users, and include a low-cost, low-emission, energy-efficient, multimodal transportation system.
- Solutions must be based upon return on investment to the general public.
- The Purpose and Need section utterly fails to mention climate change and its projected impacts at all scales for the canyon environments, snowfall patterns, and resultant viability or lack thereof of various ski resorts, watershed values, and more. Little Cottonwood Canyon may see more relative winter demand due to the lack of snow at lower elevations on the Park City side of the range during the timeframe of the study.
- The entire analysis should be updated with specific analysis of climate change scenarios. It should also address how climate mitigation is optimized through the alternatives.
- Do not use the outdated level of service system as the basis of analysis for determining project need and alternative design or success.
- Do not plan for peak-period conditions because the vast majority of hours in the year are off-peak travel, and planning for peak demand is largely a fool's errand as decades of transportation planning have shown. The basis for analysis should be changed to better reflect most-common rather than peak conditions.

3.1.2 Alternatives – Avalanche

- The current system of avalanche control is sufficient.
- Install more Gazex or other remote mitigation systems.
- Provide snow sheds or bridges at avalanche areas. Snow sheds should also provide wildlife overpass.
- Avalanche control should happen earlier (5 AM to 7 AM) and be reduced to an hour.
- Avalanche sheds must have a way to control black ice.
- Avalanche sheds should include room to add a train later.

- If road closures are still needed to shoot the avalanches, then snow sheds don't solve the problem.
- Bridge over avalanche paths.
- Reduce the number of vehicles to improve (decrease) the avalanche risk.
- Fire-suppression systems should not be chlorinated nor contaminated (no glycol).
- Any water discharged from fire suppression should be captured and not released into Little Cottonwood Creek.
- Consider avalanche protection at Tanners slide path.
- Do avalanche sheds provide protection from rock slides?

3.1.3 Alternatives – Parking

- Require paid parking at ski resorts.
- Enter into agreements with ski areas to use parking lots near TRAX and existing bus lines.
- Add parking at the base of the canyon.
- Do not add parking in the canyon.
- Re-open the use of the 3900 South/Wasatch Boulevard park-and-ride for ski buses.
- The parking lot of the Reams strip mall on 7200 South is never full and could possibly be used as a park-and-ride.
- Triple the number of spaces at the Little Cottonwood Canyon park-and-ride lot.
- Provide parking for cars waiting for the canyon to open. Cars should not block access to neighborhoods for residents and emergency vehicles. Use the shoulder for stacking cars.
- Parking areas at transit hubs need to operate efficiently, to move people quickly from cars onto buses and then back on the road.
- No additional parking at trailheads. Just add transit service.
- Charge a fee for parking at trailheads.
- Add a multilevel parking lot at the base of Little Cottonwood Canyon.
- Ski areas should build parking structures.
- Employees have no place to park their car for 24 hours if they need to spend the night in the canyon, so can't take transit or rideshare.
- Better trailhead parking and bathrooms are essential in the canyon.
- Obtain the tree farm land between south Wasatch and Little Cottonwood for large parking structure.
- There must continue to be a way for recreation users to park along the roadside where necessary to access dispersed recreation areas.

- Parking for all trailheads should be considered, including traditional-use trails, dispersed-use areas, and marked trailheads.
- Multilevel parking structures at the base of the canyons will cause just as much traffic and congestion as the road, though in a different place and close to neighborhoods.
- Add parking at Grit Mill.
- Expand parking at the swamp lot.
- Expand parking lots at ski areas.
- Ski area parking lot attendants should park cars closer together.
- Ski areas should expand parking for carpools and limit for single-occupant vehicles (SOV).
- Eliminate parking in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons.
- No parking should be allowed along the highway. Cars parked on the highway should be fined.
- Do not add parking at Lisa Falls: there is not much space and it would add congestion and ruin the ambiance.
- Use school parking lots and empty business parking areas on weekends.
- Add parking at the gravel pit; use it as a major transit center.
- Expand White Pine lot. Provide separate entrance and exit points.
- The proposed expansion of White Pine lot is too big. It will affect the visitor experience.
- Any parking solutions should be underground or no more than two stories.
- If parking on-road is eliminated at the trailheads, it should also be eliminated at the ski resorts.
- Do not expand parking at the base of Little Cottonwood Canyon.
- Without overflow parking and/or a viable transit option, recreation access at Gate Buttriss would be limited if roadside parking is eliminated.
- The development of new parking areas for Bonneville Shoreline Trail access should be considered and compatible with climbing access in lower Little Cottonwood Canyon.
- Mid-canyon parking should not be used by resort skiers.

3.1.4 Alternatives – Tolling

- Don't toll Little Cottonwood Canyon.
- Toll non-carpool commuters.
- Toll non-transit vehicles.
- Set toll based on number of people in vehicle (highest amount for SOV).
- Tolling reduces access for low-income populations.

- If you add a toll to the canyon, people will dump cars along Wasatch Boulevard.
- Dynamic pricing based on day, time, type of vehicle (that is, related to fuel efficiency), and number of people in the car.
- Yearly passes should be available.
- No toll for residents, season pass holders, and resort employees.
- Charge access fees for trailheads.
- Revenue from tolling should go back into the canyon maintenance.

3.1.5 Alternatives – Roadway

- Increase roadway capacity and improve access.
- Provide three lanes for the full length of the road.
- Include Bots Dots or rumble strips for protection of cyclists on roadway.
- Adding a third lane will solve nothing because there is not enough parking in the canyon.
- Third lane should be reversible.
- High-T intersection at Alta is confusing: people believe it is a left turn lane coming down canyon, others use it as a normal lane coming up canyon.
- Crossing the road and pedestrian stop lights seem dangerous. Tunnels or bridges would be better if people need to cross.
- High-T intersections at Alta and Snowbird have greatly improved traffic flow and safety; however, roadway marking need to be kept clear and visible. Lengthening them would be beneficial.
- Give Alta a dedicated lane downhill.
- Eliminate “right on red” for vehicles traveling north on Old Wasatch Boulevard turning right onto S.R. 209.
- Widening the road will make it more dangerous for pedestrians and bicyclists because vehicle speeds will increase.
- Add pullouts up the canyon for slower-moving vehicles.
- Add hawk lights at pedestrian crossings.
- The intersections of Wasatch Boulevard with North Little Cottonwood Road and Little Cottonwood Canyon Road create the traffic problems by giving traffic light priority to neighborhoods instead of ski resort traffic. A signalized metering system and longer merge lanes would improve traffic flow.
- The design of the merging lane at the S.R. 209/S.R. 210 intersection is “fixing a problem that does not exist.” Slower road speeds (30 mph) would improve safety, reduce noise, and moderate speeds so that a long merge lane is not needed. Traffic lights or barriers would improve safety and give priority to buses and shuttles.

- Add a signal at the S.R. 209/S.R. 210 intersection.
- Create a “thru-lane” on Wasatch Boulevard for preapproved vehicles (four-wheel drive with snow tires), transit vehicles, residents, and essential personnel.
- Traffic controls (signal or manual) are needed facilitate merge areas for vehicles leaving the ski areas.
- Prohibit cars on the road during ski season or ski weekends; allow exceptions for people staying at the resort with appropriate traction devices on their vehicles.
- Do not add a third lane in the canyon.
- Widen the road to two lanes in each direction.
- Do not add lanes to Wasatch Boulevard; it will only create a bottleneck farther down the road.
- Add a flex lane to Wasatch Boulevard for buses only.
- Add guard rails up the canyon.
- Restrict larger vehicles (construction, delivery) during peak hours
- Limit access in the canyon from 10 AM to 3 PM to transit only.
- Turn-out and -in lanes for select trailheads should be studied for environmental impact and safety.
- Concerns with safety, neighborhood access to the east of Wasatch Boulevard.
- High-T intersection at Wasatch Boulevard creates dangerous conditions for people pulling out of neighborhoods along Wasatch Boulevard.
- High-T intersection at Wasatch Boulevard creates dangerous conditions for bikes at the intersection. There is frequent bicycle traffic through that intersection 9 months out of the year.
- Access to neighborhood roads along Wasatch Boulevard needs to be addressed. A slightly longer turn lane seems insufficient.
- Decrease speed on Wasatch Boulevard: 35–40 mph would ideal.
- Add full bike lanes in Little Cottonwood Canyon.
- Add bike lane wide enough so it can be used as third lane in winter.
- High-T intersection at Wasatch Boulevard: why is there no longer a right-on-red?
- Add a paved trail for pedestrians and bicyclists, divided from the highway.
- Add a traffic signal at Kings Hill Drive/Wasatch Boulevard intersection.
- At Kings Hill Drive/Wasatch Boulevard intersection, improve line of sight by cutting trees and extending the turning lane, add flashing lights. Do not take [i.e., acquire] homes.
- Limit the number of vehicles that can go up the canyon.
- Restrict travel up and down the canyon to single direction for 30 to 60 minutes during peak periods.

- Do not widen Wasatch Boulevard, other than to provide better bike lanes.
- Reduce car travel on Albion Summer Road.
- Give priority up the canyon to carpools, HOV.
- Prevent Snowbird roadside parking from U-turning into downhill Alta traffic.
- Commuters traveling through the study area (i.e., not destined for Little Cottonwood Canyon or the Wasatch Boulevard neighborhoods) should have an alternate route.
- Improve intersection of Danish Road and Wasatch Boulevard, or cut it off completely. Current traffic pattern is confusing and dangerous.
- Add a shared bike and pedestrian path along both sides of Wasatch Boulevard; allow movement back and forth over Wasatch Boulevard.
- Consider the *Cottonwood Heights Bicycle Master Plan*, which calls for “Neighborizing” Wasatch Boulevard through the use of protected cycle tracks. Such measures serve as a traffic-calming device that would reduce the speed of vehicular traffic along this corridor. According to the *Bicycle Master Plan*, “The ultimate goal should be to improve Wasatch Boulevard to a Category 1 bicycle lane.”
- Review the recommendations of Salt Lake County's bicycle guidelines and apply such improvements at all intersections to facilitate alternative modes of travel as well as increase the safety of every user along this corridor.
- Preregister vehicles with stickers to show they meet tire and 4×4 requirements.
- Provide a fast pass to vehicles that meet winter driving requirements (4×4, snow tires).
- Improve enforcement of winter driving requirements; cars with proper equipment could get a seasonal sticker.
- Prohibit SOVs in the canyon during peak periods.
- Provide transit-only, van pool, high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane.
- Provide transit, van pool, and HOV priority after avalanche control.
- Vehicles shouldn't be allowed to queue up at the base of the canyon.
- Improve access to Golden Hills Drive. There is a dip in the road that reduces visibility of northbound turning movements.
- Extend Highland Drive from 9800 South to 12300 South (complete the bridge idea) to offload traffic at the south end of Wasatch Boulevard.
- Widen Wasatch Boulevard.
- Provide a roundabout where 9400 South meets the canyon near the Little Cottonwood Canyon park-and-ride.
- Provide a roundabout at Wasatch Boulevard/North Little Cottonwood Road.

- On road closure mornings, buses and employee shuttles should have priority over personal vehicles.
- Add extra lane for vehicles during peak periods that can be used by cyclists in the summer.
- Make the road uphill-only in the morning and downhill-only in the afternoon.
- Meter the ski resort intersections to allow for better traffic flow.
- Put through traffic on Wasatch Boulevard in an underground tunnel from North Little Cottonwood Road to I-215.
- Wasatch Boulevard should be no more than three lanes.
- Wasatch Boulevard should include a nonmotorized trail on both sides.
- Wasatch Boulevard should include protected bike lanes.
- Limit expansion of Wasatch Boulevard through land use planning.
- Consider a roundabout at the intersection of S.R. 210/S.R. 209.
- Cottonwood Heights City requests that it's *Wasatch Boulevard Master Plan*, upon formal adoption, represent its formal comment and vision for Wasatch Boulevard and the surrounding area. The EIS should consider the character, scale, and diversity of uses in the study area.

3.1.6 Alternatives – Transit

- Provide police escort for buses; cars must follow buses up the canyon.
- Reduce the number of large buses and increase the number of smaller, more frequent shuttles. Use passenger vans.
- Bus service should be free for skiers and resort employees.
- Continue free bus pass with season ski pass.
- Accommodate rideshare at transit hubs.
- Bus fare should be discounted for skiers and resort employees.
- Provide a bus route that prioritizes Alta.
- There should be more bus stops near big neighborhoods.
- Extend light rail to Alta.
- Add routes and encourage use of transit by commuters on Wasatch Boulevard.
- Create a transit hub in Sandy with multilevel parking.
- Bus movements into and out of park-and-ride lots should be improved to reduce their wait time for a gap in traffic.
- Provide bus connections with TRAX from transit hub at base of canyon.

- Extend TRAX along Wasatch Boulevard and connect it with a transit bus hub at the base of the canyon.
- Bring TRAX up the canyon.
- A transit hub will create traffic problems in the neighborhood: dispersed bus pick-up locations would be better (e.g., schools, corporate parking lots on weekends).
- Create a multipurpose transit hub accommodating public buses, resort shuttles, car-share, and carpool users. Include amenities such as coffee shop, bathrooms, and storage lockers.
- Transit should be available for all, including low-income and minority populations.
- Make the road bus-only from 8 AM to 10 AM and from 3 PM to 5 PM.
- Provide bus service using high school and church parking lots.
- Consider bus rapid transit.
- Provide bus priority when road is reopened after avalanche control.
- Have the four major ski areas lease a large parking lot in the center of the valley (near freeways) and then have dedicated Utah Transit Authority buses for each resort go from the parking lot directly to a resort with no other stops. Private shuttle companies can use the parking lot during off-peak periods.
- Provide bus priority at traffic signals and dedicated bus lanes.
- Add a bus-only reversible lane in the canyon.
- Increase winter transit service and provide year-round transit service in the canyon.
- Provide a dedicated route in the canyon; people can transfer to other buses from the parking facility at the base of the canyon.
- Increase bus frequency during peak hours.
- Allow parallel loading of buses for rapid and frequent departures.
- Provide bus stops at trailhead locations, such as Lisa Falls and White Pine Canyon, and improve pedestrian safety access. Consider pedestrian bridges or tunnels for road crossings.
- Modify buses with more seating and with proper accommodations for ski/snowboard equipment.
- Bus service should include a later run (10:30 PM) for employees leaving at the end of the day.
- Buses should be environmentally friendly/electric.
- If ski areas offered free ski storage, lockers for day use, and ample comfortable area to wait for the bus, more people would take transit.

3.1.7 Alternatives – Other

- Institute heavy penalties (\$10,000 fine, loss of ski passes) for ill-equipped vehicles stuck in the canyon.
- Provide a webcam at high-traffic areas for real-time traffic information.
- Raise prices at ski areas to reduce demand; use dynamic pricing for lift tickets.
- Rental car agencies should make renters aware of vehicle restrictions in the canyon during snow periods.
- Provide a reader board at the base and resorts' websites showing the number of cars parked in resort parking lots and whether the lots are full.
- Have police direct traffic at all mergers during high-traffic snow conditions.
- Have police reduce traffic taking "shortcuts" through neighborhoods.
- Enforce rules for use of four-wheel drive, snow tires, and chains.
- Improve monitoring of the road so people don't unnecessarily pull over and put chains on.
- Provide an easily accessible, large, level chain-up area.
- Improvements are needed on the Bypass Road: it is steep and slippery, requiring traffic to slow considerably. Merging traffic and cars parked on the road make the situation worse. It should be widened and re-graded.
- All winter trailheads should be plowed for easy vehicle pull-off access.
- Add warning signs for black ice.
- Consider providing e-bike rentals up and down in summer.
- Restrict further development in the canyon until transportation is green and safe.
- The ski areas should not accept the IKON pass or other multi-resort passes because they have resulted in increased traffic. A study should be done to see how these passes directly affect traffic.
- Access to Snowbird from American Fork Canyon would decrease congestion on heavy ski days.
- Provide trails and trail connections for runners and bicyclists from Cottonwood Heights into the canyon.
- Implement a Winter Driver Certification Program, including vehicle inspection.
- Like the idea of aerial tram at park-and-ride lot near Fort Union Boulevard.
- Provide a train up Little Cottonwood Canyon.
- Provide a mountain train like in the Alps.
- Provide a tram from the mouth of the canyon to ski areas and close roads to all but local traffic and bicycles.
- Provide a gondola from base of canyon to Alta.

- Provide a free gondola and toll the road.
- Put a high-speed train up the canyon.
- Provide a gondola from Heber and Park City to Alta.
- Have law enforcement issue fines/tickets for vehicles parked at ski areas that do not have appropriate traction equipment.
- Transit hubs should include places to purchase lift tickets, rental equipment, food and drink, etc.
- Any infrastructure improvement must be accompanied by an increase in maintenance funding.
- Support for summer Sunnyside chairlift.
- Run a giant loop train from Salt Lake City to Park City to Big Cottonwood Canyon, and then to Little Cottonwood Canyon. Include a hub at gravel pit, 9400 South, and 2000 East.
- Install a chairlift from Park City.
- Ski areas should incentivize skiers to stagger their departure (more dining options, live music).
- Develop a high-speed, passenger-carrying, Télécabine-type gondola ropeway that carries gondola cabins from a base at the canyon entrance to Alta with stops at Tanners Flat Campground, White Pine Trailhead, and Snowbird. Gondola cabins would be detachable and loaded at a hub outside the canyon (e.g., a base could be developed at the intersection of S.R. 209 and Highland Drive or at the gravel pit), and the loaded cabins would then be transported on an electrically powered vehicle (pickup-type trucks) to the base, where they would be placed on the ropeway.
- Extend mountain biking trail to Snowbird.
- Prohibit bikes from being on the road except during special events.
- Create a well-designed ride-share system that includes a mobile phone app, and allow only a certain number of cars up the canyon every day.
- Provide for active transportation.
- Consider short-term and long-term (e.g., aerial) solutions.
- Require people to carpool during peak periods.
- Organize carpool systems and provide parking at lots in neighborhoods farther from canyon.
- Use pilot car system to lead cars up the canyon.
- Add more snow plows.
- Ski areas should offer discounts for HOV and transit users.
- SkyTran would be a solution for the whole Wasatch Front (<https://vimeo.com/253517920>).
- Put a monorail in the old train right-of-way up the canyon; consider combining cog rail technology with monorail.
- Provide bus service from downtown Salt Lake City.

- Public education is needed for people to understand best practices for driving in the canyon and understanding protection of resources.
- Evaluate a cabin/gondola system from park-and-ride lots.
- Alternatives should address summer issues.
- Use innovative technology to reduce vehicle use.
- Replace the bridge at Wasatch Resorts.
- Provide pedestrian under-crossings at the mouth of the canyon.
- All improvements to the canyon infrastructure and transportation systems should include consideration for unique natural, historical, and wildlife characteristics of the canyon such as the Historic Temple Quarry and creekside trail previously identified.

3.1.8 Alternatives – Screening and Evaluation

- A key criterion in evaluating impacts should be whether balance between commercial and wilderness recreation is preserved.
- All stakeholders should have an opportunity to discuss options before screening decisions are made.
- Project need should be supported with data to support making decisions about which alternatives are most appropriate. For example, if an average of three people are killed in accidents every year as a result of having to maneuver around cars parked on the shoulder of the road, that is a strong basis for finding solutions that will avoid this situation, even if there is some environmental degradation; however, if there are no accidents but just three complaints a year, that is a much weaker basis.
- Trailhead should be defined when screening alternatives for “trailhead parking” – it should account for dispersed and traditional-use trails. Limiting improvements to certain locations eliminates alternatives prematurely.
- In order for transit to be effective and efficient, the following attributes should be considered: travel time, accessibility (for many people, to different locations), reliability, capacity, and complementary auto policies.
- Transit benefits should be considered in screening: safety, reduced environmental impacts, land use management, opportunity for public/private partnerships, economic, and visual.

3.1.9 Air Quality

- Consider effects of snow shed construction on air quality.
- Idling cars waiting to get up the canyon create an air quality problem.
- Study the impact of vehicle speeds on air quality.

3.1.10 Community Impacts

- Loss of homes/property impacts are a concern. People will need to relocate; properties close to the road will have reduced values.
- Widening the road will reduce or diminish green space in Cottonwood Heights.
- The City of Cottonwood Heights proposes a plan for Wasatch Boulevard that would result in “traffic calming,” whereas UDOT’s goal is a bigger and faster road.
- Consider impacts to residents in the canyon.

3.1.11 Cultural Resources

- The project is in an area rich in cultural resources significant to the Shoshone and Bannock Tribes; a cultural resources survey report should be submitted to the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes Heritage Tribal Office.
- Preserve the old stone historic bridge and build an adjacent pedestrian bridge to match.
- The first rail line up Little Cottonwood Canyon was constructed in 1875. In 1876, snow sheds were built over much of the rail line to protect it from avalanches. The “China Wall” was built in 1876 to support these snow sheds and is best preserved along the north side of the road between Tanners Flats Campground and Snowbird. The rail line itself is best preserved between the campground and the road, where it makes a broad turn. The rail line and the “China Wall” are both archaeological sites and will be destroyed if the road is widened. The old rail line can be faintly traced elsewhere in the canyon, and these traces will also be potentially destroyed by widening the road.

3.1.12 Cumulative Impacts

- Due to the NEPA requirement to study cumulative effects, I do not see that the *Cottonwood Canyons Transportation Action Plan* is adequate to satisfy the cumulative effects requirements of NEPA and the Council on Environmental Quality. Big Cottonwood Canyon needs to be studied as a part of the same EIS as Little Cottonwood Canyon. The effects are cumulative across the canyons, and the effects are connected.
- The EIS cumulative impact analysis should include projects developed as part of the *Transportation Action Plan*.
- Consider impacts from the Little Cottonwood Canyon Project in conjunction with the construction and use of other transportation projects, including elements of a broader transportation plan for the Wasatch canyons and mountains.

3.1.13 Economics

- Study the economic benefits of the snow sheds.
- The EIS should include an assessment of the economic value of the natural system in the study area.

3.1.14 Ecosystems

- The solution needs to have the least impact to natural resources.
- How does construction of snow sheds affect wildlife and native vegetation?
- Consider how future vegetation composition will affect avalanche intensity.
- Consider how construction of snow sheds will affect wildlife.
- Recognize throughout the document that Little Cottonwood Canyon is host to a diversity of wildlife (plants and animals) and crucial wildlife corridors. Wherever the document gives consideration to recreational and water resources, so too must consideration be given to maintaining functioning ecosystems, wildlife corridors, and native wildlife/plant populations.
- Consider forest health management and ecosystem impacts.
- There is a carrying capacity of the ecosystem. The carrying capacity of the Wasatch needs to be determined.
- Increased infrastructure could harm watershed function and ecology.
- How will increasing capacity help meet the goal of reducing wildfire risk?
- Wild Utah Project is overseeing a project to study the movements and interactions of wildlife in the Cottonwood Canyons. Consider reviewing the study for a better understanding of wildlife populations in the study area.
- Describe impacts on plants and animals, including endangered, threatened, and sensitive species.
- Consider the impacts of increased visitation in backcountry areas with present and future Forest Service use authorizations (e.g., helicopter skiing) on plant and animal life.
- Determine effect on riparian areas.
- Study the impacts of increased roadkill from wider and faster roads.
- Consider the impact of increased invasive species from construction and increased visitation.

3.1.15 Indirect Impacts

- Changes in transportation in Little Cottonwood Canyon could lead to increased traffic and related issues of increased visitation in Big Cottonwood Canyon.
- Transportation improvements would lead to increased visitation, which could result in increased development in the canyon, particularly at ski resorts.
- Adding lanes on Wasatch Boulevard will give developers a green light to build on the benches.
- Impacts from increased visitation on the ecosystem should be included in the EIS.
- Study indirect impacts stemming from the direct impacts; for example, impacts on wildlife population health, number, and behavior indirectly attributable to more direct effects of the improvements and/or their construction on migration, access, and passage to/from habitat areas.

- Study impacts from future construction and development inevitably resulting from increased demand for housing, lodging, services, etc.
- Perhaps the most significant impacts of the proposed project will be those caused by the increased number of people that the highway improvements are intended to deliver into the Wasatch.

3.1.16 Environmental Justice

- Consider the equity issues of a toll facility on low-income populations.

3.1.17 Land Use

- The Little Cottonwood Canyon Project team should work in partnership with Cottonwood Heights City as they complete/adopt the *Wasatch Boulevard Master Plan*.
- The *Wasatch Boulevard Master Plan* has not been adopted, and the community is still deciding what it should and should not include.
- A land swap with Forest Service for land next to the road could lead to additional building/development that would exacerbate transportation problems and crowding in general.
- Study impacts of the proposed improvements together with new road construction on National Forest lands, which may result from the expected amendment of the Forest Service's Roadless Rule.
- The EIS should consider local, state, and federal plans and requirements.

3.1.18 Noise

- Provide sound walls or other noise mitigation on Wasatch Boulevard.
- Increased traffic and increased speed increases noise.
- Consider a noise barrier between Iron Blossam Lodge and S.R. 210.
- Will the project increase the number of modified muffler vehicles?

3.1.19 Recreation

- Improve trail connections between Wasatch Boulevard and Little Cottonwood Canyon.
- Add pull-offs and trailheads to take the pressure off other trailheads.
- Moving more people up the mountain will only make hikes more crowded and lift lines longer. The mountain will get overcrowded.
- Include the effects of recreation due to the improved roads and parking. The lead agency may be UDOT, but the state EIS funding must also include studying recreation effects on the National Forest.

- A latent-recreation-demand study is needed. Due to traffic congestion, many recreationists are staying away from Little Cottonwood Canyon. With reduced congestion as one of the objectives of the road improvement, many of these displaced people will return, rapidly increasing the number of people recreating in the canyon. The congestion cycle will start over, now with a higher number of people, and will continue to cycle until congestion overwhelms the new improvement of the road now being studied. Again, the Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS will be inadequate without studying recreation demands on the environment. These issues are connected. The sooner a limit on the number of visitors to these canyons is studied, the higher the quality of each visit will be.
- At the present time, parking limits the number of backcountry skiers accessing the backcountry.
- Consider avoidance and/or mitigation of impacts to climbing resources from cut and fill and other construction activity within and outside the right-of-way. Some of the most popular bouldering areas such as the Secret Garden, Cabbage Patch, 5 Mile, The Worm, and others are all within 30 feet of the road. Understanding their location in relation to any proposed changes is critical to these resources.
- Access to bouldering areas and cliffs farther up canyon will continue to develop as climbers push further into the backcountry. Formalizing or maintaining existing, informal pullouts is necessary to facilitate access in some areas.
- The analysis should describe how each alternative will impact visitation and recreation demand; include how the additional use of recreation facilities will be managed and what funding will be needed for additional maintenance and management.
- Evaluate the impact to visitor experience.
- Study impacts on backcountry use, including user conflicts from and among other backcountry users, including those making such use under present and foreseeable Forest Service use authorizations, such as helicopter skiing.
- Don't forget about hikers and snowshoeing.

3.1.20 Health and Safety

- Safe ingress/egress to neighborhoods along Wasatch Boulevard is a concern.
- Trailhead security is an issue.
- Emergency response is affected by traffic on Wasatch Boulevard.
- Evaluate the impact to visitor safety.
- Idling cars on Wasatch Boulevard would increase if you add more lanes and would result in health issues for people with allergies or asthma, and the elderly as they are exposed to an increased level of toxins.
- Consider the effects of the project on climate change.

3.1.21 Sections 4(f) and 6(f)

- The EIS should include a Section 4(f) evaluation.

3.1.22 Study Area

- The study area is inadequate to address the effects of the proposed changes in access to Little Cottonwood Canyon on surrounding areas.
- Expand the study area to include S.R. 209 because it experiences severe traffic congestion similar to S.R. 210.
- The study area ignores critical feeder routes from adjacent communities along S.R. 209, S.R. 290, Interstate 215, and Wasatch Boulevard South.
- The study area should be expanded to include 9400 South and the park-and-ride lot at 2000 East.

3.1.23 Visual

- Consider visual quality along Wasatch Boulevard and its effect on home values.
- A gondola base station and parking would be an eyesore and destroy the natural beauty of the area.
- Snow sheds should be landscaped to look like part of the mountains.
- Out-of-canyon parking should be hidden by lush landscaping.

3.1.24 Water Quality, Resources, and Floodplains

- Consider how each option performs if future water quality problems prohibit use of salt and other road de-icing agents.
- The highest priority should be maintaining the water flow and water quality, and having no negative impact on water supply in the canyon.
- Conduct a detailed analysis of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to all waters in the project area.
- The EIS should evaluate risk to public drinking water. Salt Lake City Public Utilities will help in the risk assessment.
- The EIS should include analyses that rely on the protocols, metrics, and targets that local, state, and federal agencies require.
- The EIS should include appropriate plans for mitigation, monitoring, assessment, and reporting [of] water quality impacts.
- The EIS should include environmental restoration projects that provide a positive result to the watershed.
- Water quality best management practices and green infrastructure should be included in the EIS.
- Invest in bioswales throughout the canyon as pollution mitigation from road runoff.

3.1.25 Other

- Build public awareness about the effects of resort expansion.
- Prepare a programmatic EIS with tiered EISs from the programmatic EIS.
- The comment period should be at least 90 days from the last publication of the NOI.
- Community outreach for comments should include a larger area.
- Do not use any Mountain Accord data.
- Local residents should be included as a cooperating agency.

4.0 Next Steps: Screening Analysis and Environmental Analysis

All of the alternatives that were proposed during the scoping process will be included in the alternatives-development and screening analysis to determine which alternatives will be carried forward for further review in the EIS and which will be eliminated from further consideration. Once alternatives are selected for further review, the project team will invite the public to review the remaining alternatives and provide comments and suggestions before the environmental review process moves forward. Additional public involvement opportunities will be available throughout the environmental review process, including additional open houses, community working groups, and community outreach opportunities. Public comments will continue to be accepted on the project website (www.udot.utah.gov/littlecottonwoodeis), by email (littlecottonwoodeis@utah.gov), and on social media.

This page is intentionally blank.