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INTRODUCTION

Building on the Vision Document, the five vision statements have been expanded in the following Goal Initiatives. The five Vision Statements, developed through a series of community conversations, represent the aspirational outlook for the Wasatch Canyons’ land use and development, environment, recreation system, transportation system, and the broader economy. They are overarching statements that describe the desired future of the Wasatch Canyons based on shared community values. The vision document is available for review on the project website (slco.org/wasatch-canyons).

GOAL INITIATIVES
This Plan focuses on fundamental concepts to make the Vision Statements and Principles materialize. The 19 Goal Initiatives are goal-level statements that highlight a specific subject. The Goal Initiatives have been prioritized by level of implementation importance based on public input and staff review.

STRATEGIES
The Strategies are the last and most specific component within the planning framework. A strategy is a statement of intent or expectation -- a course of action that provides clarity on the type, location, and methodology to accomplish goals. Presented in this document are several strategy choices under each Goal.

DEFINITIONS
A number of acronyms are used in this document for brevity. Those include:

• ADA – Americans with Disabilities Act
• BMP – Best Management Practices
• BSA – Boy Scouts of America
• CRMP- County Resource Management Plan
• CWC – Central Wasatch Commission
• DNR – Utah Department of Natural Resources
• DWR – Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
• FCOZ – The Foothills and Canyons Overlay Zone
• MRZ – The Mountain Resort Zone
• NGO – Non-governmental Organization
• USFS – United States Forest Service
• UTA – Utah Transit Authority
• UDOT – Utah Department of Transportation
• WFRC - Wasatch Front Regional Council
1. RECREATION MANAGEMENT AND MAINTENANCE

GOAL 1A: IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF RECREATION FOR VISITORS AND RESIDENTS WHILE MEETING THE NEEDS FOR ANTICIPATED FUTURE DEMAND.

STRATEGY CHOICES

Overall System
1. Support the USFS in maintaining a quality trail system canyon-wide.
2. Ensure that all new trails have identified sources of funding for operation and maintenance prior to trail construction.
3. Establish a volunteer program to lead and train volunteers. Dedicate County staff time to coordinate with volunteer groups.
4. Concentrate and encourage recreation use in key identified recreation activity nodes. Manage and maintain recreation facilities and systems in a way that protects open lands and natural resources.
5. Promote lesser-used recreation areas in Salt Lake County outside the Wasatch Canyons to provide alternatives to the frequently-used Wasatch Canyons. Alternatives could include the Oquirrh Mountains, Dimple Dell, Ensign Peak, Yellow Fork, etc.
6. Develop new phone and computer applications to maximize user experience, promote key recreational areas, and provide most up-to-date information.
7. Work with willing sellers to acquire strategic land or easements for recreation access and management. Promote trailheads as transit-friendly or ride-sharing options.

Recreation Infrastructure
1. Assist the USFS and other agencies and stakeholders that manage trails and lands in implementing their standards for the development of trailheads, parking areas, and other use areas.
2. Provide and maintain key areas to include designated parking and needed amenities (garbage receptacles, restrooms, parking, etc.).

Trails
1. Work with the Forest Service, state and local jurisdictions, and property owners to develop an updated trails master plan for the central Wasatch area.
2. To the extent possible, locate trails outside of riparian and stream areas.
3. Implement sustainable trail and trailhead design guidelines and work with volunteer trail groups on implementation projects.
4. Complete the entire Bonneville Shoreline Trail for entire north-to-south system.
5. Enhance selected high use trails (such as Doughnut Falls) to handle significant usage. High use trails whenever possible should be surfaced and include amenities such as benches, restrooms, drinking water, bus stops and parking.
6. Focus on enhancing foothill easement acquisition programs and trailhead developments (for areas such as Deaf Smith Canyon).

GOAL 1B: IMPROVE PUBLIC ACCESS FOR RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES.

STRATEGY CHOICES

Overall System
1. Establish additional locations for parking lots, recreational access to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail, and other recreational open spaces.
2. Utilize multiple funding sources to protect and maintain key parcels for open space and recreational access through acquisition from willing sellers or conservation easements.
3. Pursue acquisitions with willing sellers of land at trailheads for additional facilities and parking.
BACKGROUND
The Wasatch Canyons are a unique recreational amenity close to a major metropolitan area. Achieving sustainable recreation in the Wasatch Canyons will require specific management tools to manage capacity and ensure a high-quality visitor experience.

Sustainable trail development can provide other recreational opportunities while protecting our environment. The intentional design and retrofit of trailheads, use areas, and parking areas can promote sustainability, encourage resiliency, and manage visitation. Additionally, the concentration of use at key recreation nodes can help preserve the Wasatch Canyons into the future.

The 2003 Revised Wasatch-Cache Forest Plan comprehensively addresses recreation access and management on USFS lands in the Canyons. The CRMP identifies management objectives, policies, and guidelines for recreation and tourism including:

- **Engage recreation users, resource managers, and residents in developing strategies for managing recreation to meet desired future conditions and address recreation pressures and demands.**
- **Work cooperatively across agencies to support recreation choice and demand.** When conflicts arise, pursue practical, lasting, win-win solutions in an atmosphere of open communication, broad participation, and respect.
- **Encourage education in values of outdoor recreation.**
- **Support education efforts about naturalness, solitude, and other backcountry values.**
- **Recognize the value of outdoor activities in the development of children and young people, and through education and hands-on experience, encourage their active participation.**
- **Improve the quality of recreation experience for visitors and residents.**
- **Support the development of funding mechanisms for the creation, implementation, and ongoing operations of needed recreational facilities, transportation options, infrastructure, and maintenance.**
- **Install interpretive signs in multiple languages at high-use areas, including parking lots, trailheads, and viewpoints to foster stewardship, encourage proper behavior, and appreciate natural resources.**
- **Encourage participation from a diverse range of stakeholders in the development of recreation system improvements, including local governments, private landowners, and recreation groups.**

Recreational access to open space is an important component of an open space preservation program. The County is committed to completing the Bonneville Shoreline Trail corridor and trail system and providing for access to the trail at appropriate locations. Additionally, some privately-owned parcels of property are located within the National Forest. Many of these lack potable water and have limited access and development potential, leaving landowners with few options to realize ownership benefits. Access to open spaces and public lands is often through or across private lands which creates difficult challenges for both the property owners and public.

The County could evaluate the utility of acquiring conservation easements, or fee title to strategic properties especially relating to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail, in conjunction with Salt Lake City’s land preservation efforts.
2. DEDICATED FUNDING SOURCES

GOAL: EXPLORE AND IMPLEMENT OPTIONS FOR DEDICATED FUNDING SOURCES TO ASSIST THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CANYONS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS AND TO PROVIDE ONGOING SUPPORT FOR MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS TO SUPPORT THE GROWING DEMANDS OF THE CANYONS.

STRATEGY CHOICES

**Overall System**
1. Tap into funding resources from foundations, grants, State, federal, and other revenue sources.
2. Implement Canyon user fees or roadway tolls, with all funds to be used within the canyons for improvements.
3. Create a Regional Wasatch Canyons Recreation District (Local or Special Service District).
4. Apply for grants through Zoo, Arts and Parks Tax (known as the ZAP or RAP tax).
5. Request a portion of Transient Room and Lodging Taxes.
6. Implement tax shareback agreements or tax increment financing.

**BACKGROUND**
Funding for needed infrastructure improvements and ongoing maintenance has not kept up with the growing needs. The types of funding necessary for one-time construction projects are different from sources that can provide long-term revenues for operations and maintenance. To achieve the community’s vision, additional funding sources should be evaluated to implement a variety of strategies. Money generated should directly benefit the canyons.

**Implementation of Canyon use fees or roadway tolls.**
While some Wasatch Canyons currently charge entry fees, such as Mill Creek Canyon, others do not. The Utah legislature recently passed legislation that allows UDOT to levy tolls on identified State highways for a variety of purposes. The toll-authorizing legislation is flexible and allows UDOT to use tolls collected to support non-transportation projects, such as expanded recreational facilities, parking improvements and facility maintenance, among others. Dashboard permits are an alternative to fee collection, but the enforcement of a permit system (e.g., bicycle tags, parking permits, etc.) would be costly, and enforcement would be sporadic at best.

The County would work with the USFS, UDOT, and other stakeholders to determine potential sites for tollbooths or variable tollings per TRIP studies, or potential revenues from permit-restricted programs, based on USFS data regarding use. The Millcreek fees are collected by the County and remitted to the Forest Service for maintenance projects in Millcreek Canyon. The County would work with the USFS and UDOT to allocate collected tolls in a manner to address the most pressing demands in the Canyons.

**Create a Regional Wasatch Canyons Recreation District (Local or Special Service District).**
Creation of a Wasatch Canyons Recreation District would provide a stable, predictable revenue source for both operating and capital expenses, and a basis to bond for capital improvements. The process of forming a local district requires cooperation of all cities/counties involved, and creates
a new taxing authority. Local districts have independent taxing power whereas special service districts must request any taxes or assessment from the governing body that created them.

The County would work with all municipalities in the County to create a local special service district. If the district area is larger than Salt Lake County, the County would work with involved taxing entities to develop and manage the district(s).

**Implement a Zoo, Arts and Parks Tax (known as the ZAP or RAP tax).**

Salt Lake County has already enacted this tax to the full allowable 1/10th of one percent, and the ZAP tax generated approximately $24 million in revenue for Salt Lake County in 2017. The ZAP tax is a competitive process to apply for and receive funds; many other organizations rely on this same revenue source. Raising the limit above 1/10th of 1% would require State legislative approval. The ZAP tax revenues are year by year, and is best utilized for capital improvements. The County is responsible for reviewing ZAP tax applications and distributing funds. The County could decide to re-allocate some funding to address the Canyons’ issues.

**Implement Transient Room and Lodging Taxes.**

A county may impose a tax on charges for lodging facilities for less than 30 days at a rate not to exceed 4.25 percent. Salt Lake County has already enacted this tax at the full 4.25 percent rate. Municipalities may also enact a rate of up to one percent of the rates charged for fewer than 30 days. An additional transient room tax of 0.5 percent may be imposed under certain circumstances to repay bonded or other indebtedness. There are only two cities in Salt Lake County that are currently eligible to, and have enacted, this tax: Sandy City and West Valley City. Other travel and tourism-related taxes include the resort communities tax, restaurant tax, and motor vehicle leasing tax. The benefits of these taxes include a stable and predictable revenue source, and that tourism and travel-related taxes have been growing in Utah. Raising the tax rate would require legislative approval.

The County would need to allocate funds generated to the Canyons on an ongoing basis. The County could also work with the Legislature to increase the tax rates in Salt Lake County to be used specifically for funding in the Canyons.

**Tap into funding from foundations, grants, State, federal, and other revenue sources.**

**Foundations** - Creating a foundation is one means of raising revenues. The benefits of creating a foundation to raise funds include creating partnerships with the private sector to obtain business contributions, and a sense of ownership by the entire community in addressing Canyon needs. This would not be a steady or consistent revenue source, being dependent on voluntary contributions, and foundation funds are not a basis for bonding. Operating a foundation involves significant administrative costs, unless that work is done by volunteers.

**Grant Funding** - Some of the most popular grant sources for recreation-related projects include the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the Utah Waypoint Grant, the Recreational Trails Program (RTP), and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). Grant funding is a new money source that does not need to be repaid, but is not a steady or consistent revenue source. Grants may also require matching funds or other restriction on use of funds.

The County could devote resources to provide leadership assistance in grant writing.

**Tax shareback agreements or tax increment financing.**

With tax sharebacks or tax increment financing (TIF), Revenues are generated through growth in property values or sales taxes. A portion of the revenues received may be paid back to a developer for improvements or to a Redevelopment Agency (in the case of a creation of Project Area) to assist with improvements. Advantages include flexibility in use of funds, and the ability to incentivize development to occur in a particular area.

The County would need to evaluate the creation of a Project Area(s) in the Canyons where tax increment generated funds could be applied.
3. TRANSIT SERVICE ENHANCEMENT

GOAL: SUPPORT ENHANCED YEAR-ROUND TRANSIT SERVICE TO AND WITHIN THE WASATCH CANYONS.

STRATEGY CHOICES
Because the character, uses and visitation patterns vary among the Canyons, transit strategies are presented for both the Wasatch Canyons Plan Area, and for each Canyon, as appropriate.

Overall System
1. Support the development of transit centers/hubs outside canyons, but within reasonable distance of entrances. Transit centers should provide access to a variety of transportation choices and information and connect to the regional transportation system. Encourage these hubs in mixed-use/business centers where parking can be shared.
2. Assist funding to support UTA with increased year-round bus service.
3. Where possible, develop ride-share and bus pullouts at key use nodes.
4. Incentivize carpooling/share vehicle or programs.
5. Support the development of areas, such as pickup spots, that prioritize rideshare vehicles, transit, and electric vehicles.
6. Support increased transit frequency and additional stops at critical locations in the canyons such as trailheads to improve usability and ridership of public transit.
7. Ensure that new and enhanced transit facilities and operations are designed to avoid degradation of watershed health and water quality.

Mill Creek Canyon
1. Consider voluntary permitted summer shuttle service.

Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons
1. Support the addition of summer UTA bus service and significantly increased winter service to key destinations.

BACKGROUND
Transit serves as an essential tool to reduce single occupancy vehicles and the growing demand of visitors in the canyons. Coupled with parking management strategies, transit allows for the ability to transport visitors and employees while mitigating the need for additional parking. Additionally, bus service can reduce the delay and congestion on the roadways in the canyons.

Public transit in the canyons, in the form of bus service, is currently provided by UTA per their transit plans. During the summer, there are limited public transit options. UTA runs route 990 to Snowbird, which consists of one trip up the canyon in the morning and one trip back down in the evening.

Separate fixed UTA routes are proposed for winter and summer services. Summer services may require additional/different stops than those used for the winter Ski Bus service. Additional bus service would need to be funded through a dedicated funding stream, such as a purchase agreement with the County so that the increased service does not disproportionately affect the overall UTA service area. It should also be noted that transit service expansion at trailheads and recreation areas is directly tied to supporting infrastructures such as restroom facilities and their associated operations and maintenance funding.

Mill Creek Canyon currently does not have any transit service. Transit concepts should address parking congestion at key areas in Mill Creek Canyon, and accommodate a range of users and their gear: dogs, bicycles, picnic hampers, skis, snowshoes, and other accessories. The Mill Creek Canyon Transportation Feasibility Study (2012) considered various transportation concepts, including the idea of a permitted shuttle. Salt Lake County could consider a shuttle system to reduce parking demand in Mill Creek Canyon, though banning personal vehicles altogether is not an appropriate solution.
4. ROADWAY FACILITIES

GOAL: SUPPORT ADEQUATE ROADWAY FACILITIES TO ENHANCE SAFETY AND MODE CHOICE IN THE WASATCH CANYONS.

STRATEGY CHOICES

**Overall System**

1. Support roadway design that allows for transit and increased occupancy rates where appropriate. Pursue enhancements to Park and Ride lots.
2. Work with UDOT and UTA to integrate active transportation planning in the canyons.
3. Utilize appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) when upgrades and enhancements to roads are performed to address stormwater impacts to the watershed and water quality. Ensure there is a funding source for maintenance of BMPs.

**Parley’s Canyon**

1. Support construction of an off-street bicycle pathway (uphill and downhill) connecting Salt Lake County and Summit County via Parley’s Canyon.

**Mill Creek, Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons**

1. Provide a bicycle lane in the uphill direction, where feasible.
2. Provide downhill bicycle shared-lane marking and signage in the Cottonwood Canyons, where possible, as much as the terrain and site conditions will allow.
3. Where needed, provide downhill bicycle pullouts and passing areas.

**BACKGROUND**

New types of road facilities will be more consistent with the vision of Wasatch Canyons while protecting character and environment while providing transportation choice. An obvious solution to improve the cycling environment is bicycle lanes. There are a growing number of people road bicycling, mountain biking, and running or walking on the road shoulder. According to the 2017 Cottonwood Canyons Transportation Recommendations, a substantial portion of the canyon’s roadways lacks the sufficient shoulder width to accommodate dedicated active transportation facilities like bicycle lanes. In addition to narrow shoulders, cyclists must also compete with automobiles using the shoulders for roadside parking. In some cases, cyclists must move into travel lanes to avoid opening doors, parked vehicles, and road debris.

Specific issues include:

- The shoulder is less than 6 feet for most of the Canyons, which is not enough space to accommodate parking, cycling, and pedestrians.
- The walking and biking experience can be uncomfortable and unsafe. In the summer, pedestrians sometimes walk in the lane of traffic or the vegetation if cars are parked on the shoulder. On peak days when the ski resort parking lots are full, skiers often walk in the snowbank or in the lane of traffic with skis and/or with children. High vehicle volumes and the speed differential between vehicles and cyclists degrade the cycling experience and impact safety.

Mill Creek Canyon Road could be an ideal route for road cyclists with proper facility accommodations. The current need to share the roadway with much faster motor vehicles, particularly in the uphill direction, makes for an experience stressful enough to likely be discouraging otherwise interested people from biking into and up the canyon.
5. PUBLIC UTILITY INFRASTRUCTURE

GOAL: MEET THE GROWING DEMANDS FOR RESIDENTS, BUSINESSES, AND VISITORS BY ENHANCING AND IMPROVING PUBLIC UTILITY SYSTEMS.

STRATEGY CHOICES

**Overall System**

1. Work with agency partners to identify public infrastructure needs to address residential, recreational, environmental, and business impacts.

2. Evaluate infrastructure needs and coordinate agency capital improvement plans (CIPs) to ensure they are consistent with the General Plan. Ensure General Plan projects (to be identified) are in CIPs and prioritize their implementation.

3. Evaluate infrastructure priorities and incentives for development in appropriate areas that achieve environmental protection, recreational impact mitigation, and other goals consistent with the General Plan.

4. Ensure that infrastructure development, maintenance and repair are conducted in a manner that protects water quality.

5. Evaluate all funding options to support development and maintenance of needed infrastructure. All funds generated within the canyons should be spent within the canyons.

**BACKGROUND**

Providers and managers of public infrastructure and services in the canyons include the USFS (trails, trailheads, toilet facilities, picnic areas, parking); SLCDPU (watershed); UDOT (roads); UTA (transit); Salt Lake County (sewer services), and other agencies. No centralized public water service is provided in the canyons. Private water companies and individual springs, wells, mine tunnels, and other sources such as cisterns and small storage have been developed by businesses and property owners to meet their water needs to date. Roads and transit are addressed in later sections of the Goal Initiatives. These agencies identify infrastructure and service needs and prioritize projects and spending through the development of CIPs. Although several initiatives are underway to address shortfalls, funding for infrastructure improvements and maintenance is not meeting current needs. Ideas to address funding shortfalls are discussed in Goal Initiative 2. Dedicated Funding Sources for Capital Improvements and Ongoing Maintenance and Operations.

The Wasatch Canyons see many visitors across all seasons, primarily for recreational uses. Targeted new infrastructure development and upgrades to existing infrastructure will be needed to achieve the vision for recreational experience and to support the desired future land uses. Also, visitors and residents can adversely impact the natural environment due to the current lack of infrastructure (sanitation, parking, etc.) and intential damage (graffiti). A challenge is that agency budgets have not been sufficient to keep up with infrastructure development and maintenance needs, and alternative or additional sources of funding need to be identified.
6. PARKING MANAGEMENT

GOAL: SUPPORT YEAR-ROUND PARKING MANAGEMENT TO PROVIDE PARKING IN DESIGNATED LOCATIONS AND SAFETY, SCENIC QUALITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION THROUGHOUT THE CANYONS AND FOOTHILLS.

STRATEGY CHOICES
Some parking strategies could apply to all of the canyons in the planning area, while some are canyon-specific.

PLAN-AREA STRATEGIES
1. Collaborate with UDOT, UTA, and the Forest Service to develop a parking system master plan for parking and canyon transportation. Construct parking structures/transit center or park-n-ride near entrances in or nearby cities close to the canyons with connections to transit.
2. Encourage striping parking lots and allowed roadside parking areas to maximize parking availability. Manage roadside parking to minimize pedestrian and vehicle conflicts.
3. For high usage centers, design parking lots and pedestrian roadway to enhance user experience and safety.
4. Partner with public and private agencies to encourage the most efficient use of parking.
5. Work with ski areas, Forest Service, UDOT, UTA, businesses, and hotels near the canyons to coordinate parking and provide real-time information on lot capacity and areas that are less crowded as well as alternative locations to visit through a website and phone apps.
6. Utilize appropriate best management practices (BMPs) when upgrades and enhancements to parking facilities are performed to address stormwater impacts to the watershed and water quality. Ensure there is a funding source for maintenance of BMPs.
7. Explore the feasibility of dynamic congestion pricing parking fees during peak demand days.

MILL CREEK CANYON
1. Consider developing a parking master plan to work in conjunction with a shuttle service for Millcreek Canyon.

BACKGROUND
Parking management is a valuable tool to manage users, provide access, and reduce adverse environmental impacts. Several recent documents have researched parking management solutions in the Wasatch Canyons. These include the 2017 Cottonwood Canyons Transportation Recommendations, The Mountain Transportation Study (2012), and Canyons Parking Study (2012). The USFS policies and guidelines also address parking management and needs within the Wasatch Canyons.

REAL-TIME PARKING INFORMATION
Electronic parking utilization signs, used in a variety of applications to communicate to visitors when lots are at capacity, could be useful for mitigating parking issues. Messaging signs connected to vehicle counters and placed strategically along canyon roads, and more importantly, outside the canyons, would be able to provide real-time utilization information and direct incoming visitors towards open parking spots. The biggest hurdle to implementing a system of parking management signs is bringing the technology required into a remote area. Vehicle counters and a power source (likely solar) would be needed at each parking lot, along with a cellular or satellite connection to a control center capable of feeding real-time information to each messaging sign.

PARKING OUTSIDE THE CANYONS
According to the 2017 Cottonwood Canyons Transportation Recommendations, to meet the bus and carpool goals for the Wasatch Canyons, about 2,500-3,000 new/additional parking spaces are needed in the valley on the three ski bus routes (estimated cost of $60-100 million). There are currently 2,900 spaces at nine key park-and-ride lots serving the ski bus routes, and they are reaching capacity. It is presumed that many of these lots are being used for carpooling in addition to accessing the ski bus since there are 2,900 spaces and the current ski bus takes around 750-1,500 people into the canyons.
7. ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION

GOAL: EDUCATE AND ENCOURAGE RESIDENTS, EMPLOYEES, AND VISITORS TO ENHANCE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES TO PROMOTE A CULTURE OF BICYCLING AND WALKING.

STRATEGY CHOICES
1. Develop a wayfinding signage program for bicyclists and pedestrians with detailed, site-specific signage that directs users to key destinations within the canyons.
2. Develop additional wayfinding collateral such as maps or online information to prepare visitors traveling to the canyons.
3. Provide education on appropriate speed and safety of cyclists and increase enforcement of speed of cyclists.
4. Work with UTA and UDOT to incorporate and enhance bicycle usage on bus and shuttle systems.
5. Collaborate with UDOT, Salt Lake City, and Forest Service to include needed amenities such as bike fix station and potable water (where available and feasible) at key trail heads or activity centers.

BACKGROUND
Encouraging proper and safe use of trails and active transportation facilities will aid in converting more trips from vehicle trips to non-motorized trips. Wayfinding signage helps bicyclists and pedestrians traveling for transportation and recreation navigate unfamiliar areas. The inclusion of travel time and distance on wayfinding signage has proven to be a positive influence on active transportation activity. Wayfinding information can promote active transportation as a viable method for traveling to or within the Canyons. Wayfinding signage can be coordinated with branding and aesthetic goals.
8. PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES

GOAL: ENSURE PEDESTRIANS CAN SAFELY ACCESS TRAILHEADS, PARKING LOTS, AND OTHER PUBLIC FACILITIES.

STRATEGY CHOICES
1. Enhance or where appropriate create new off-street trail connections. The USFS would like to see trails connecting to other trails.
2. Implement pedestrian road crossing signs, pavement marking, and traffic controls at key recreation destinations.
3. Implement ADA and senior/child-friendly facilities at key locations throughout the canyons.
4. Support the replacement and reconstruction of the Silver Lake boardwalk.

BACKGROUND
To provide additional access and reduce roadside parking conflicts with the growing number of people walking, running, and bicycling, non-motorized recreation options must be available with the appropriate connections. Pedestrian facilities for persons of all ages and levels of ability should be provided in key destination areas. Although sidewalks are not likely feasible, off-street pathways and on-street crosswalks would improve pedestrian conditions at key locations. Additional concerns to consider are that, other than the ski resorts and park and ride lots, there are limited ADA facilities (ramps, parking spaces, cross-walks) in the canyons.

The extensive trail network is perhaps the primary feature drawing visitors to Mill Creek Canyon. Due to the Canyon’s parking congestion issues, however, some visitors are not able to park in the lot closest to their desired trailhead. Instead, they must drive to a different lot and walk or bicycle in or alongside the roadway to the trailhead. Better pedestrian connections between parking lots and trailheads would make this a much more comfortable experience. The Mill Creek Canyon Feasibility Study identified the Big Water, Church Fork, and Maple Grove trailheads as the most problematic for trail connectivity.

According to the 2017 Cottonwood Canyons Transportation Recommendations, the lack the adequate facilities along or parallel to the roadway make it hard for pedestrian users to access their destination. There is also a lack of safe facilities to bicycle and walk on canyon roadways. Bicycle and pedestrian use of the Canyons contributes to some transportation issues on roads.

Informal trailheads (or social trailheads) created by people straying from official USFS access locations have developed as people access a myriad of dispersed recreational opportunities. Informal trailheads contribute to erosion, mineral soil loss, loss of vegetation, and can be unsafe for users. Unregulated roadside shoulder parking adds to informal trailheads when users are not funneled to official access points. Regulation and control of roadside parking within the canyon can help alleviate this problem.
9. WATERSHED MANAGEMENT

GOAL: ENSURE THE MANAGEMENT OF WATERSHEDS IN THE WASATCH MOUNTAINS TO PROTECT WATER QUALITY AND QUANTITY.

STRATEGY CHOICES
Both the 2017 Salt Lake County Integrated Watershed Plan and the 1999 Salt Lake City Watershed Management Plan establish goals and policies for future watershed management and recommendations for implementation of management strategies. Salt Lake City is currently updating the 1999 Plan.

1. Support the continued implementation of the recommendations of the most current Salt Lake County Integrated Watershed Plan and the Salt Lake City Watershed Management Plan.

2. Identify impaired reaches of streams for funding to implement restoration.

3. Continue cooperation with the Salt Lake County Health Department, Utah Department of Environmental Quality, the Forest Service, and Salt Lake City to implement anti-degradation standards, stream setback and environment zones, stormwater BMPs, monitoring programs, enforcement activities, and other canyon watershed policies to maintain water quality in the canyons.

4. Concentrate major developed recreation facilities as much as possible to avoid sprawl and preserve open space.

5. Pursue canyon land use policies which will allow continued use of the Canyons for transportation, recreational, residential, and commercial development as long as these activities do not result in deterioration of water quality. Any new or expanding uses in the watershed canyons must be reviewed and carefully scrutinized to determine if the proposed use is consistent with water quality goals.

6. Require recreation facilities to be constructed and operated to minimize both point and non-point sources of pollution.

7. Encourage landowners, developers, utility providers, and government agencies to establish stream setbacks, protect vegetation, site appropriately, and implement stormwater BMPs as factors that should be considered in the design and construction of all canyon development.

BACKGROUND
Surface water emanating from the canyon watersheds in the Plan area is a critical source of culinary water for 500,000 people in Salt Lake County. Communities that rely on these source waters include Salt Lake City, Mill Creek, Holladay, Sandy, and Cottonwood Heights. Public water suppliers such as Salt Lake City and Sandy City have strict regulatory obligations to meet federal and state Safe Drinking Water Act requirements, and amendments in 1996 to the federal Safe Drinking Water Act recognized the importance of protection of sources of drinking water as critical prevention to protect public health.

Water quality protection is a top priority within the multi-use watershed of the Wasatch Canyons. The health and resiliency of these resources must not be degraded to ensure high-quality drinking water for Salt Lake County in the future. Pressures related to water supplies are increasing due to climate change and population growth, making these water sources more critical, and more in need of protection than ever. Therefore, protection of the current drinking water supplies continues to be a critical priority.
10. WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES MANAGEMENT

GOAL: ENSURE THAT FUTURE USE OF AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE WASATCH CANYONS ARE MANAGED TO PROTECT WILDLIFE, FISHERIES AND HABITAT AND TO REDUCE HUMAN-WILDLIFE CONFLICTS.

STRATEGY CHOICES
1. Support the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (DWR) in the implementation of the Utah Wildlife Action Plan.
2. Work with other agencies to further designate sensitive areas, wildlife corridors, and conflict areas.
3. Identify wildlife protection measures (such as fencing, changes in trails, and wildlife crossings) for key sensitive areas.
4. Review and revise, as necessary, Salt Lake County codes and regulations to support wildlife.
5. Continue to support a science-based data resource to inform decision-making.
6. Work with applicable federal, state, and local agencies to identify sensitive aquatic populations within the plan area and, if needed, explore feasibility related to in-stream flows to protect sensitive aquatic life.

BACKGROUND
Increasing public visitation and vehicle use of the Wasatch Canyons could result in impacts to wildlife. The 2017 Salt Lake County Resource Management Plan (CRMP) addresses wildlife management on public lands in detail, identifying several management objectives with accompanying policies and guidelines. The four most relevant wildlife management objectives are:
1. Managing to keep species off the federal endangered species list.
2. Provide for the sustained diversity of species and maintain communities within their historic range.
3. Support maintenance and improvement of existing aquatic habitats, including riparian and wetland habitat.
4. Coordinate with DNR and UDOT to reduce wildlife and vehicle collisions on Salt Lake County roadways.

Section 19.72.140 of FCOZ, Wildlife Habitat Protection, establishes development limitations in areas of critical wildlife habitat and provides standards and guidelines to protect wildlife and their habitats.
11. PUBLIC AWARENESS AND STEWARDSHIP OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND RECREATIONAL VALUES

GOAL: ENHANCE PUBLIC AWARENESS AND STEWARDSHIP OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND RECREATIONAL VALUES AND PRACTICES.

STRATEGY CHOICES
1. In cooperation with canyon stakeholders and volunteers, develop a county-wide public education campaign and associated social media and materials to support public education and stewardship of the Wasatch Canyons.
2. Support development of educational materials for school programs and support programs aimed at making the Wasatch Canyons accessible to all.
3. Review and consider the Cottonwood Canyons Scenic Byways Plan signage plan when planning for educational signage.

BACKGROUND
Increasing visitation and use of the Canyons is creating additional impacts to the natural resources and the recreational experience. Greater understanding by visitors of the function and sensitivities of canyon resources to impacts could reduce those impacts and support better overall canyon visitor experiences. A program to promote environmentally-friendly and user-friendly public activities while in the Canyons and foothills could mitigate adverse impacts.

Visitation to picnic areas and trailheads in the canyons is increasing rapidly, with accompanying impacts to toilet facilities, parking areas, tables, fire pits, and other amenities. Canyon trails are also experiencing an increase in use and incidents of misuse. According to the 2016 report, An Estimation of Visitor Use in Little Cottonwood, Big Cottonwood, and Mill Creek Canyons (Utah State University’s Institute of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism), the estimated annual visitation in the Wasatch Canyons was 4,505,004 total users. Of those users, 30% visited designated resort areas, and 70% were dispersed users. The rate of visitation is expected to continue to increase as the Salt Lake Area population grows. The CRMP addresses environmental education as an element of wildlife and habitat preservation.
12. LAND PRESERVATION

GOAL: MAINTAIN AND INCREASE THE CONSERVATION OF NATURAL LANDS THAT PROVIDE REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE TOWARDS ECOSYSTEMS, WATERSHED, AND RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES.

STRATEGY CHOICES
1. Identify priority areas of natural lands that should be conserved and maintained. Identify the criteria to prioritize areas that are important to be conserved and supported, such as environmental values, ecosystem health, aesthetics, recreation experience, and contiguity to trails and open space area linkages.
2. Develop a system to evaluate natural lands for purchase.
3. Create a mechanism to fund open space preservation and ongoing maintenance.
4. Utilize all possible funding resources available, such as the County’s Open Space Trust Fund, Salt Lake City, State of Utah, or NGOs, to protect critical parcels. As a last resort, explore other funding mechanisms such as fees.
5. Coordinate with the State of Utah to purchase lands for conservation.
6. Promote the use of private land trusts and other means to facilitate the conservation and maintenance of key properties through donations, conservation easements, and acquisition from willing sellers.
7. Develop resource and stewardship plans for existing open space parcels.

BACKGROUND
A defining attribute of the Wasatch Canyons is the abundance of natural open space for scenic, recreational, and habitat values. The identification and protection of open space in identified locations will forever preserve the character of the Wasatch Canyons and protect sensitive resources.

The Salt Lake County Open Space Acquisition Plan was developed to meet Salt Lake County’s goal of creating a diverse portfolio of conserved lands that improve quality of life and protect ecological health in Salt Lake County. The plan comprises the tools and process by which the Open Space Trust Fund Advisory Committee recommends projects for funding from the Open and Green Space Bond and the Open Space Trust Fund. It contains two major sections: policy and process and land analysis. The former establishes a Project Selection Process and sets priorities. The latter is a GIS-based (Geographic Information System) analysis designed to identify and evaluate open lands in Salt Lake County and recommended acquisition strategies.

The County could also evaluate the utility of acquiring conservation easements, or fee title to lands, in conjunction with Salt Lake City’s efforts.
13. RESILIENCY PROGRAM

GOAL: PREPARE THE CANYONS AND FOOTHILLS FOR POTENTIAL NATURAL HAZARDS AND ADDRESS THE IMPACTS CAUSED BY AGING INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE CANYONS TO REDUCE IMPACTS.

STRATEGY CHOICES
1. Work with corresponding agencies to further prepare the canyons for the event of a wildland fire, earthquakes, landslides, and other natural disasters.
2. Work with the USFS to understand and prepare for the impact of insect and disease issues that may severely impact the forest ecosystem in the near future.
3. Apply adequate resources to fire protection, noxious weed control, and habitat protection.
4. Ensure communities and resort areas have adequate emergency preparedness plans and supplies.
5. Work to develop programs to incentivize the upgrading of existing homes and businesses including septic upgrades and improved water and sewer connections.
6. Explore a tree and mitigation bank for removed trees to help fund restoration work.
7. Work with science professionals to enrich and educate Salt Lake County planners, commissioners, and elected officials of lessons learned through research application.

BACKGROUND:
The long-term health of the Wasatch Canyons’ ecosystems, water quality, and recreational experience in the canyons depend on both future protections and remediation of past and existing problems. Much of the development in the canyons is quite old, and water, sewer, and utility systems are aging. The climate is changing and better techniques for managing flooding, wildfire, noxious weeds, and other problems are emerging. A program to repair older systems and employ new management techniques would result in better environmental and recreational outcomes.

The CRMP addresses floodplains, noxious weed control, and fire management, setting forth the County’s desired future conditions, management objectives and associated policies and guidelines. FCOZ identifies floodplains and riparian areas as sensitive lands deserving of greater protections in the development process. The CRMP also recognizes agency partners for sustainability projects and efforts. Salt Lake County could develop its own program to incentivize upgrades of private systems and could coordinate with jurisdictional agencies on sustainability programs. The CRMP calls for coordination among the USFS and emergency service providers to prevent and remediate damage caused by fires, flooding, and other natural disasters. The County’s Integrated Watershed Plan identifies strategies to protect water quality in the Canyons. The CRMP addresses explicitly fire management, floodplain management, and geologic hazards, with accompanying goals, policies, and management.
14. INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION

GOAL: ENSURE THAT FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL AGENCIES AND ENTITIES WITH JURISDICTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE WASATCH CANYONS PLANNING AREA COORDINATE THEIR EFFORTS AND PLANNING PROCESSES TO PROVIDE FOR EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES AND THE RESOURCES OF THE WASATCH CANYONS.

STRATEGY CHOICES
1. Implement the inter-agency coordination measures identified in the CRMP for fire management, forest management, riparian areas and wetlands, recreation management, and the other resources addressed in the CRMP.
2. Work to establish collaborative goals, action plans and timelines among jurisdictions, including the County, USFS, towns, cities, and community councils.
3. Work with the partner agencies and the Wasatch Front Regional Council on updates of their development and management plans and any corresponding amendments.
4. Work with the USFS, Army Corps of Engineers, UDOT, Salt Lake City, and UTA on any implementation level projects, so they meet the Wasatch Canyons General Plan's vision.
5. Include the USFS, towns, metro townships, cities, community councils, UDOT, CWC, and UTA on County level plans, studies, and projects to ensure all activities are coordinated.
6. Invite participation of the Scenic Byway Councils through the State of Utah Office of Tourism in future planning efforts.
7. Coordinate with WFRC and UDOT to ensure canyons transportation projects and appropriate funding are included in RTP and Unified Transportation plans.

BACKGROUND
Successful planning for management of the lands and resources in the Wasatch Canyons will require a general plan area-wide approach across jurisdictional boundaries. The CRMP identifies inter-agency coordination as key to successful planning and management of resources related to public lands, notably the National Forest. The CRMP calls for active engagement in forest planning and in other agency planning efforts. The CRMP calls explicitly for intergovernmental coordination on fire management, fisheries, forest management, noxious weed management, recreation and tourism, riparian areas and wetlands, water quality and water rights, wilderness areas, and wildlife management.

The CWC has been created as an inter-local entity by agreement among jurisdictional agencies and stakeholders. The CWC will be governed by a 28–35 person diverse stakeholder council and may decide to function as an intergovernmental coordination committee, although that determination has not yet been made. It is essential for the County to engage in future updates to the Forest Management Plan, city and community council management plans, and UDOT and UTA planning and approved implementation-level actions.
15. REGULATORY TOOL REVIEW

GOAL: AS NEEDED, REVIEW AND UPDATE COUNTY ORDINANCES TO FURTHER IMPLEMENT THE VISION, GOALS, AND STRATEGIES OF THE GENERAL PLAN.

STRATEGY CHOICES
1. Consider the need to periodically update County ordinances like the Foothills and Canyons Overlay Zone (FCOZ) and the Mountain Resort Zone (MRZ) to meet the General Plan Vision and County leadership goals.
2. Consider the need to periodically update County ordinances related to development siting, access, floodplains, water protection and the structural design of buildings to ensure that health and safety requirements are met while allowing appropriate development to meet State Code.
3. Work to streamline and clarify the FCOZ/private property development process, including better coordination between jurisdictions.
4. At the General Plan draft level and adoption, review the FCOZ and MRZ to compare goal and strategy alignments or conflicts.
5. Review progress and update the Wasatch Canyons General Plan every five years to better understand progress and work towards goals.
6. Plan for a complete General Plan update in the 15-20 year time frame (2033-2038).

BACKGROUND
The Foothill Canyons Overlay Zone (FCOZ) and the Mountain Resort Zone (MRZ) were both adopted before this General Plan update process began. Both will be significant plan implementation tools and may need to be modified to implement the objectives of the General Plan. Significant revisions were recently made to the FCOZ, and the ordinance addresses current needs of the County; however, the General Plan update should consider the FCOZ and MRZ updates to aid in plan implementation. Potential revisions to the FCOZ and the MRZ should be carefully considered to accomplish General Plan goals without revisiting previously settled issues.
16. AESTHETICS AND CHARACTER GUIDANCE

GOAL: RAISE APPRECIATION AND STEWARDSHIP OF CANYON BEAUTY THROUGH AESTHETICS AND DEVELOPMENT GUIDANCE.

STRATEGY CHOICES:
1. Consider creating design guidelines/standards for the commercial development, gateways, and public areas that include consistent design quality, materials, and placement.
2. Work with stakeholders, communities, and businesses to implement comparable aesthetic plans.
3. Consider the implementation of unique canyon theming, similar to national parks, which promotes a sense of place, stewardship, and heritage (i.e., signage, architecture, wayfinding, entry features, benches, etc.).
4. Support programs such as Keep It Pure to further public education in canyon and watershed values.

BACKGROUND
The beauty and physical aesthetics of the Wasatch Canyons are an essential factor to the success of the region. Guidelines for public and private improvements can support the preservation of its character. The County’s CRMP identifies visual quality goals and policies including, “Encourage the enhancement of the aesthetic beauty of our built environment.” Section 19.72.170 of FCOZ establishes design standards for private lands and development in the canyons to preserve and enhance the beauty of the landscape; encourages project planning and building design that protects natural terrain; manages development in sensitive lands, and steers development toward the most suitable areas. FCOZ and MRZ also set forth mandatory and advisory design guidelines to address structures, siting, vegetation, screening and other aspects of development in the Canyons.

The USFS needs to be engaged to ensure that branding, aesthetics, and character guidance are consistent across county and federal lands, including UDOT highway easements throughout the area. Also, recommend considering coordinating with the Utah Office of Tourism Scenic Byway Program in regards to the State Scenic Byway status of SR-190 and SR-210.
17. VOLUNTEER AND CITIZEN GROUP SUPPORT

GOAL: SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT OF CITIZENS’ GROUPS AND VOLUNTEERS IN PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES IN THE WASATCH CANYONS.

STRATEGY CHOICES
1. Identify the citizens groups, community councils, property owners associations, non-profits, and other similar associations active in each canyon, and meet with regularly them to identify opportunities for the County to support their activities, enhance communications, and define common objectives that align with the Wasatch Canyons General Plan.
2. Commit staff time and/or funding to these groups in the form of grants for activities that support the implementation of the General Plan.
3. Sponsor a forum of volunteers and community groups to coordinate communications and interactions with the County and other agency stakeholders.
4. Track service projects, hours, and efforts to show progress and gauge involvement.
5. Using a County website, list citizens groups, and government agencies to provide resources for the County to better coordinate with and utilize existing groups.

BACKGROUND
There are many citizen-led organizations with interests in the Canyons. These groups serve many valuable roles, but coordination among them is generally limited to addressing specific issues as they arise. Small organizations and groups may not have the ability to address systemic issues efficiently; a larger pool of resources and funding are often necessary to accomplish this task. In the long term, these coalitions need resources and organizational support to maintain viability. The County could act as a facilitator in improving communication, coordination, and partnerships among community organizations that represent the needs of specific interests on an on-going basis.
GOAL: SUPPORT THE CONTINUATION AND VIABILITY OF CANYON RESORTS AND BUSINESSES. WORK TO CONSERVE THE NATURAL FEATURES AND RECREATIONAL ATTRIBUTES THAT MAKE THE CANYONS A VITAL ECONOMIC DRIVER IN UTAH.

STRATEGY CHOICES:
1. Review County FCOZ, MRZ, and other relevant Salt Lake County development codes to ensure they meet the goals of the Wasatch Canyons General Plan.
2. Focus on the environmental and scenic preservation of the Wasatch Canyons as an economic development strategy.
3. Encourage businesses to have the proper business permitting (guiding, shuttle, etc). The County should work with businesses and public to assist in reporting violation of laws, policies, respecting private property, etc.
4. Include tourism and economic groups in planning, coordinating, and implementing the Wasatch Canyons General Plan.
5. Coordinate transportation planning and implementation with canyon resorts and businesses. If tolling is used as a transportation, request that a portion of the tolling money be used for assistance with transit, parking, activity center trailhead, etc.
6. Regulate through business licenses the use of short-term rentals. Work with short-term rentals and hotels to understand necessary canyon policies for parking, watershed protection, and permits.
7. Support appropriate ski area/Forest Service land exchanges.

BACKGROUND
The economic benefits and opportunities related to the Wasatch Canyons can be generally characterized in two categories. The first is the economic activity that occurs within the canyons and the economic benefits that canyon activities, such as destination tourism, create for the County as a whole. The second is the value of the canyons as a lifestyle asset that supports recruitment of new businesses and skilled employees.

Figures reported by the Utah State Tax Commission indicate that the tourism-related tax revenues realized by Salt Lake County in 2017 totaled approximately $53 million. While that figure includes all tourism-related activities county-wide, a significant portion of that can be attributed to recreation activity in the Wasatch Canyons.

Based on a 2014 study, sales revenues from Big Cottonwood Canyon were $471 million; Little Cottonwood Canyon, $365 million; Parleys Canyon, $217 million; and Mill Creek Canyon $123 million. The Wasatch Canyons Tomorrow study reported that revenues generated by jobs and wages paid by canyon businesses totaled approximately $150 million in 2010, and are projected to increase to $220 million by 2030 assuming no ski area expansions occur.

Recent studies have shown that approximately 55 percent of Utah skier-days are due to out-of-state and international visitors. A 2016 research paper reports that $895 million was spent by nonresident skiers and snowboarders in 2015 with an average daily per person expenditure of $315.

The second economic benefit category is harder to quantify. The Wasatch Canyons are an asset to both Salt Lake County and the State in addition to their attraction as a premier recreation destination. The natural beauty, recreational opportunities and proximity of the Wasatch Canyons to the Wasatch Front are a significant attraction for new businesses and businesses that are recruiting skilled employees. The Canyons therefore have a substantial impact on the Utah economy as a whole.
19. BROADBAND AND COMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE EXPANSION

GOAL: SUPPORT THE EXTENSION OF BROADBAND AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS HARDWARE TO ENHANCE COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES IN THE WASATCH CANYONS.

STRATEGY CHOICES

1. Evaluate and modify, if necessary, communications infrastructure and CIP plans so that they are consistent with the General Plan.

2. Incentivize development of communications infrastructure in appropriate areas and achieve other goals such as public safety improvements and environmental protection.

3. Investigate other methods of providing broadband services (preferred providers, county partnerships, etc.)

4. Ensure that new communications infrastructure is designed and installed per General Plan goals regarding aesthetics, environmental and water quality, and character of the canyons.

5. Implement improvements in broadband and telecommunications in the canyons.

BACKGROUND

Enhanced electrical capacity and improved fiber optic, wireless, and broadband are critical to support year-round employment, local businesses, quality of life, tourism, and public safety. UDOT has recently installed real-time traffic monitoring equipment in Big Cottonwood and Little Cottonwood Canyons, which includes wireless communication capabilities. These improvements have expanded and improved cell communications in the Canyons.

In pursuing communications infrastructure upgrades, emphasis should be placed on broadband services to Big Cottonwood Canyon, Little Cottonwood Canyons, and improved cellular services to Mill Creek Canyon, which has significant gaps in coverage or available providers. Providers’ facilities should be consolidated or co-located.
As part of the community outreach process for the Wasatch Canyons General Plan Update, Salt Lake County hosted several open house events throughout July and August 2018. A series of 19 goals and corresponding strategies were presented for public review and feedback.

In addition to these open houses, two mobile workshops were held. One at the Donut Falls trailhead and one at Silver Lake. Approximately 500 people participated in these events, including residents, employees, business owners, community leaders, youth, and other stakeholders. The open house events were noticed on the project web-page, social media pages, project email lists, and by community groups.

In addition to the in-person events, an opportunity to participate online was provided in the form of a questionnaire. The online questionnaire contained the same questions and information from the in-person events and was meant to serve as a detailed comment tool for those wanting to dive into each goal and strategy.

The purpose of the goals and strategies outreach was to give interested members of the public an opportunity to provide input on potential goals and strategies for the Wasatch Canyons.

Large meeting rooms inside libraries and community centers were used for the open house's where several poster boards with each of the 19 goals were presented. Each board included a draft goal with space to rank the corresponding strategies, participants were directed the online questionnaire. Three large maps were also used to gather input on potential activity nodes in the project area.

Additional presentation boards included a “Where are you from?” map where participants were asked to place a pin where they lived, as well as “What we’ve been hearing” boards with a summary of public input gathered so far in the planning effort.

Special thank you to all those who took time to participate in these meetings.
The process provided an opportunity for the community and visitors to voice their values, describe pressing needs, and prioritize opportunities. A range of events were held to engage all types of respondents: kids, teenagers, families, locals, and visitors were given an opportunity to participate.
WHO DID WE HEAR FROM?

At each event we asked participants to place a pin on where they live to get a sense of where our participants were coming from. Each red dot represents 1 - 5 people.

WHERE ARE YOU FROM?

WHERE DID WE GO? THE MAP ABOVE WAS DISPLAYED AT THE FOLLOWING EVENTS:

July 26th, 2018
Sandy City Library

July 31st, 2018
Whitmore Library, Cottonwood Heights

August 14th, 2018
Millcreek Community Center
WHAT WE HEARD

The enthusiasm towards community engagement and passion of local residents was evident in the responses received during the goals and strategies events. The following is a summary of residents and visitors shared feedback. Below are the goals that received the most positive feedback during our public open houses.

**Goal 9: ENSURE THE MANAGEMENT OF WATERSHEDS IN THE WASATCH MOUNTAINS TO PROTECT WATER QUALITY AND QUANTITY.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal 1A: IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF RECREATION FOR VISITORS AND RESIDENTS WHILE MEETING THE NEEDS FOR ANTICIPATED FUTURE DEMAND.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal 11: ENHANCE PUBLIC AWARENESS AND STEWARDSHIP OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND RECREATIONAL VALUES AND PRACTICES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal 3: SUPPORT ENHANCED YEAR ROUND TRANSIT SERVICE TO AND WITHIN THE WASATCH CANYONS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal 10: ENSURE THAT FUTURE USE OF AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE WASATCH CANYONS IS MANAGED TO PROTECT WILDLIFE, FISHERIES AND HABITAT AND TO REDUCE HUMAN-WILDLIFE CONFLICTS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**COMMENT SUMMARY**

The following is a summary of goals and strategies rating results from the choices events and general feedback received on each vision draft goal.

**GOAL 1 A: IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF RECREATION FOR VISITORS AND RESIDENTS WHILE MEETING THE NEEDS FOR ANTICIPATED FUTURE DEMAND.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Written Comments**

- Is this possible?
- Easements for trailhead/public land access should be a priority
- Need to figure out the carrying capacity instead of filling demand
- Define “Meeting needs”
- We need a major transportation hub at the gravel pit
- Connect trails to GIS system to help hikers navigate the trails
- More signage on trails and historical landmarks
- I want better access to the canyons but no trax line up the canyon
- This goal is so vague as to be meaningless. How are these terms defined? What kind of recreation? Front country, side country, backcountry, developed, not developed? Answers to the survey depend upon these definitions.
- How exactly does one “Maintaining The Needs for Anticipated Future Demand.” ...Poorly written.
- Should be focusing on meeting needs for future demand should also include focus of how those areas will be conserved with higher future demand. If construction is done on new parking areas, needs to be careful of harming surrounding water sources as well as protected wildlife and vegetation.
- I strongly believe we must install a toll in both Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons as we have in Millcreek to improve the current problems with pedestrian and cyclist danger/risk, traffic, pollution, and drug and alcohol use up these canyons.
- Don’t pave trails. Need bathrooms and parking, but only at high use areas.
- SOMETHING NEEDS TO BE DONE AT DONUT FALLS/CARDIFF FORK ROAD!!!!!!!!!!!!
- What are “the needs for anticipated future demand”?
- I don’t know what you want to do to “Improve the Quality of Recreation for Visitors?” Paving hiking trails is not an improvement in my mind. What kind of improvements is this question talking about?
- Residents’ quality of life must be highest priority. Future development should be limited and minimize the impacts of commercial activities.
- it depends. Does that mean develop the “quality” until your pockets are overflowing? Or does that actually mean limiting development so that we can enjoy the quality of the natural places that already exist?
- Better explanation needed of what you mean by ‘quality of recreation’
- It’s unclear what the real intent of this statement is.
- shut it down... the canyons are too busy, too many people parking at the bird/Alta. Too many skiers, too many vandals in the lower canyon.
- In so far as any supposed growth or development by ski resorts does not destroy or degrade local conservation efforts.
- Need to be careful here as the canyons are already getting “loved” to death much like our National Parks

**STRATEGIES**

**OVERALL SYSTEM**

1. Support the USFS in maintaining a quality trail system canyon wide.
Written Comments
- As long as it gets done. Otherwise take control locally
- What does “quality trail system” mean? Does a quality trail system come at the expense of natural beauty and habitat? If so, then hell no.
- Quality and well kept trail systems will hopefully promote less off trail exploration that diminishes landscapes.
- Yes, but not as urban pavement.
- Look to improve existing side canyon trails, a canyon length trail and perhaps a select # of Wilderness Trails. Only to the extent that there are funds for maintenance
- SOMETHING NEEDS TO BE DONE AT DONUT FALLS/CARDIFF FORK ROAD!!!!!!!!!!!!!
- The USFS is under paid, under staffed and a joke when it comes to patrolling the area. They are easily swayed by the powers up hill like Alta and Snowbird... Snowbird does as they please, encroaching, building, and parking everywhere.
- Unfortunately, Forest Service receives minimal funding from the federal government to manage recreation facilities and maintenance.

2. Establish a volunteer program to lead and train volunteers. Dedicate County staff time to coordinate with volunteer groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- This is unnecessary
- May want to partner with other programs or organizations to get a volunteer base.
- Leave that up to the Forest Service to coordinate and educate volunteer groups to maintain as the FS deems appropriate
- You community is your most undervalued workforce.
- What would the volunteers be doing?
- Great idea
- Yes, local canyon rangers, with training and backup.
- Volunteer groups are great but they take good management and nothing is free. If it is started then county needs to dedicate resources to keep it going.

3. Concentrate and encourage recreation use in key identified recreation activity nodes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- Spread it out as to not over crowd areas.
- Encourage recreation all over the Wasatch mountains not just certain areas.
- Explain. Try writing in plain English rather than business speak. What kind of recreation use? Different recreation uses require significantly different infrastructure which in turn impacts quality of experience, water quality, wildlife.
- Would a concentrated use in certain areas cause more breakdown of vegetation as well as displace wildlife?
- Ski Resorts yes. Allow people to make their own decisions on where they recreate
- SOMETHING NEEDS TO BE DONE AT DONUT FALLS/CARDIFF FORK ROAD!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
- If this means downhill only trails. Yes. Pretty vague definition prone to misinterpretation.
- If we encourage everyone to go to the activity nodes, won’t the activity nodes become very crowded and less enjoyable? The idea is to get away from the crowds a bit when we go to the canyons.
- Hard to tell what this means. What are the key identified recreation activity nodes? Is this code for “develop like crazy” with no restrictions? If so, I’m against it.
- It depends how
- Lets just make it hard to get to, cut the number of people.
4. Promote lesser-used recreation areas in Salt Lake County outside the Wasatch Canyons to provide alternatives to the frequently-used Wasatch Canyons. Alternatives could include the Oquirrh Mountains, Dimple Dell, Ensign Peak, Yellow Fork etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- Also need to coordinate with the state of UT & other UT counties to encourage expanding high-elevation resort skiing & backcountry ski access in other counties. You need to draw people away, not force them away.
- I believe that promoting other areas will help with higher demand.
- Stick to the high use areas
- Yes, absolutely
- Lets just put people everywhere geez, crazy around here
- Keep the people concentrated so the other areas will remain less used and more preferable to the die hards that seek them out.
- Yes, tell them to go to antelope island.
- Good to have other alternatives to try and limit impacts on heavily used Tri Canyon areas

5. Develop new phone and computer applications to maximize user experience, promote key recreational areas, and provide most up to date information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- Too often the information provided by these kinds of services lags too far behind the reality. This would be a waste of money unless you commit to providing the permanent staff to keep this information not just “up to date”, but up to the MINUTE.
- ride share apps - for climbers/cyclist/hikers
- This will drive more use and greater intensity, not less.
- in respect to emergency services yes, otherwise no.
- Would be useful for finding areas of interest but most and up to date information.
- More so for the transportation solutions. People want to get to their destination in a short time to enjoy their experience
- As a developer, i support the industry to promote software development. but, we don't need another thing to 'check'
- I'm not sure "promotion" is the right strategy with the public recreation system. The opportunities do not necessarily need promotion, although information about regulations, best practices, and current conditions does need to be promoted.
- The wilderness experience should limit availability of communications systems without limiting their availability for residents.
- We have the software and communications we need. This will be a waste of money.
- Private sector will do this better
- No way... why confuse the soul with mobile apps in the forest?

6. Work with willing sellers to acquire strategic land or easements for recreation access and management. Promote trailheads as transit friendly or ride sharing options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Written Comments
• Not if it hurts the value of the homes by the mouth of the canyons
• I prefer less encouragement to use canyons. Less traffic is desirable.
• What does sentence one have to do with sentence two? Only work with willing sellers if they abide by fair market value and are honest actors. What the hell does sentence have to do with sentence two.
• Maybe-but not in order to increase usage-but to better mitigate existing users
• Eliminate the snowmobiling permit with USFS for Cardiff Fork. Those folks routinely go past their boundary allow others to snowmobile in Cardiff. They ruin the experience for everyone with their bad attitude.
• These two unrelated objectives work against each other . . . why have you grouped them?
• Only if the land acquired isn’t just developed with no plan to keep wild places wild.
• Buying land is one of the best uses of money I can think of.
• Yup, get it all, keep the peace by buying out the share holders... Raise taxes and promote bonds.
• In so far as acquiring strategic land does not mean using public land for business purposes like expansion of ski resort areas. As long as appropriate impact studies are done and there is a public comment period.
• Very important as too much public land is locked off due to private land ownership.

RECREATION INFRASTRUCTURE
1. Assist the USFS in implementing their standards for the development of trailheads, parking areas, and other use areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Oppose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• Only if these standards protect the natural areas. More development of areas is not desirable.
• However, I believe these trailheads should be outside of purely residential areas to maintain the privacy of residents and to prevent high traffic areas in residential neighborhoods. These trailheads can be a short distance from the actual trail if necessary.
• Depends
• SOMETHING NEEDS TO BE DONE AT DONUT FALLS/CARDIFF FORK ROAD!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
• What does USFS stand for? United States Forest Service?
• Impossible to say unless you know what the USFS standards are and how they differ from current use.
• I don’t understand federal regulations. Generally local control is better.
• Less trail heads, less parking, more buses that drop off determined people
• In so far as the USFS consults with local desires and conducts appropriate impact studies when considering new parking areas or development of trailheads.
• I mostly agree but if parking in the canyons is increased then increase in traffic will also increase. Need to promote access to and use of mass transit. Promote more mass transit parking in strategic locations in the valley.

2. Provide and maintain key areas to include designated parking and needed amenities (garbage receptacles, restrooms, parking, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Oppose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• As long as key amenities maintain the quality of canyon experience and don’t lead to further development. For instance flushing toilets is a waste of resources and will lead to further development use.
• Day use fees for non canyon residents would offset this
• Again, I support this if it is not within a residential area.
• If construction is done on new parking areas, needs to be careful of harming surrounding water sources as well as protected wildlife and vegetation.
• Don’t pave trails
• If you don’t keep the toilets clean, the outside is the next choice. Lets keep water quality at the forefront.
• must allow signage for Skiers at the base of the Mountain with notices of parking limitations at Brighton and Solitude. Build more parking at Brighton and at the base of the mountain. More buses in Big Cottonwood all year round.
• This is THE priority which must be satisfied before expanding or creating new recreation infrastructure like trails.
• Yes, one at the top, one at the bottom.
• These are good but takes funding to keep up with regular maintenance

TRAILS
1. Work with the Forest Service to develop an updated trails master plan for the central Wasatch area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• But do not allow the proliferation of illegal trails. Close illegal trails. Don’t facilitate further trails at the expense of wildlife. Not every area needs to be biked.
• Lets not get carried away with too many trails that then can’t be maintained. Let’s not overburden Local Tax Payers. Quit building Government bureaucracy.
• This is important, but again, figuring out how we will maintain current infrastructure, and fulfilling the backlog of maintenance needs, must take place before we plan new facilities. In some cases, the ski areas do have enough amenities to permit some additional planning and development, although funding should be devoted to outstanding, existing needs before
• Trails yes, small silly parking lots for climbers are impossible to control... the USFS has no time, $, or manpower for this.
• Good ideas but funding is currently not there to keep up with existing use of existing trail system. Funding needs to be there for any expansion of trail system and maintenance.

2. Implement sustainable trail and trailhead design guidelines and work with volunteer trail groups on implementation projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• Sustainability throughout our recreation areas is extremely important. These ideas should shifted to work for the long term goal rather than short term, right now.
• Leave it up to the Forest Service
• SOMETHING NEEDS TO BE DONE AT DONUT FALLS/CARDIFF FORK ROAD!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
• The concept of sustainability too often becomes code language for achieving unstated objectives that are not generally acceptable

3. Complete the entire Bonneville Shoreline Trail for entire north to south system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• Would be superb under ideal conditions, but smog & summer heat would still drive people to higher elevations.
• But not at the expense of existing wilderness boundaries.
• I think the Bonneville shoreline area is a beautiful area that could support high demands. It is also an area that is extremely accessible and should be encouraged to stay that way.
• Not sure how you’ll cross Millcreek to Neffs
• Both for bicycles and hiking.
• Without limits to use - bicycles permitted.
• Bike access is the only option here.
• Pursue a trail MTB riders can use, but, not at the expense of completing the trail in a relatively timely fashion. I would rather see the project completed soon, with some segments MTB’s can’t use, than see it get delayed in order for the whole thing to be a MTB trail.
• A MUST !!!!!
• yes

4. Enhance selected high use trails (such as Donut Falls) to handle significant usage. High use trails whenever possible should be paved or well graded and include amenities such as benches, restrooms, drinking water, bus stops and parking.

![Survey Results]

Written Comments
• A select few but not many. I appreciate beauty as created by nature not paved paths. There might be a few trails this would help those less able to walk on dirt trails.
• graded, not paved yes to bathrooms, drinking water, bus stop, parking.
• Absolutely not! No paving of trails, or providing amenities and drinking water. It’s a goddamn canyon, not a city park treat it as such.
• I do not believe any trail needs to be paved. But amenities need to be adequate.
• Paved trails??? gasp!!
• These trails should be able to handle high usage yet also support the conservation and beauty of it.
• NO pavement. Are you kidding me? You can have well graded trails with restrooms and water. No on bus stops. Have you considered having pay shacks and closing the canyon when it’s too full?
• Try not to overburden the high use choices. Too much garbage, dogs that aren’t allowed. Public Service Announcements and Education sorely needed
• As a full-time resident in BCC, Cardiff is overrun. We need to get those people off the road that leads to private cabins and houses, and onto a trail. Making another paved walkway through the wetlands seems silly, a natural trail with a guard rail telling guests they have to stay on trail is better. Rather than accommodating more people on non-natural facilities we should let overrun places heal and limit visitation as well.
• Donut Falls NEEDS TO BE COMPLETELY ENHANCED to handle the immense number of people!!! A pedestrian trail is way overdue. Families with little children are endangered with the huge pedestrian traffic on the road.
• Pavement on a mountain trail is not enhancement. A well graded (smoothed) trail is also not enhancement. Make it rideable and hikeable. That’s all! Leave as many natural features as possible.
• Stop promoting this place
• Investments like these should be prioritized in areas where
• I do not agree with paving the trail to Donut Falls. Yes restrooms, parking and drinking water are nice to have. They do already have a restroom at the bottom of the trail.
• Let it remain a location for wilderness activities. For Example, We don’t need garbage collection but should expect users to remove their own garbage.
• making it easier for everyone to visit by car and no matter their ability leads to over-development, misuse, traffic congestion, etc.
• I hate the idea of that. Yet, probably will be needed in the future.
• Be careful with paving trails as they often do not hold up unless carefully designed and then need to be maintained. Consider other ways of hardening trails and provide for erosion control
• I’m sometimes skeptical about pavement. When things are finished and “clean”, they no longer look like wilderness anymore.
• DO NOT PAVE TRAILS.
5. Focus on enhancing foothill easement acquisition programs and trailhead developments (for areas such as Deaf Smith Canyon).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments

- Deaf Smith: This must be settled once and for all. Someone is going to get hurt.
- I oppose encouraging more access. It is ruining the existing ecosystem.
- Public access to Deaf Smith Canyon is extremely important. Illegal "No trespassing" signs at its mouth should be removed.
- Absolutely!
- I do not believe placing a trailhead in this residential neighborhood is appropriate. The trailhead itself should be outside of the neighborhood. It may be reasonable to have a neighborhood access point, but the main trailhead needs to start elsewhere. Can you imagine if an advertised trailhead went into your neighborhood and traffic and use then increased to the level we see at other advertised trailheads such as donut falls. It would not be fair to those residents. The trail may need to realigned to make this feasible but it is the only fair option.
- Absolutely! Long overdue. See state ombudsmans response on this topic to cottonwood heights city council.
- This goal must include a statement to minimize impact to residents and private landowners. For example, an easement to access Deaf Smith Canyon should prioritize a route from Little Cottonwood Rd rather than through the Top of the World/Kings Hill Dr neighborhood.
- What are "foothill easement acquisition programs?"
- These questions need to be dramatically simplified in order for me to provide meaningful feedback and input. I’m an educated, engaged citizen but this is not my area of expertise so I worry that I’m guessing what you mean when providing my answers. It’s not enough to send out citizen surveys. They must be accessible to all of us in order to provide useful data. Thank you.

GOAL 1 B: IMPROVE PUBLIC ACCESS FOR RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments

- While maintaining environment and air quality
- Access needs - mass transportation instead of cars
- Deincentivize driving cars
- Provide affordable mass transit
- Look at what Zion NP did! (Decrease parking invites more vehicle and auto use)
- Use mass transit, drop people off at trailheads
- SLCO Health Department is always looking for opportunities to promote free recreational opportunities to SLCO residents. More promotion could improve access?
- More Parking at major trailheads mass transit to all trailheads Is this possible?
- Public access to Deaf Smith Canyon is extremely important. Illegal "No trespassing" signs at its mouth should be removed.
- This needs to be done with the assistance of public transportation and not wider roads.
- Depends on the access, recreational opportunities and infrastructure.
- Again, not at the expense of current residents. You can increase access but it needs to be outside of the residential area. Realign the trail to make this happen.
- Improve public accent at The expense of the environment in the Wasatch and surrounding areas.
- Not sure what that means. Yes better, faster transportation solutions.
- Getting to the trail that lead to Lakes Mary, Martha, and Katherine has been a problem. Last time I traveled that trail from Brighton the marking was unclear to non existent.
• Solidifying sustainable funding for current infrastructure must be the priority.
• Improving public access is dangerous. When you make it easier for everyone, everyone comes and then you’ll have more people causing problems: injury/life rescues, fires, defecation, accidents, etc.
• There’s too much use already. Don’t make it worse by improving access.
• That means complying with federal access regs. Not a good fit for the outdoors.
• Honestly, it’s pretty good as is. the only thing that would be better is to try to REDUCE the number of cars on the roads. Honestly, there should be dedicated, FREE, UTA buses running up and down canyon every 15 minutes during the winter (at least during peak ski times, and maybe every 30 minutes during the summer with specific trailhead stops along the way.

STRATEGIES
OVERALL SYSTEM
1. Establish additional locations for parking lots, recreational access to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail, and other recreational open spaces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Written Comments
• This needs to be done in locations that allow for the use of public transportation and not at the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon and other areas that ruin the ability of residents to get into and out of their homes and communities. Establish park n ride areas close to freeways and major roads and out of neighborhoods.
• Only if outside of the canyons.
• No parking lots in residential areas.
• No, no, and no parking lots along Wasatch blvd. This is a residential area. Create reciprocal parking agreements with private property owners in Holladay and Cottonwood Heights office/business park at 300 east and 6200 south.
• Only in order to serve major new segments; there seem to be enough trailheads to serve the existing trail segments.
• Do not facilitate commercial activities.
• Depends on the cost.
• Only for lower in the canyons, or just outside.

2. Utilize multiple funding sources to protect and maintain key parcels for open space and recreational access through acquisition with willing sellers or conservation easements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>76</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Written Comments
• I support open space but not increased access. I want to discourage traffic.
• Especially to unclog the traffic on Wasatch, Canyon Roads so people are not trapped in or out of their neighborhoods while the skiers idle for hours.
• The state has less than 30% private lands as it is. To acquire additional private lands and put them into the public venue adds to the tax of the balance of private property. It is time to consider a use tax on public use of public lands for the purpose of maintaining them and enhancing the experience.
• what kind of funding sources would be used? a large question is where are you getting the funds to promote these ideas and how will you keep funds to sustain these changes.
• Not through General tax increases. Hotel, restaurant Canyon fees, tourist tax.
• SOMETHING NEEDS TO BE DONE AT DONUT FALLS/CARDIFF FORK ROAD!!!!!!!!!!!!
• Easements if possible. Purchase if required to provide access.
• Do not facilitate commercial activities.
3. Pursue acquisitions with willing sellers of land at trailheads for additional facilities and parking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Written Comments**
- strongly support 5
- strongly oppose 1
- neutral 3
- neutral 2

- protect the watershed by requiring solar panels with back up generators on all new properties, and 1 of every four residential units accessible for disabled and clustered on ground floor. charge developers impact fees adequate to cover the additional infrastructure building and maintenance and required including roads and school.
- This should include working with local municipalities when contemplating the construction of new facilities or upgrades of existing facilities
- Again, look for park n ride areas that can utilize public transportation and ride sharing rather than burdening residential areas with parking facilities.
- No additional parking in the canyons. Parking is the only existing limitation on increased use in the canyons and is the closest thing to limiting capacity as is currently available. Until the county can identify canyon carrying capacities no additional parking to facilitate greater capacity should be allowed. Just look what increased visitation has done to destroy Zion's environmental quality, we don't want that for the Wasatch and we don't need it for the watershed.
- Not in residential areas.
- parking lots and developed trail heads are not necessary, as in case of Death Smith. Hikers can walk in from Golden Hills Park, parking area, etc. Please learn from the mistake at Ferguson Canyons. Neighbors are at a loss as to how to remedy the issues with cars, noise, trash, and off-leash dogs there.
- sellers only need to be willing and the government should offer an acceptable amount for property.
- Limit the number of visitors/parking
- SOMETHING NEEDS TO BE DONE AT DONUT FALLS/CARDIFF FORK ROAD!!!!!!!!!
- Do not facilitate commercial activities.
- Additional parking in the canyons draws more traffic so need to be careful
- Keep it natural

**GOAL 2: EXPLORE AND IMPLEMENT OPTIONS FOR DEDICATED FUNDING SOURCES TO ASSIST THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CANYONS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS AND TO PROVIDE ONGOING SUPPORT FOR MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS TO SUPPORT THE GROWING DEMANDS OF THE CANYONS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Written Comments**
- very against tolls, but open to other options
- NO tolls
- Parking fee instead
- More passing lanes where possible (HOV)
- Deincentivize single occupant vehicles
- Offer discounts on “mass transit” passes for people volunteering for service projects, low income, students, and elderly
- I support principle of canyon users funding canyon improvements
- Educate toll payers where their money is going as well
- Let the people who use it pay for it
- Have an annual pass, make it reasonably priced
- I would prefer an annual pass for canyon use with a personal vehicle or a reduced fee pass for bus access
do not pile tax raises and fees on the residents of the towns. No big deal developments like tunnels and Swiss style trains.
• This is critical. Nothing in this plan gets done if this doesn't happen.
• This is where the use tax comes into play. The toll in Millcreek Canyon is an example.
• Support maintenance of existing uses and facilities but not creation of new ones.
• are there already these kinds of options available?
• SOMETHING NEEDS TO BE DONE AT DONUT FALLS/CARDIFF FORK ROAD!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
• Do not facilitate commercial activities.
• Either the County, the State, of the USFS need to start charging a fee for driving up BCC and LCC. It works in Millcreek Canyon and is absolutely necessary in BCC and LCC.
• Some Public funding will be needed. I prefer user fees.

STRATEGIES
OVERALL SYSTEM
1. Implement Canyon user fees or roadway tolls, with a portion of the tolls to be used within the canyons for trailheads, restrooms, etc.

Written Comments
• Why not use all of the toll “within the Canyon”? 
• I believe ALL fees collected should go to funding the canyon itself and the collecting of the fees. I am strongly against if ANY funds go else where!
• ABSOLUTELY. Take the burden off the backs of the property owners and those who do not use the facilities.
• Make the resorts pay extra as many of these accommodations are done for the purpose of peaks in visitation - much of which is resort driven.
• But locals (city wide) should be exempt from fees
• If there are any tolls in place all of the money should go to the protection and conservation of the canyons. Recreation needs to be accessible to everyone especially in our public lands. Toll should be very small and all of the money needs to go directly to the canyon.
• An absolute must to take the financial load off taxpayers and improve safety and beauty in our canyons.
• Yes, support tolls and also maximum amount of users
• ALL of the roadway tolls or fees should be used in the canyon in which they were generated!
• Please do this ASAP for both LCC and BCC. We have to have both tolled at the same time to avoid increased congestion in either.
• SOMETHING NEEDS TO BE DONE AT DONUT FALLS/CARDIFF FORK ROAD!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
• Would be in favor if a) fees were used directly for the canyons and b) reasonable monthly & annual passes were available. Higher fee if actually using a facility, lower if just driving through or up/back.
• All of the money collected should be put to use in the canyon not just “a portion.”
• I think having one pass for Millcreek and a pass that encompasses both Little and Big Cottonwood is a reasonable request.
• Look at peak pricing
• ALL the user fees should stay within that canyon
• As much of this revenue as possible must remain in the canyons
• This has been wonderful for Millcreek canyon. The other canyons MUST have it too.... it will make the LCC and BCC experience much better for all,by the improvements these funds can generate directly.
• Do not burden canyon residents.
• Works in Millcreek, we strongly support tolls to increase revenue to accomplish other goals

2. Create a Regional Wasatch Canyons Recreation District (Local or Special Service District).
Written Comments
• only if the group is impartial and promotes wildlife and area wild conservation. Not interested in seeing more dead doe/fawns, spray paint and garbage (Suicide Rock area)
• We don’t need another layer of government.
• I can’t support something that does not have much supporting information
• We want transparency and voter input on options, a then a vote at election time.
• no - too much red tape already
• This is a slippery slope. Local and Special Service Districts place the burden back on the property owners rather than on the USERS.
• How would this work with existing districts, Mountainous Planning, CWC, etc?
• less agencies. part of the problem is too many agencies have ideas/agendas for these areas.
• I am not quite sure what this would do for the Wasatch?
• Keep taxes minimal for locals
• For what intent?
• No more layers of government and taxation
• Depends on governance, political context
• Do not facilitate commercial activities.
• As long as this is not controlled solely by a new town of Brighton or Alta, it should be controlled by the County.
• too many cooks in the kitchen. Cut it down, keep it simple.
• Absolutely. The Wasatch is what makes SLC what it is, we all need to help keep them pristine.

3. Apply for grants through Zoo, Arts and Parks Tax (known as the ZAP or RAP tax).

Written Comments
• Again, this is placing the burden on the property owner and will lead to property tax increases.
• if available, then yes.
• Grants funding is a great way to pay for projects as long as the funding is going to the correct place and projects.
• SOMETHING NEEDS TO BE DONE AT DONUT FALLS/CARDIFF FORK ROAD!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
• Good idea except the animals belong outside the zoo, I don’t support incarceration of nature. Sorry.
• This is meant for in-city funding, don’t take from them

4. Request a portion of Transient Room and Lodging Taxes.

Written Comments
• YES, this allows the burden to fall back on the likely users from out of state or out of the area.
• impact of users is not a transient/visitor issue. it’s locals, and everyone else alike impacting canyon use.
• SOMETHING NEEDS TO BE DONE AT DONUT FALLS/CARDIFF FORK ROAD!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
• Make a specific transient room tax for the canyons, i.e. Snowbird and Alta, so that the visitors also help pay a larger share of the costs and facilities
• NO, NO, NO! That’s the reason we have a problem in the first place - tourists! Just stop building!!!
• This is local. We should be paying for it.
• The canyons are a world-renowned tourist draw, so it makes sense to let them pay a share of keeping them in good shape.

5. Tap into funding resources from foundations, grants, State, federal, and other revenue sources.
Written Comments
- Not if you are making us eligible for help by making Cottonwood Heights distressed by tax increases, manipulated high density, and no traffic control in ski season.
- Why does the public care where the money is coming from?
- where available.
- using these funding resources is good but these sources are not unlimited supplies of money. they need be spent in a smart way.
- SOMETHING NEEDS TO BE DONE AT DONUT FALLS/CARDIFF FORK ROAD!!!!!!!!!!!!
- There are already so many competing needs for this limited funding. Tourists should instead pay more fees to help protect and maintain the reasons they come here.
- User fees are better here.
- Millcreek City has been wildly successful with this approach

6. Implement tax share back agreements or tax increment financing.

GOAL 3: SUPPORT ENHANCED YEAR ROUND TRANSIT SERVICE TO AND WITHIN THE WASATCH CANYONS.

Written Comments
- Parking fees should be free or low cost
- No tolls
- Gravel pit and 9400 s and highland
- Transit hubs to accommodate cars
- Create partnerships between UTA, resorts, owner associations
- Transit to all major trailheads
- Improve mass transit, gravel pit is a great place for a mass transit hub
- The problem is continuous service is expensive, but without continuous service, people will not use it
- In Little Cottonwood Canyon in the winter I think we should be looking to how traffic is done for Zermatt Switzerland. It's time for a change to a train.
- Get some traffic control on Little Cottonwood
- need to limit single ride cars and charge them.
- This is a critical paradigm shift for the Canyons area that is the only viable solution to reducing Canyon traffic. UTA has shown hesitancy to be actively engaged in this planning process, and that needs to change.
- Already commented
- But being mindful of impacts that accompany increased capacity and use.
- the Wasatch canyons that are enjoyed by people all year long. Accessibility for some parts of the year is more difficult for some than others. What kind of ways would they be more accessible? different roads? more snow plowing for the winter months?
- Quick and efficient. with not too much impact. If solution is environmentally impacting short term, the solution should be the 50-100 year answer
- If taxes are not increased, I support it.
- Within canyons maybe, but not to additional routes for access to the canyons.
- This MUST happen... we are running out of parking spaces in Big Cottonwood and other places
- PLEASE do this... we need it. There are too many cars in BCC and LCC and other recreational areas. I would use good and timely transit to these places!!
• It sounds like a good idea but I really don’t think that many people would actually use it.
• charge a high price to take a personal car up the canyon (like $20 a trip) and make transit free up the canyons - you’ll solve the traffic problem.
• And make it free to reduce cars in the canyons!

STRATEGIES

OVERALL SYSTEM

1. Support the development of transit centers/hubs outside Canyons, but within reasonable distance of entrances. Transit centers should provide access to a variety of transportation choices and information and to connect to the regional transportation system. Encourage these hubs in mixed-use/business centers where parking can be shared.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• Sounds time-consuming and complicated for the traveler. Need to consider a very large number of small, express (non-stop) shuttles from many starting points, such as South Town Mall to Albion Basin or Jordan Commons to Snowbird Center.
• People won’t use it.
• Focus transit in large transit hubs, and decrease the amount of stops between them (i.e. Gravel pit, 9400 S & Highland Drive, etc.). Again, we need to rethink the way we’ve thought about transit in the past.
• Already commented on this.
• be careful where and how these are implemented. for BCC & LCC from north approach a hub at gravel pit is appropriate. From south(Sandy) access to LCC reminder that there is a hub already on 9800 south... less redundancy and minimize impact of park lots, please.
• very popular places should all have a bus line of some sort that can take individuals up into the canyons. downtown areas especially because of tourism.

2. Assist funding to support UTA with increased year round bus service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• no need for funding uta-air quality is issue and shuttle and bus service should be provided for community.
• Yes, but only with a commitment by UTA to actively work towards rethinking transit and providing solutions in the Canyons. I’m strongly opposed to increased funding to UTA if they don’t actively engage in various planning processes and make changes.
• UTA needs to provide bus service to the canyons from the north, not just via 9400 South!
• UTA needs to figure out their own financing as need for services up the canyons increases.
• This hopefully is only the immediate to 10 year plan. We need longer term solutions
• Will it increase taxes? If it does I strongly oppose.

3. Where possible, develop ride-share and bus pullouts at key use nodes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• Not sure about the year round issue as much as a greatly needed winter increase in the Cottonwoods
• With large transit centers and more efficient service, this is unnecessary. This idea reinforces current bad habits of having way too many transit stops, which makes transit less desirable for the public.
• Require capacity studies to ensure increased visitation made possible by better transit doesn’t lead to the overall degradation of the canyons.
• Only if placed with strategic caution, and minimal impact to adjoining neighborhoods in immediate vicinity of both canyons.
• no, keep the cars out.

4. Incentivize carpooling/share vehicle or programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• There needs to be a bigger change than this. Large scale transportation. Trains
• charge single ride cars a fee
• how would this be done? could people carpooling not have to pay a toll if implemented? or would there be carpool only parking?
• this did not work for U of U. I doubt it would work for the general public.
• keep them full 4 passengers only.

5. Support the development of areas, such as pickup spots, that prioritize rideshare vehicles, transit, and electric vehicles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• Same as above
• Depends on where it is.
• these can be same hubs/nodes.
• what kind of things would you develop to make these goals?
• People with electric vehicles should not get special treatment.
• Electric vehicles shouldn't get special treatment. Batteries are caustic to our environment.

6. Support increased transit frequency and additional stops at critical locations in the canyons such as trailheads to improve usability and ridership of public transit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• A double-edge sword. Makes it a long trip for those going to Albion Basin.
• The increased frequency of stops in the Canyons themselves needs to be reactive to the season. We need less stops in the winter, and more in the summer. Still, the number of transit stops outside the Canyons needs to decrease and be focused.
• Increase transit at peak times, cut back mid-day trips that are empty.
• Yes, UTA should make it extremely easy to get outside.
• If the cost of the public transit is cheaper than driving an economical personal vehicle and if the public transit provides a way to carry multiple bicycles. Right now my personal vehicle can carry 5 bicycles and when the cost of gas is divided 5 ways the cost of going up and down Big Cottonwood canyon is less than $1 per person.
• YES,YES, YES !!! I am hopeful Utahans can learn this to be a great way to get to the mountains.
• There should be an electric bus service that comes every 10 minutes and picks up at the gravel pit.
• Great idea. Somehow there needs to be an incentive for people to do this. I would not complain if we just banned cars up canyons. What would the resort industry say about that when their out of stat guests come with rental cars?
MILLCREEK CANYON
1. Consider voluntary permitted summer shuttle service.

| Strongly Support | 43 |
| Strongly Oppose | 21 |

Written Comments
- Not needed
- or, commercial enterprise.
- Would you need a shuttle service during the summer if you have a bus service?
- This is already being done. Why does it have to be permitted? If the permits are free, I would support permits. But why?
- What makes Millcreek Canyon great is it’s LACK of access. Keep it that way.

BIG AND LITTLE COTTONWOOD CANYONS
1. Support the addition of summer UTA bus service and significantly increased winter service to key destinations.

| Strongly Support | 61 |
| Strongly Oppose | 25 |

Written Comments
- Winter for sure, summer not so much
- Oktoberfest is a joke - no shuttles? Summer activity in canyon needs shuttles.
- Add service at peak times, not all day long. UTA should use the data from the users on the routes to add more buses in the busier times.
- Summer bus would be a great idea. Make the canyons accessible to everyone!
- If the cost is minimal and the buses can carry multiple bicycles. More than 5 or 6. Not just two. And taxes are not increased to support it. Tax revenue for UTA has increased over 77 million dollars from 2008 to 2017. Funding for increased bus service cannot come from increased taxes!
- This is not a Canyons issue but a Ski resort issue, I think more people would take public transit if 1) There were more lockers available for rent at the ski resorts 2) the lockers were cheaper to rent.. the only reason we haven’t taken the buses is because we don’t have anywhere to store our ski stuff/ lunch when we’re skiing.
- These are all good ideas . . your survey doesn’t enable us to prioritize our preferences.
- The buses should originate at the bottom of the Canyon and be very frequent (every 10 minutes). Buses should not originate in Sandy but drop off form Sandy.
- Add express buses that go directly to key points like Alta/Snowbird so that the bus doesn’t take so long. Have buses available specifically for ski area workers.
- As an incentive, resorts could provide free or discounted lockers and equipment storage for those using buses and shuttles. Having no place to put equipment is a disincentive for using transit.
- Did I mention making it FREE?

GOAL 4: SUPPORT ADEQUATE ROADWAY FACILITIES TO ENHANCE SAFETY AND MODE CHOICE IN THE WASATCH CANYONS.

| Strongly Support | 8 |
| Strongly Oppose | 1 |

Written Comments
- Work with UFA to ensure needs of emergency personnel are met when traveling down the canyon in a hurry.
- But don’t make parking lots larger
- Maybe a bike and bus lane?
• Install more restrooms at trailheads
• NOT bigger parking lots in the canyons, this will incentivize driving up. Provide adequate parking at gravel pit and 9400 south and highland
• Downhill bike lanes
• Get bikes out of the roadway
• More parking at major trailheads
• Off street bike paths in Big Cottonwood and Little Cottonwood Canyons
• As you have noted, this can only be partially successful.
• what does this mean
• I support this concept, but “enhance safety” is too broad. What does this mean?
• English, please.
• how would mode choice be enhanced throughout this development? What other kinds of mode choices are you trying to promote.
• not too many signs, cross walks, lights etc. this is the Forest.
• I don’t know what you mean by this statement.
• The only way enhancing safety and mode choice would realistically work is to expand the footprint of canyon roads, which would have a tremendously negative environmental impact.
• Mode choice should be based only on how much you’re willing to spend to drive your personal car up. Nothing else. Personal auto=high dollar; public transit=free.
• Don’t know what this means

STRATEGIES
OVERALL SYSTEM
1. Support roadway design that allows for transit and increased occupancy rates where appropriate. Pursue enhancements to Park and Ride lots.

Written Comments
• Enhancements should be a complete refocusing of the park and ride concept to major transit hubs
• How about a designated bike lane
• Make sure to only make this happen when appropriate. Do not move natural landscapes for another driving lane.
• Not increased occupancy rates
• It simply HAS to happen. We are on the cusp of disaster and tragedy the way the roads are currently being used.
• I would not support roadway design for more cars, if that is what this is asking
• No, no more cars, let the pot holes form, let the road deteriorate, keep the rental cars out... keep the tourists out..
• The bigger the parking lots the more people that come and the more hotels we need at Alta and Snowbird. Parking for park and ride I support.

2. Work with UDOT and UTA to integrate active transportation planning in the Canyons.

Written Comments
• Make certain this does not include Park n Ride that infringes on private residences and the ability of the residents to get to and from their homes. Also that the Park N Ride areas do not become eye sores, such as tall parking structures at the mouths of the canyons.
• What kind of active transportation planning will there be for this plan? Make sure that when saying active you really mean that you are active.
• Maybe. Don’t know what how you’re defining “active transportation planning”

3. Utilize appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) when upgrades and enhancements to roads are performed to address stormwater impacts to the watershed and water quality. Ensure there is a funding source for maintenance of BMPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• water quality for the valley is a very important factor to promote throughout any upgrades. funding is also important. Our goal should always be to have clean water in the long term.
• No new taxes.
• Again, maybe. But what do you define as “best practices” -- that’s such a blanket (and mostly useless) statement. Be specific.
• As long as the new roads are not used to create more development.
• let the roads get bad.

PARLEY’S CANYON
1. Support construction of an off-street bicycle pathway (uphill and downhill) connecting Salt Lake County and Summit County via Parley’s Canyon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• Only if bikers cover a majority of the costs.
• And up and down all canyons!
• This will be a great way to promote more modes of transportation as well as promote outdoor recreation.
• Only if bicyclists are FORCED to use this. Otherwise it’s a waste of tax dollars.
• Make it also accessible to hikers/runners
• too far for most people to utilize. not good payback.
• This is already being done. It has already been studied.
• I strongly support this as a user/commuter between Salt Lake and Summit counties.
• Maybe - depends on where the funds for this come from, and what else is sacrificed

MILL CREEK, BIG AND LITTLE COTTONWOOD CANYONS
1. Provide a bicycle lane in the uphill direction, where feasible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• “Where feasible” is the key statement. Where it is NOT feasible, DO NOT ALLOW bike traffic. It is too dangerous and disrupts traffic flow. Currently, bike traffic should not be allowed in Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons. If allowed, it should be restricted to early morning hours and only during day light (6-8am). This would restrict it to summer only.
• I think this should be at the top of the safety list. Too many cyclists are killed every year.
• If you provide for a bike lane make it all the way or not at all.

2. Provide downhill bicycle shared-lane marking and signage in the Cottonwood Canyons, where possible as much as the terrain and site conditions will allow.
Written Comments
- This is cheap and easy, and could be done today. I’m not sure why this has to be in the plan.
- See above...
- The bicyclists do whatever they want regardless of rules, regulations, road markings, and signage.
- Bicycles should be held to a speed limit as in city creek canyon
- Can we just ban bikes in the canyons? lol.

3. Where needed, provide downhill bicycle pullouts and passing areas.

Written Comments
- This would need to be for uphill bike traffic as well. Currently, bikes create a problem for traffic except in the areas of Little Cottonwood with passing lanes. Restrictions of timing in the Cottonwood Canyons should be implemented. A toll or pass for bicycles as well as cars should be implemented. They are supposed to live by the same rules as motorized transportation, hence a toll should be included.
- pullouts and passing areas will be very important for the safety of the bikers.
- dumb
- Great idea. However, experience has shown that the bicyclists will ride where there is the least amount of road debris and that is in the center of the road.
- Where needed?
- And require bicycles to go the speed limit - I am regularly passed by downhill bicycles in Millcreek Canyon, even if I am near or just over the speed limit


Written Comments
- Expensive. Create the bicycle toll.
- this kind of lane in this area will be very important. guardsman pass is very narrow and may be very dangerous for bikers, especially when cars are not paying attention.
- dumb
- At the pass? What does that mean?
- These are all good ideas . . your survey doesn't enable us to prioritize our preferences.

GOAL 5: MEET THE GROWING DEMANDS FOR RESIDENTS, BUSINESSES, AND VISITORS BY ENHANCING AND IMPROVING PUBLIC UTILITY SYSTEMS.

Written Comments
- More bathroom and serviced more often
- #4 yes, funds stay in canyons
- Demand will always increase, capacity of the natural environment will not
- More bathrooms and maps
- Residents chose to live in a canyon, why should the rest of county residents subsidize their chosen lifestyle by paying for enhancing and improving their utility systems?
- you cannot meet the needs of all people throughout the valley. If everyones needs were met the Wasatch would not be able to support all of the people and infrastructure. Make sure the needs of the mountains
are being met more so than the people.

- Does this mean Internet? We already have great water. It is only as the masses litter and pee in the forest that it affects you.
- Residents/Businesses can pay for any needs they have. As a frequent canyon visitor I do not ever see a need for enhanced public utilities.
- This is too vague - need more information on what types of public utilities, and if the purpose is to increase lodging and other commercial uses - if so, I would oppose
- Public Utility investments should not be made to support development in the Canyons.
- Depends - need more info on how
- I don't know if this is talking about plumbing for additional bathrooms, or what.
- I live at the mouth of Little Cottonwood, I am not in favor of increasing businesses up the canyon, not in favor of more residences in the canyon, it should be off limits for development.
- It would be better for the organizations to work within the confines of what exists rather then trying to increase. That doesn't preclude maintenance and upgrades, but require users to fit in with what exists.

**STRATEGIES**

**OVERALL SYSTEM**

1. Work with agency partners to identify public infrastructure needs to address residential, recreational, environmental, and business impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Written Comments**

- I do not believe there needs to be much more infrastructure in our canyons. If there is infrastructure it needs to be small and not largely impact these delicate areas.
- It would be nice to feel like the public matters, not just the profiteers/ski resorts/business owners. Work on being very overt with your “worst” and most disputed ideas as you currently are seen as good old boys scratching one another’s backs.
- Infrastructure. What needs? As a frequent visitor my needs, while in the canyons, are being met.
- See comment above
- Business impacts are not the priority and shouldn’t even be in this list.
- As long as this is not related to new residential development.
- I thought that was what the Wasatch Accord was already doing?
- Infrastructure needs means more building, more development, more noise and pollution in the canyons?

2. Evaluate infrastructure needs and coordinate agency capital improvement plans (CIPs) to ensure they are consistent with the General Plan. Ensure General Plan projects (to be identified) are in CIPs and prioritize their implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Written Comments**

- also, be sure the GP is consistent with local area GP's... therein lies a huge problem with Cottonwood Heights.
- Consistent with the general plan as well as sustainable and environmentally friendly.
- Work with community councils in Big Cottonwood Can. and the town of Alta
- This feels like a statement made specifically to do whatever the State wants. Infrastructure improvements shouldn't be prioritized until after residents get a say in whether we should do them or not.
- As long as this is not related to increased development in the canyons.
3. Evaluate infrastructure priorities and incentives for development in appropriate areas that achieve environmental protection, recreational impact mitigation, and other goals consistent with the General Plan.

Written Comments
- Minimize developments in canyon area.
- see above comment.
- What kind of incentives? I would hop they would be environmentally based incentives that may be cost effective. Incentives to protect the environment and that are sustainable should be priority.
- There is enough infrastructure right now. If a visitor reaches a trailhead and there is no more parking available, then that trail is too busy already. Choose another trail.
- As long as this is not related to increased development in the canyons.

4. Evaluate all funding options to support development and maintenance of needed infrastructure. All funds generated within the canyons should be spent within the Canyons

Written Comments
- That includes property taxes on canyon properties that are currently going to schools. If the properties are 2nd homes, the property taxes should stay in the canyon areas.
- YES! all of the funding generated within the canyons go to the canyons! This will make users feel more confident in paying tolls, parking fees etc. The canyons should not be making profit off of these funding implementations.
- This is a must!
- Winter visitors to the canyons are there to primarily visit the privately owned ski resorts. Whose pockets are being lined by all those visitors? Use some of that money to make improvements. Many summer visitors are there to stay at the resorts too. Ski resorts even get free advertising on Utah license plates. Charge for that advertising.
- How do you define, “all funds generated within the canyons would be spent within the Canyons?” Giving funding to UTA, will that count as spent in the canyons?
- These are all good ideas . . . your survey doesn’t enable us to prioritize our preferences.
- sounds nice, but really isn’t, unless the money is spent cleaning up the mess we allow by making the rules for rich, white males. Dumb way to spend money, isn’t it?
- As long as this is not related to increased development in the canyons.

GOAL 6: SUPPORT YEAR-ROUND PARKING MANAGEMENT TO PROVIDE PARKING IN DESIGNATED LOCATIONS THAT PROVIDE SAFETY, SCENIC QUALITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION THROUGHOUT THE CANYONS AND FOOTHILLS.

Written Comments
- Don’t like dynamic pricing
- More parking places and better management at major trailheads
- Do not stop people from parking at other places, must encourage distribution
- Discourage parking and driving
- Don’t make small businesses pay for expensive improvements with small impacts when USFS and SLCO will not reduce their dramatically larger impacts
- Summer trailheads, sell parking passes
• Create large parking facility/hub at gravel pit with coffee shops, food, hotel, etc
• Work with office buildings to share parking spaces on weekdays
• Central transportation hub at the gravel pit!
• NO increase in parking in the canyons, more parking only invites more cars
• Reduce fees per number of passengers to mitigate co2 impacts
• I LOVE dynamic pricing
• What does this mean?
• let the ski resorts pay for building parking structures. they are the ones hurting for profits and patrons, so they can tow the line with the expense of building these structures.
• Parking management? Sounds stupid to me. At places like Mill D and Donut Falls. Paint parking stripes on the ground and put up no parking signs where it’s not allowed. Done. When the parking is full people have to go elsewhere. Done. In winter, places like White Pine and the Spruces areas take care of themselves. When parking is full, people go elsewhere.
• What would this actually accomplish? The Cottonwood Canyons need a user fee to limit overcrowding. That’s the only feasible way of managing the parking situation.
• Increased parking in the canyons will only invite more traffic.

STRATEGIES

OVERALL SYSTEM

1. Collaborate with UDOT, UTA, and the Forest Service to develop a parking system master plan for parking and canyon transportation. Construct parking structures/transit center or park-n-ride near entrances in or nearby cities close to the Canyons with connections to transit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>StrONGLY SUPPORT</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>STRONGLY OPPOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• No, no, and no parking lots along Wasatch!
• Parking outside of the canyons, in places easily accessible to users as well as close enough to make it time efficient to bring them in could solve a parking problems concerning the environment but still try to meet growth.
• let the public decide, and vote.
• Better to increase parking outside the canyons to support the increase use of mass transit

2. Encourage striping parking lots and allowed roadside parking areas to maximize parking availability. In dangerous areas removed roadside parking to minimize pedestrian and vehicle conflicts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY SUPPORT</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>STRONGLY OPPOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• We need to rethink transit parking. Construct a few huge parking hubs and remove small park and rides to reduce corridor congestion.
• DO NOT allow “ROADSIDE” parking. Put the emphasis back on public transportation and shared ridership. As stated in this paragraph..roadside parking by definition limits pedestrian and vehicle access and increases the potential for conflicts/accidents.
• Remove roadside parking except in existing pullout areas.
• Improve the roadside parking. Don’t remove it. If people are parking there there is a legitimate need for parking. If there is already off-road parking, then eliminate the roadside parking or improve it. Of course you should stripe parking lots. Why hasn’t it been done already? Why do you even need to ask? Only a government bureaucracy would have to ask if it is a good idea.
• Those are two DIFFERENT questions.
• NO ROADSIDE PARKING. so dangerous...
• This is especially a concern and a problem with the ski resorts. there should be no parking allowed along
the state highways adjacent to the resorts. This is a safety concern that can affect road plowing and ingress/egress for emergency vehicles.

3. For high usage centers redesign parking lots and pedestrian roadway to enhance user experience and safety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>4 Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- As long as the redesign of the parking lots does not include tiered parking which obstructs the visual impact of our mountain scenery and can add to the negative impact on surrounding residences.
- why would these lots not have been designed with user safety in mind in the first place? if enhance safety equates to a cherry picker form parking lot to parking lot to bus stop or bridge over Wasatch or BCC canyon road, then NO!
- enhance user safety not at the cost of the environment.
- What does “enhance” mean?
- SOMETHING NEEDS TO BE DONE AT DONUT FALLS/CARDIFF FORK ROAD!!!!!!! WE NEED A PEDESTRIAN ROADWAY AWAY FROM THE CARDIFF FORK ROAD.
- Redesign a parking lot? Paint some stripes. Done.

4. Partner with public and private agencies to encourage the more efficient use of parking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>4 Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- why do hundreds and thousands of parking space sit empty 90% of the time with private enterprise at 300 east and 6200 south? realizing no one agency can obtain grant money of other funding for this purpose, so my assumption is that it is not pursued as result. what a huge waste of asphalt.
- What does this mean? Private agencies as in “for profit?”
- Not sure what this one means, but more efficient parking can't be bad.
- I am very skeptical of public-private partnerships, so would want more information
- I disagree with more parking in the canyons themselves. The more parking is available the more hotels we need, how can we contain development from encroaching up the canyons? Local people should use park and ride and exclusive out of state guests at hotels can use their own cars. Double standard?

5. Work with ski areas, Forest Service, UDOT, UTA, businesses, and hotels near the Canyons to coordinate parking and provide real-time information on lot capacity and areas that are less crowded as well as alternative locations to visit through a website and phone apps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>4 Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- Need to commit to permanent staff to keep information up to the minute; otherwise, don’t bother.
- These sound like two completely separate ideas. How will corporations and businesses help supply real time parking information in the canyons. Also, would businesses really allow people to park in their facilities when going into the canyons? doesn’t sound like it will benefit business in any way.
- No on alternative areas, yes on lot capacity.
- This is a must-have concept... Providing real-time parking availability/capacity in partnership with enhanced availability of public transit or a canyon shuttle service, would be a game changer for increased safety and happy recreationists, plus a more beautiful environment in a scenario of ever-increasing canyon use and outdoor recreation.
- leave private business and corporations out of this - completely. That’s how the problem starts and
6. Utilize appropriate BMPs when upgrades and enhancements to parking facilities are performed to address stormwater impacts to the watershed and water quality. Ensure there is a funding source for maintenance of BMPs.

Written Comments
- Ensuring the funding is there is crucial before implementing these ideas.
- The Cottonwood Canyons are already managed too strictly for watershed protection. Enough already. If something is rebuilt, build it with best practices. No need for a survey to ask if it’s a good idea.
- It’s the law.
- This is a particularly excellent idea... If users can see real-time unavailability of parking, they will either rideshare, or better yet, USE PUBLIC TRANSIT !!!
- What are BMPs?
- Don’t know what BMP is.

7. Explore the feasibility of dynamic congestion pricing during peak demand days.

Written Comments
- So only rich people ski on powder days?
- NO
- The concept is good, but would require extensive public education to explain why it’s not a flat rate all the time.
- Make resorts pay, they’re the ones instigating the use and congestion.
- keep it simple.
- only making people pay when usage is high may be enough to provide funding to certain areas and not make people as upset with paying in this plan.
- What does this mean? If it means limiting the number of people/cars in the canyons, I agree
- Canyons should be tolled no matter what.
- Dynamic congestion? What language are you speaking. Use a transient tax to fund the canyons. See how Park City does it. They already know how. No need for a study. (Use some of those airport fees too.) Have you ever noticed that every airport vehicle is new? How they are always building something new. Or tearing something down, that was in perfect shape, so they can rebuild it to try to use up their fees? I’ve watched it for more than 20 years.
- Great idea
- Not fair for public land use

MILL CREEK CANYON
1. Consider a shared parking agreement with the Boy Scouts of America for Millcreek Canyon.

Written Comments
- no longer boy scouts - just scouts
- Use public transportation.
- Why? What is there to do, for the general public, in that part of the canyon? Are you going to build some new trails? Now that would be a unique idea. There have been very few new trails built in decades.
• This depends on what the Boy Scouts have as a long-range plan, now that the Mormons are no longer going to have boys in the scouts. Is BSA/BSU keeping the facilities?
• It's actually not fair that the boy scouts get to dominate the road parking when they have a large parcel of land already at their disposal.
• The question and options will change in 2019.

2. Consider developing a parking master plan to work in conjunction with a shuttle service for Millcreek Canyon.

Written Comments
• Mill Creek Canyon does not need more usage, let the usage be controlled naturally by what is available.
• Why? When current the parking areas are full it's time to go elsewhere. The canyon doesn’t need even more users. Maybe put up a sign at the canyon mouth that informs visitors of areas with available parking. If they’re full then the person can turn the car around and go elsewhere. Even Disneyland limits number of visitors.
• These are all good ideas . . your survey doesn't enable us to prioritize our preferences.
• A shuttle system in Mill Creek canyon would be a good thing.

GOAL 7: EDUCATE AND ENCOURAGE RESIDENTS, EMPLOYEES, AND VISITORS TO ENHANCE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES TO PROMOTE A CULTURE OF BICYCLING AND WALKING.

Written Comments
• Encourage carpooling
• Educate bicyclists and motorists on how to navigate canyon roads safely
• SLCO Health Dept can help with wayfinding signage
• Plenty of parking to be created inside gravel pit
• Convenient bus services up BCC and LCC year round
• More parking at 9400 s and highland rd If you work in the canyon free bus pass-encourage public transportation.
• I support this goal, but it's wording is too fluffy. This goal needs to be worded more strongly to actually make a difference in active transportation. It seems like active transportation is always resigned to broad, vague language.
• There are certain areas where bicycles should be prohibited. If allowed, they should pay to use.(I am a bicyclist).
• Yes, please
• Need more education of Pack it in Pack it out. Lousy maintenance of toilets encourages people to litter, because they think Forest Service and no one else cares.
• I think biking up Millcreek Canyon creates a hazard for motorists. On the canyon roads there just isn't enough room for both cars and bikes to travel.
• I LOVE this ,but I am afraid efforts such as these will mostly be ignored, and therefore using resources to this end is wasteful.
• A tiny fraction of canyon visitors are actually going to be able to bike to their final destinations within the canyons.
• YES!
• Yes, healthy options. Less obesity!
• More effort to educate people with signs, brochures, billboards about the necessity of using public restrooms and not driving cars.
STRATEGIES
OVERALL SYSTEM

1. Develop a wayfinding signage program for bicyclists and pedestrians with detailed, site-specific signage that directs users to key destinations within the Canyons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- Not needed
- Bicycle area prohibitions.
- No more signage, its visual clutter.
- Signs that direct cyclists to use the safest streets is good. Trailheads, picnic areas etc. are already signed. Don’t waste money.
- There are better ways to do this than signage
- This is much better than the previous suggestion.
- Can you provide a way finding app?
- This is unnecessary in the age of smart phones.

2. Develop additional wayfinding collateral such as maps or online information to prepare visitors traveling to the Canyons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- I’m not sure if this has a place in today’s world. Who is going to go to the County website to get a travel map of the Canyons? Consider providing information inside of the ski resorts, local business & restaurants, etc. Bring the information to the places people already are, don’t make them go somewhere new to find it.
- Hopefully whatever information is provided is more accessible, readable, and concise than this survey.
- Any kind of information people can receive about the canyons with no cost is ideal
- Much of this already exists. Have you seen UtahMountainBiking.com? Maybe throw some money their way. They do it all for free. It’s mostly for mountain bikers bikers. Hikers need a resource that’s as good. Most hiking sites need vast improvements. Most, if not all of them, have unclear, inaccurate and incomplete info.
- LOVE it ! this will automatically encourage more active transportation and general curiosity.
- There are private sector apps that do this.
- There is already a lot of info, but I guess consolidating it wouldn’t be a bad idea.

3. Provide education on appropriate speed and safety of cyclists and increase enforcement of speed of cyclists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- Education never hurts but enforcement of speeds for bikes, come on really?
- This is a big problem. Cyclists coming down Big Cottonwood Canyon are often two abreast and take up the whole lane.
- The cyclists are generally not the problem. It’s the texting people driving cars. It’s also the people driving cars that think they need to speed ahead of a cyclist traveling downhill, and then braking in front of the cyclist who does not have power brakes, only hand brakes- I think educating drivers of vehicles is very important.
- Cyclists are often harassed by cars in BCC.
- Create more trails where cyclists can maintain a safe but fun speed. Make some hiker and some cycling
specific trails. There is no need for radar guns in the canyons. Cyclists are already discriminated against. In Millcreek they can only ride on even days. Hikers can hike any day. You could put up some signs that prohibit motorized e-bikes. That would be fine.
- The people that don’t already care will continue not to care and remain a-holes.
- Cyclists never follow road rules ever, idiots!!!
- Better Signage and more citations on violators!!!
- An enforced cycle speed limit is need as in City Creek Canyon.

4. Work with UTA and UDOT to incorporate and enhance bicycle usage on bus and shuttle systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- udot needs to educate public about transportation.
- Cyclists in the Canyons is still the question.
- You cant take the bus or the shuttle if you cant take your equipment.

5. Collaborate with UDOT and Forest Service to include needed amenities such as bike fix station and potable water at key trail heads or activity centers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- see above
- Mostly a waste of money. Users should be self-sufficient. Maybe some added water fountains in picnic areas. But no need at trailheads. Take your own water. Maybe tools if financed by local businesses who get a sign advertising their business.
- These are all good ideas. . . your survey doesn’t enable us to prioritize our preferences.
- Self responsibility should be promoted. Not coddling from local government. Maybe a sign that says “hey dummy, where’s your water?”
- Why can’t people just prepare for a hike themselves and bring their own water? Bike security I’m fine with that./

**GOAL 8: ENHANCE PEDESTRIAN SAFETY AT TRAILHEADS, PARKING LOTS, AND OTHER PUBLIC FACILITIES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- Love the idea of more trail connections
- Utilize some 8-80 principles/ideas? 8-80 cities for An
- Maybe install road signs "congested area ahead, caution"
- What kind of safety ideas would be implemented??
- But, not paved trails
- SOMETHING NEEDS TO BE DONE AT DONUT FALLS/CARDIFF FORK ROAD!!!!!!!!!!!!
- They’re accessible now.
- Get off the bus, get on a trail. Yes.. Not park here, walk next to death, and hike there.
- Trails should meet off the road, crossing road to new trails is dangerous, more loop trails
STRATEGIES

OVERALL SYSTEM

1. Enhance or where appropriate create new off-street trail connections. The USFS would like to see trails connecting to other trails.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments

- What is the impact of all these new trails on use, environment, water and wildlife?
- This idea sounds great trails connecting to other trails would be fun! Although, special analysis of these areas needs to be extremely thorough in order to protect the wildlife and natural vegetation.
- I LOVE this...yes please!
- What is USFS?
- This would be fantastic if feasible.
- This is Utah I think local hikers should decide instead of what the USFS "would like to see" do they live here?

2. Implement pedestrian road crossing signs, pavement marking, and traffic controls at key recreation destinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments

- This goal falls short. We should also consider enhanced pedestrian facilities at key destinations and along corridors (separated pedestrian crossings, shared-use pathways, etc.)
- We don’t need a proliferation of signs in the canyons.
- SOMETHING NEEDS TO BE DONE AT DONUT FALLS/CARDIFF FORK ROAD!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

3. Implement ADA and senior/child-friendly facilities at key locations throughout the Canyons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments

- Some of the trailheads in the canyon should be up to ADA standards. Make the canyons accessible to all!
- I’m a senior and the access is fine now.
- We already have a trail standard on new trail construction that delays starting on new trails and makes funding more difficult.

4. Support the replacement and reconstruction of the Silver Lake boardwalk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments

- How would the reconstruction affect the areas this boardwalk is on? Is this boardwalk sustainable without having high impacts?
- I just walked it. It’s fine. Who is coming up with this stuff?
- needs to be done badly, it’s dangerous.
- Why does it need to be reconstructed? It looks fine to me.
- These are all good ideas...your survey doesn’t enable us to prioritize our preferences.
- It’s great how it is. Reconstruction will probably mess things up and could damage the lake.
- It’s in good shape, not a priority.
GOAL 9: ENSURE THE MANAGEMENT OF WATERSHEDS IN THE WASATCH MOUNTAINS TO PROTECT WATER QUALITY AND QUANTITY.

Written Comments
- Provide guidance on water availability in the future
- Support wilderness proposals from Save Our Canyons
- Protecting watersheds (municipal) is extremely important.
- Limit building expansion in all canyons
- Way overboard already!
- Protect the City’s water now and for generations to come!!
- Highest Priority
- !!!!!! watershed protection is the most important item addressed in this entire proposal.
- It’s being protected now. Why is this even here?
- who opposes this anyway?
- enough w/ the no dogs in the canyon no swimming in the water.
- nobody follows the rules anyways, always dogs in all the watershed areas every time i go.
- What about human waste management? . . . SLC prohibits dogs but has ignored the need of human visitors to eliminate. Absurd.
- In order to ensure water quality, bad dogs from Dog Lake (which is actually in the BCC drainage) and start enforcing dog rules in Millcreek. Also increase penalties for people bringing dogs into protected watershed and improve enforcement.
- LET SALT LAKE CITY CO. CLEAN THE WATER... WHY DO THEY NEED TO BANK $$$$$ BY NOT ALLOWING US TO USE THE CANYONS (DOG, HORSE, PACK MULE) AND THEN CHARGE US $$$$$ FOR THE WATER?
- Strong support!!!

STRATEGIES
OVERALL SYSTEM
1. Support the continued implementation of the recommendations of the most current Salt Lake County Integrated Watershed Plan and the Salt Lake City Watershed Management Plan.

Written Comments
- Lousy maintenance by the Forest Service reflects poorly on SLPU Where is the study on how water quality has improved since the sewer installation. How has it deteriorated with the mass visitation
- I think Salt Lake City has too much power over the watershed.
- I don’t know enough about the current WMP to comment
- Enforce the dog rules, dog feces is a serious threat to our watershed, to many people ignore the rules.
- who on earth is going to know what the "current Salt Lake County Integrated Watershed Plan" is. Whoever wrote this survey is not too bright.
- NOPE, ITS JUST A Trojan horse FOR SALT LAKE CITY CO.

2. Continue cooperation with the Salt Lake County Health Department, Utah Department of Environmental Quality, the U.S. Forest Service, and Salt Lake City to implement anti-degradation standards, stream setback and environment zones, stormwater Best Management Practices, monitoring programs, enforcement activities, and other canyon watershed policies to maintain water quality in the Canyons.
Written Comments
• Strengthen watershed protections throughout the canyons.
• Bull crap. What has been implemented on residential has been quite restrictive. When are you going to believe that the 1.75 Million visitors are going to have some impact, with poorly maintained toilets
• LET US USE THE CANYONS, WHY CANT I SIT IN A POOL OF COLD WATER??

3. Concentrate major developed recreation facilities as much as possible to avoid sprawl and preserve open space.

Written Comments
• Need to add high-elevation ski resorts and improved backcountry ski access outside of BCC & LCC to draw people away, rather than forcing them away through increased cost and inconvenience. The solutions to these problems lie (partially) beyond SL County.
• Instead of this goal, how about limiting new recreation facilities, and work to improve what we already have
• What is “sprawl and preserve open space?”
• Now we’re getting to what’s important. I can’t strongly support this enough!!
• BUY THE LAND AT THE BASE OF LCC, BUY TRAVACHI AT THE BASE OF BCC.

4. Pursue canyon land use policies which will allow continued use of the Canyons for transportation, recreational, residential, and commercial development as long as these activities do not result in deterioration of water quality. Any new or expanding uses in the watershed canyons must be reviewed and carefully scrutinized to determine if the proposed use is consistent with water quality goals.

Written Comments
• Do not privilege or prioritize transportation over environmental health
• No deterioration of our water quality! Once that step is crossed it is extremely hard to bring it back to it’s former quality.
• Stop the permitting of snowmobiling in Cardiff, it ruins water quality as those machines leak oil/gas.
• Would like to see commercial development as a low priority
• NOT commercial development! Why is commercial development together with recreational development? NOT the same at all!!
• Don’t develop any more, period.
• THERES A SEWER LINE, USE IT. MAKE WASATCH RESORT HOOK UP TO SEWER. EXTEND THE SEWER LINE PAST EX MAYOR LEVITTS IN ALTA AND LET PEOPLE ENJOY / LIVE IN THE CANYON. TELL SLC TO DRILL A WELL INSTEAD OF USING CREEK WATER/SURFACE WATER.

5. Require recreation facilities to be constructed and operated to minimize both point and non-point sources of pollution. Stream setbacks, protection of vegetation, appropriate siting, and stormwater Best Management Practices are among the factors that should be considered in recreation area construction and management.
Written Comments
- No pollution from recreation!
- don’t know fully what that means
- What?
- This would include idling vehicles at any proposed toll booths!
- These are all good ideas . . your survey doesn’t enable us to prioritize our preferences.
- This is a double-edged sword question - written very poorly. Yes, we likely all want to require this of future recreation facilities. The problem is allowing that construction to begin with. What impact does that have?
- Like limit how much building a resort can do!

GOAL 10: ENSURE THAT FUTURE USE OF AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE WASATCH CANYONS IS MANAGED TO PROTECT WILDLIFE, FISHERIES AND HABITAT AND TO REDUCE HUMAN-WILDLIFE CONFLICTS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Oppose</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- Yes Please!
- Need botanical and wildlife maps on trails and for purchase
- Animals live in the mountains. If people go there there will be contact with them. Everything is fine as it is now.
- This survey is too long, I am not going to finish it.
- Triple support!
- The only way to reduce human-wildlife conflict is to restrict human. No. This is our land, we deserve access.

STRATEGIES

OVERALL SYSTEM
1. Support the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (DWR) in the implementation of the Utah Wildlife Action Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Oppose</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- And this is?
- Support the Utah Division of Wildlife! Do not implement anything that will harm the wildlife that may already be at risk due to climate change.
- I don’t know the details of this plan
- WE LIVE HERE TOO..

2. Work with other agencies to further designate sensitive areas, wildlife corridors, and conflict areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Oppose</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- Yes, please
- Yes!!!
- NOPE, SOUNDS LIKE THE END OF THE BST
3. Identify wildlife protection measures (such as fencing, changes in trails, and wildlife crossings) for key sensitive areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>43</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Written Comments
- No need. The animals already avoid us. Don’t need to spend another 22 million on a stupid over constructed bridge like the one being built at the Summit on I80. Do you have a deer whisperer to teach them where to cross?
- does fencing protect wildlife by also keeping the areas wild? this may be a conflict.
- No fencing
- Priorities should not be all about the recreation users. We must protect the wildlife.
- NOPE SHARE IT

4. Review and revise, as necessary, County codes and regulations to support wildlife.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Written Comments
- Yes. Too bad republican county council members elected to cut these wildlife protections during the last FCOZ process. Do it over and do it right.
- Only revised to protect wildlife even more rather than less.
- Please-o-please !!!
- NOPE, WE ARE HERE... LET THE MTN LIONS TAKE THE YOUNG OF A TOURIST... LET THE FISHERMAN FISH IN THE POLLUTED (ZINC) STREAMS...

5. Continue to support a science-based data resource to inform decision-making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>58</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Written Comments
- Like the one that killed all the fish in Mill Creek Canyon just to play god and try to put a fish back that was there a hundred years ago. Let nature change and rule itself!
- Yes!
- Solid data is always better than someone’s opinion.
- This seems like an absolute no-brainer - why would you not use science-based data???
- I can’t believe that is even a question. Science is REAL!
- YES WITH COMMON SENSE OF INSERT MORE USE, GET MORE POLLUTION.

6. Work with applicable federal, state, and local agencies to identify sensitive aquatic populations within the plan area and, if needed, explore feasibility related to in-stream flows to protect sensitive aquatic life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Written Comments
- NO, FIRST IN LINE, FIRST IN RIGHT. DO NOT EXERCISE BUREAUCRATIC POWER TO TAKE WHAT IS NOT YOURS IN THE FIRST PLACE.
GOAL 11: ENHANCE PUBLIC AWARENESS AND STEWARDSHIP OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND RECREATIONAL VALUES AND PRACTICES.

Written Comments
- SLCC geoscientist would love to partner
- Focus this effort on the youth (graffiti)
- SLCO health dept works with schools on physical activity initiatives, would love to connect PA to canyon usage and value to schools throughout SLCO, have connections with the state board of education
- Youth field trips/ volunteer learning service opportunities for elementary, junior, and high school
- Public needs to know about our lands and the risks to them if changes are not implemented and places are not restored.
- You haven’t done anything to educate the public on their garbage
- Please teach LNT principles!!!!
- People are already aware of environmental values and practices. Unfortunately, many people chose to ignore these values and practices by littering, doing graffiti, bringing dogs into watershed, etc. The only real solution is more enforcement and harsher penalties.
- Many of the problems associated with increased use, could be helped be educating the public
- This is important in local schools to develop and maintain their future enjoyment of watershed and public lands

STRATEGIES
OVERALL SYSTEM
1. In cooperation with canyon stakeholders, volunteers, develop a county-wide public education campaign and associated social media and materials to support public education and stewardship of the Wasatch Canyons.

Written Comments
- This is a good idea, but a cost-benefit analysis should be done on the resources required to create the campaign versus the number of people it will realistically reach.
- as long as it is not costing tax payers money.
- Love this. Get people involved. Let them know it is also their job to protect the areas we recreate in.
- It would be nice if you approached development and profiteers the same way.
- educate on LNT!!
- within a reasonable spending limit
- We need Stewards at every picnic area to enforce trash clean-up and the NO DOGS -rule by users of BCC and other watershed picnic areas.
- and officers to fine them when they ignore the education you provide. Because they will ignore it.

2. Support development of educational materials for school programs and support programs aimed at making the Wasatch Canyons accessible to all.

Written Comments
- ...making ALL Wasatch Canyons accessible to all.
- Aiming to start in schools with information like stewardship is a great idea. Children need to be some of the first people we educate. this will help create a more aware generation to come.
• They are already accessible to all.

3. Review and consider the Cottonwood Canyons Scenic Byways Plan signage plan when planning for educational signage.

   - Strongly Support: 5
   - Neutral: 3
   - Strongly Oppose: 2

Written Comments
• I don’t know what that sentence means.
• ITS NOT A BYWAY, ITS GOT CELL PHONE TOWERS STUCK ON THE SIDES WITH NO CAMO ON THEM... START BY HAVING THE USFS STAND STRONG, NOT GETTING PAID OFF.

GOAL 12: MAINTAIN AND INCREASE THE CONSERVATION OF NATURAL LANDS THAT PROVIDE REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE TOWARDS ECOSYSTEMS, WATERSHED, AND RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES.

   - Strongly Support: 67
   - Neutral: 12
   - Strongly Oppose: 2

Written Comments
• Land Swamps or purchase of critical ecosystems
• Conservation prioritized
• Buy up lands while we still can
• Conservation of all lands thought the Wasatch should be a main goal of any new programs and plans put into place.
• It depends on what “conservation” means. No new wilderness. Wilderness does not ensure access to all. It ensures access to only a few and sometimes to no one.
• Do not facilitate commercial activities.
• THERE IS NOT ENOUGH PATROL WHAT WE HAVE, NOT ENOUGH $ TO SUPPORT A BACKBONE, WHY GO FOR MORE??
• Support more wilderness proposals such as those by Save Our Canyons

STRATEGIES
OVERALL SYSTEM
1. Identify priority areas of natural lands that should be conserved and maintained. Identify the criteria to prioritize areas that are important to be conserved and supported, such as environmental values, ecosystem health, aesthetics, recreation experience, contiguous to trails and open space area linkages.

   - Strongly Support: 56
   - Neutral: 5
   - Strongly Oppose: 3

Written Comments
• They all ready have. It is called Wilderness
• The Wasatch canyons are primarily forest service land. It’s already identified for conservation.
• This sounds like a trick question
• SOUNDS LIKE ANOTHER $450,000 STUDY BY A OUT OF STATE CONSULTANT.

2. Create a mechanism to fund open space preservation and ongoing maintenance.

   - Strongly Support: 63
   - Neutral: 3
   - Strongly Oppose: 2
Written Comments
- More open space in the Wasatch is ideal rather than more infrastructure.
- So long as it is preserved by an organization that can be trusted - not like certain NGOs that have sharp political agendas
- Open space is such a joy for all. It does need supervision and maintenance, however. The blood lake/Bonanza flats area is wonderful, but vandals and litterbugs will destroy it……it’s happening now, tragically!

3. Utilize all possible funding resources available, such as the County’s Open Space Trust Fund, Salt Lake City, State of Utah, or NGOs, to protect critical parcels. As a last resort, explore other funding mechanisms such as fees.

Written Comments
- Fees are fine with me.
- Need to have many areas of funding in place to keep projects going successfully rather than cutting them off at a certain point.
- User Fees should not be a last resort. Adequate funding is critical.
- No new fees. Do you know how much we already pay in taxes?
- I think fees are fine.

4. Pursue the State of Utah in purchasing lands for conservation.

Written Comments
- Conservation is a must in Utah! Our lands are incredible and should be preserved.
- the problem then is it is not managed. Just like what we call wilderness here in the Wasatch.
- No. They will sell the land
- What are you talking about here? The canyons are not primarily private.
- But NOT in trying to take over Federal/already public lands!
- I do love this, but we need to take care of the lands we already have.
- No, the State of Utah can’t be trusted with public lands. They just want to make money off of it! Keep it out of State hands they’re grimy, dangerous hands.
- YES IF THEY CAN BACK UP THE MAINTENANCE.

5. Promote the use of private land trusts and other groups to facilitate the conservation and maintenance of key properties through donations, conservation easements, and acquisition with willing sellers.

Written Comments
- Yes, but again, with oversight
- A sound, useful idea…..yes, yes, YES!!

6. Develop resource and stewardship plans for existing open space parcels.

Written Comments
- Seems to be lost on planners. You can’t propose (Brighton and Solitude) chopping up the mountain for
development, bringing in more tourists, allowing the overuse and then wondering why our watershed is messed up. Plan for management and limitation to preserve.

- Too much oversite. Where have you been the last 25-30 years? Politicians have promised all of this before.

GOAL 13: PREPARE THE CANYONS AND FOOTHILLS FOR POTENTIAL NATURAL HAZARDS AND ADDRESS THE IMPACTS CAUSED BY AGING INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE CANYONS TO REDUCE IMPACTS.

STRATEGIES
OVERALL SYSTEM
STRATEGY CHOICES
1. Work with corresponding agencies to further prepare the Canyons for the event of a wildland fire, earthquakes, landslides and other natural disasters.

Written Comments
- Yes, Strategy #7 Science
- More Signage on trails
- T intersection at Wasatch and road to snowbird is unsafe!

2. Work with the USFS to understand and prepare for the impact of insect and disease issues that may severely impact the forest ecosystem in the near future.

Written Comments
- They all ready have. It is called Wilderness
- 

3. Apply adequate resources to fire protection, noxious weed control, and habitat protection.

Written Comments
- None
- 

4. Ensure communities and resort areas have adequate emergency preparedness plans and supplies.

Written Comments
- This is the responsibility of those communities and resorts
- How about private people/companies pony up their own resources?

5. Work to develop programs to incentivize the upgrading of existing homes and businesses including septic upgrades and improved water and sewer connections.
Written Comments
• I don’t know if this should be a top priority.
• Already in place. Redundant.
• Goes back to the importance of the watershed. Living and working in the canyons requires being a responsible neighbor, even if it costs more.
• YES, SALT LAKE CITY CO. SHOULD PUT IN SEWER CONNECTIONS.. THEY BENEFIT... THEY PAY.

6. Explore a tree and mitigation bank for removed trees to help fund restoration work.

Written Comments
• All of this costs money. Lets not go overboard. I know you really want to raise our taxes

7. Work with science professionals to enrich and educate Salt Lake County planners, commissioners, and elected official of lessons earned through research application.

Written Comments
• Officials need to be extremely informed about the Wasatch and the canyons especially if they are trying to make decisions based on them.
• How novel. Science professionals should exceed the number of profiteers on the committees
• We know our elected officials can’t understand the value of anything except the almighty dollar, so yes, try to educate them to the value of research. They need lots of help, so bring lots of patience.

GOAL 14: ENSURE THAT FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES AND ENTITIES WITH JURISDICTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE WASATCH CANYONS PLANNING AREA COORDINATE THEIR EFFORTS AND PLANNING PROCESSES TO PROVIDE FOR EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES AND THE RESOURCES OF THE WASATCH CANYONS.

Written Comments
• Incorporate management/ forestry, maybe into resiliency 1B or watershed A work with UFA
• This is critical. Local buy-in is vital.
• What does this mean? What does this look like?
• where have you been the last 30 years?
• It seems like when efforts start to combine and cooperate, the loudest (and often most strident and radical) views win out. I’m not sure this is a good idea
• Organizations with jusid resp are dominated by those with interests not sympathetic to those of Canyon Residents.
• GOOD LUCK
• Keep all interested parties involved
STRATEGIES
OVERALL SYSTEM
STRATEGY CHOICES

1. Implement the inter-agency coordination measures identified in the CRMP for fire management, forest management, riparian areas and wetlands, recreation management, and the other resources addressed in the CRMP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• The CRMP was a scam to justify state management of federal public lands. The CRMP was intentionally underfunded and anemic so as to allow the Commission for the Stewardship of Public Lands a soapbox to talk about how great the state is at managing it’s own lands. Nothing in the CRMP should be taken seriously.
• don’t know what CRMP means
• This is especially, desperately needed in Big Cottonwood canyon

2. Work to establish collaborative goals, action plans and timeliness among jurisdictions, including the County, USFS, towns, cities and community councils.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• Need to include State of UT & nearby counties, as well.
• Involve the residents of the canyons.

3. Work with the partner agencies and the Wasatch Front Regional Council on updates of their development and management plans and any corresponding amendments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• Need to include State of UT & nearby counties, as well.
• Involve the residents of the canyons.

4. Work with the USFS, Army Corps of Engineers, UDOT, and UTA on any implementation level projects, so they meet the Wasatch Canyons General Plan’s vision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• WITH USFS, ACE, CWC, UDOT, AND UTA.... HOW CAN ANYTHING EVER GET DONE?? TOO MANY COOKS IN THE KITCHEN

5. Include the USFS, towns, metro townships, cities, community councils, UDOT, CWC, and UTA on County level plans, studies, and projects to ensure all activities are coordinated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• Don’t overemphasize the role of community councils. These areas receive over 5 million visits a year,
community councils tend to speak only for the narrow interests of the few private property owners who attend public meetings. They deserve a voice only as much as it’s in proportion to their very limited - and often self interested - membership.

- Hasn’t happened in 30 Years
- WAY TOO MUCH IS DECIDED WITH NO CANYON RESIDENT INPUT. THE CANYON IS OUR HOME AND WE SHOULD HAVE A SAY!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
- involve the residents of the canyons.
- A Lofty, necessary goal !
- GOOD LUCK

6. Invite participation of the Scenic Byway Councils through the State of Utah Office of Tourism in future planning efforts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- But limit their ability to just make $$
- The canyons are already extremely crowded, we do not need any additional promotion of the canyons.
- No, tourism shouldn’t get its say. We live here, we pay taxes, we decide. NOT tourists nor the agencies paid for with tourist dollars.
- WHY DO WE WANT MORE RULES, MORE TOURISTS IN THE ALREADY OVERRUN CANYONS??? KEEP THEM OUT. NO PROMOTION.

7. Coordinate with WFRC and UDOT to get transportation projects and appropriate funding in RTP and Unified Transportation plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- None

GOAL 15: AS NEEDED, REVIEW AND UPDATE COUNTY ORDINANCES TO FURTHER IMPLEMENT THE VISION, GOALS, AND STRATEGIES OF THE GENERAL PLAN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- Only with logical goals and plans!
- Update ordinances to accommodate latest and best science related to protecting water quality, habitat and ecosystem health.
- City folk and regulators with only academic and limited real-world experience cannot update ordinances to address the issues involved with canyon residency.
- PLEASE STOP BEATING THIS DEAD HORSE. LET THE CANYONS ALONE. GO BACK TO THE 1988 MASTER PLAN AND CALL IT A DAY.
- SLCO-wide fireworks ban always
STRATEGIES
OVERALL SYSTEM
STRATEGY CHOICES
1. Consider the need to periodically update County ordinances like the Foothills and Canyons Overlay Zone (FCOZ) and the Mountain Resort Zone (MRZ) to meet the General Plan Vision and County leadership goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- Update ordinances to accommodate latest and best science related to protecting water quality, habitat and ecosystem health.
- You do this way to often. I know you still want to keep your jobs
- involve the residents of the canyons.
- This can already happen as is.
- But, we shouldn’t be changing ordinances to allow development just to make it look good. Ordinances should LIMIT development! Imagine that...
- NOPE, JUST KEEP IT SIMPLE.

2. Consider the need to periodically update County ordinances related to development siting, access, floodplains, water protection and the structural design of buildings to ensure that health and safety requirements are met while allowing appropriate development to meet State Code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- Update ordinances to accommodate latest and best science related to protecting water quality, habitat and ecosystem health.
- involve the residents of the canyons.
- This can already happen as is.
- NOPE, ITS BEEN UP THERE FOR 100 YEARS, WHY MESS WITH IT?? BUILDING PERMITS, MORE PAPERWORK?/. GO PICK ON DAYBREAK, ROSE CANYON, AND OTHER AREAS OF THE COUNTY THAT HAVE NOT BEEN MESSED WITH.

3. At the General Plan draft level and adoption, review the FCOZ and MRZ to compare goal and strategy alignments or conflicts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- you do this way to often
- involve the residents of the canyons.
- But which wins? Is the goal development or recreation access? We can have recreation access WITHOUT development.
- TOO MANY CHIEFS, NOT ENOUGH PEOPLE WHO THINK... CUT THOSE PROGRAMS.

4. Review progress and update the Wasatch Canyons General Plan every five years to better understand progress and work towards goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Written Comments
- you do this way to often
- This turns the process into a very political one
- And publish this review online for all to see !!!
- who authorizes those updates? Are residents invited to update too?
- SOUNDS LIKE A 5 YEAR CHANGE UP, THINK OF OUR CONSTITUTION AS A COUNTRY. IT STANDS...

5. Plan for a complete General Plan update in the 15-20 year time frame (2033-2038).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Oppose</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- Make it sooner
- NOPE, JUST KEEP IT THE SAME HERE, AND GET RID OF THE 1000’S OF CARS

GOAL 16: RAISE APPRECIATION AND STEWARDSHIP OF CANYON BEAUTY THROUGH BRANDING, AESTHETICS, AND DEVELOPMENT GUIDANCE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Oppose</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- I would love to help with this goal finally getting somewhere
- Wast of money
- City folk and regulators with only academic and limited real-world experience cannot update ordinances to address the issues involved with canyon residency.
- love design!
- We don’t need to raise appreciation for canyon beauty through branding. We need to enforce laws that protect and canyons and meaningfully punish people who break those laws.
- Branding=no, Development Guidance=no (no development), aesthetics=sure.
- NOPE, NO BRANDING, MAKE IT BLAND.
- Let’s make a law to prohibit billboards and signage like Europe. Development guidance like not more hotels and lodges!

STRATEGIES
OVERALL SYSTEM
STRATEGY CHOICES
1. Consider creating design guidelines/standards for the commercial development, gateways, and public areas that include consistent design quality, materials, and placement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Oppose</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- Good design is key for user experience and usability. Good design is not about looking good, it’s about creating the optimal solution for the user.
- In the past the government has been persuaded by groups to the point of stupid. Been too restrictive.
- How much impact would this have?
- SL County Developmental Services is doing a fine job
- As long as cost is a major consideration.
- This seems completely pointless given the real challenges and overcrowding and abuse facing the canyons.
• Consider limiting commercial development so much that design won’t be an issue. We DON’T WANT MORE DEVELOPMENT!!!!!
• WHY MAKE IT GENERIC? WHY MAKE IT BORING? LET THE PUBLIC HAVE FUN!!
• Consider creating standards for development seems to mean please consider development as an option to the natural environment, because we know money interests with prevail?

2. Work with stakeholders, communities, and businesses to implement comparable aesthetic plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• None

3. Consider the implementation of unique canyon branding, similar to national parks, which promotes a sense of place, stewardship, and heritage (i.e., signage, architecture, wayfinding, entry features, benches, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• This all sounds like a way to increase fees, costs and taxes. The canyon aesthetics is pretty awesome right now. The canyons don’t need “branding”. That’s stupidity. They’re mountains, trails, trees, animals and etc. Take a picture and post it. Done.
• I love the idea of this, but let’s FIRST initiate day-use fees, improve public transit, real-time viewing of parking capacities.
• How would unique canyon branding actually help protect the canyons? Sure it sounds nice, but there are way more important things to worry about, such as implementing a user fee in BCC and LCC and putting an end to the plagues of dog feces and graffiti that are slowly ruining the canyon environment.
• NOPE, GO CAMMO.... STAY OUT OF THE LIMELIGHT. WE DON’T NEED TO ADVERTISE THE CANYONS.

GOAL 17: SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT OF CITIZENS’ GROUPS AND VOLUNTEERS IN PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES IN THE WASATCH CANYONS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• Control graffiti
• SLCC and UofU service learning (partner)
• Involve local colleges in planning process and volunteer projects
• I like the idea of involving local schools in volunteer management and geology learning opportunities
• I only oppose because one group like Save Our Canyons has way too much voice. They are only a handful of those that live here but yet dictate the plan and out come.
• Free passes and transportation for volunteers
• Citizens’ groups often speak with greater knowledge and for more individuals who use and care for the canyons than do the community associations
• City folk and regulators with only academic and limited real-world experience cannot update ordinances to address the issues involved with canyon residency.
• Collaboration is awesome
• Support Save Our Canyons proposals
STRATEGIES
OVERALL SYSTEM
STRATEGY CHOICES
1. Identify the citizens groups, community councils, property owners associations, and other similar associations active in each canyon, and meet with regularly them to identify opportunities for the County to support their activities, enhance communications, and define common objectives that align with the Wasatch Canyons General Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• ...with them regularly...

2. Commit staff time and/or funding to these groups in the form of grants for activities that support the implementation of the General Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• Don’t fund these groups. They should be advisory groups only.
• Staff time. Not funds.

3. Sponsor a forum of volunteers and community groups to coordinate communications and interactions with the County and other agency stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• None

4. Track service projects, hours, and efforts to show progress and gauge involvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• This should be done internally.
• without documentation of service projects there is the danger they may be defunded. Good idea.

5. Using a County website, list citizens groups and government agencies to provide resources for the County to better coordinate with and utilize existing groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• This is okay, but engagement would be limited.
• Especially excellent idea !!! Yes,please !!
GOAL 18: SUPPORT THE CONTINUATION AND VIABILITY OF CANYON RESORTS AND BUSINESSES. WORK TO CONSERVE THE NATURAL FEATURES AND RECREATIONAL ATTRIBUTES THAT MAKE THE CANYONS A VITAL ECONOMIC DRIVER IN UTAH.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- Yes, #7 to preserve critical lands
- Ski resort boundaries need to be fixed and their private lands traded out
- Please support small businesses by allowing them to retain their necessary parking
- Ask ski resorts or advertise how many conservation projects they are willing to implement to show they are good neighbors
- These resorts may oppose some measures that would reduce congestion in the Canyons, such as building comparable, competing resorts elsewhere in the Wasatch. At the end of the day, these resorts benefit from congestion in the Canyons.
- Yes but let these resorts expand to handle the increase which in turns help manage where people are in the canyons.
- What does sentence one have to do with sentence two? Why should we assume these two items are compatible?
- No, quit managing for profit. Start managing to protect watershed and quality of life.
- Water Quality
- Don not facilitate commercial activities.
- The resorts are already super popular and crowded. Additional growth of the resorts, or resort visitation, will be a negative for the people of Utah. The resorts’ role of “vital economic driver” is overstated and not necessary in a state with such a robust economy and affordable housing market.
- Part 1, no. Part 2, yes.
- IT MIGHT BE IMPORTANT TO KEEP THE EXISTING BUSINESS AS IS..
- No need for resort expansion. Climate change will limit how much snow we continue to get at only higher elevations

STRATEGIES
OVERALL SYSTEM
STRATEGY CHOICES
1. Review County FCOZ, MRZ, and other relevant Salt Lake County development codes to ensure they meet the goals of the Wasatch Canyons General Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- Haven’t they been doing that
- PUT THEM ALL INTO ONE, THE 3, 4, AND 5, 6....NEXT 9... ITS IMPOSSIBLE TO LOCATE

2. Focus on the environmental and scenic preservation of the Wasatch Canyons as an economic development strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
- I actually agree but not to the crazy standards that are given to the resorts
- As long as your not managing for $
• Save what is left!
• Wow, that’s a really back-handed question, seems to be looking for more economic development. I think this is a terrible goal
• YES, please! Simplest and best method...let the Canyons speak for themselves...the visitors WILL COME

3. Encourage businesses to have the proper business permits permitting (guiding, shuttle, etc). County should work with businesses and public to assist in reporting violation of laws, policies, respecting private property, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Written Comments
• huh? This must have been written by a ski resort. Of course businesses should have proper permits. BAD question.
• WE ARE COWBOYS... LETS BEHAVE LIKE ONE..

4. Include tourism and economic groups in planning, coordinating and implementing the Wasatch Canyons General Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Written Comments
• These groups always think that bigger crowds are a desirable goal, not something to be avoided.
• That’s a sure fire way to ruining these canyons. Just look at how the Mighty Five campaign has destroyed the experiences within our national parks.
• Watershed and wilderness should come first, business expansion should be secondary.
• They’ll ef it up.
• We don’t need more tourists in the canyons. They are already overrun and over crowded.
• NO a thousand times over. Good grief! Neither tourism nor economy should even be a consideration in how we plan and manage our canyons. Leave them wild! Let tourists go to Colorado!

5. Coordinate transportation planning and implementation with Canyon Resorts and businesses. If tolling is used as a transportation, request that a portion of the tolling money is used for assistance with transit, parking, activity center trailhead, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Written Comments
• No tolling.
• But the toll funding should be directed to enhance the specific canyon where it was collected
• Really BAD question. You’re saying that someone can get up the canyon via a toll? No car involved? And who is requesting a portion?

6. Regulate through business licenses the use of short-term rentals. Work with short-term rentals and hotels to understand necessary canyon policies for parking, watershed protection, and permits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Written Comments
• Why is this only an issue for short-term rentals?
7. Support appropriate ski area/Forest Service land exchanges.

**Written Comments**
- There needs to be context here. Why do these land exchanges occur?
- But do not allow the expansion of resort boundaries or footprint within the canyons.
- Feels like back room profiting.
- Save our Canyons hasn't been for expanding Ski Area Boundaries, Now they are. But now we need more Wilderness in our back yard. Manage, don't just designate wilderness and forget about it.
- Who's to say what's appropriate? Grizzly gulch exchange perfect example. Bad for the people of Utah but good for tourist because easier access to what was once unaccessible to them because of education and skill. Keep resorts boundaries what they are now. If people want to leave resorts they need to be educated. Only support exchanges that preserve wild spaces, not put more uneducated people on them to destroy.
- Keep Grizzly out of Alta's grab
- again, this is a leading and poorly-worded question. "Appropriate" is such an ambiguous word in this context.
- A slippery slope, but it must be addressed.
- depends on what is proposed!
- That is a far too general concept that needs to be viewed very specifically and carefully
- Not sure what this implies.

GOAL 19: SUPPORT THE EXTENSION OF BROADBAND AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS HARDWARE TO ENHANCE COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES IN THE WASATCH CANYONS.

**Written Comments**
- This is key. Infrastructure has to keep up with increasing and evolving technology use.
- WHY DO WE HAVE A SLOW CONGESTED DIAL-UP INTERNET? THIRD WORLD COUNTRIES ARE WAY WAY AHEAD OF THE CANYONS!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
- It's fine now. Some places have communication. Some don't.
- Wilderness doesn't need to be wi-fi connected. If you need to be glued to your phone, do that elsewhere.
- Primary focus should be improving canyon residents’ communications and Internet access. Recreationers should come with expectation of having a wilderness experience without electronics devices.
- MAKE THE TOWERS LOOK LIKE TREES
- In so far as we're not putting up a lot of stations and poles and machinery to clutter the canyons. OK.
STRATEGIES
OVERALL SYSTEM
STRATEGY CHOICES
1. Evaluate and modify, if necessary, communications infrastructure and CIP plans so that they are consistent with the General Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• Don’t know what the General plan says about communication infrastructure
• Can’t talk on your phone while hiking up the canyon? GOOD! That’s how it should be

2. Incentivize development of communications infrastructure in appropriate areas and achieve other goals such as public safety improvements and environmental protection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• The public is safe enough. We should be able to take care of ourselves in the forest.
• This is a competitive industry and should not need incentives
• Good idea as long as we keep the stuff discrete and aesthetically blending with the environs.
• Don’t ever incentivize development.

3. Investigate other methods of providing broadband services (preferred providers, county partnerships, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• This seems too tricky.

4. Ensure that new communications infrastructure is designed and installed per General Plan goals regarding aesthetics, environmental and water quality, and character of the Canyons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• None

5. Implement improvements in broadband and telecommunications in Mill Creek Canyon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments
• Let residents and businesses pay for this, not county residents.
• It’s fine now and I know that cell phones don’t work there. It’s fine. Build some new trails. That would be nice. If you need service. Climb one of the several peak trails. You’ll have service up there...probably.
• We don’t want better telecommunications in wildlands and wilderness areas.
• No!
• Some blind spots in the plan: 1. Winter driving (4x4 & snow tire) restrictions in the Canyons need to be enforced consistently; if this is hard, a plan needs to be developed to make it easier. 2. Conducting road avalanche control earlier in the morning would greatly reduce traffic congestion on the days when the traffic is the worst; if this requires gazex, or whatever, so be it.
• Congestion is such a big problem. I am in favor of toll booths to help alleviate congestion. More money towards keeping our nature preserved and reducing the amount of people is okay with me. Encourage dog owners to “always keep a doggie bag on them.” Only the noblest of dog owners goes BACK to the poop to pick it up. Signs encouraging proper trail etiquette and proper driving etiquette.
• The Wasatch Canyons have a defined, limited amount of acreage, trails and roads. It is not physically possible to provide access to an unlimited number of people. Some selection is required to preserve the wild space and wildlife.
• Please be REASONABLE in this plan!
• It does not have to be easy to enjoy the local canyons. Let’s not make it a freeway off ramp. Most things of value are worth extra time and reflection.
• need summer shuttle service 6 am to 10 pm on the hour. Ski resorts need to pay more for canyon preservation, clearly they are making profits. Tax resorts -
• This plan has WAY too many goals, and this survey is too long. Many will not take the time to complete it, even though they have opinions. Consider some alternative methods of outreach other than open houses and long online surveys.
• This survey was horribly done. Questions were vague or poorly defined and the overall experience was not user friendly and too much of a time commitment. I’d be shocked if a quarter of those who begin the survey persevere to the end. Whoever put this together should lose their job.
• Please seek to maintain as much open space as possible. Please do not allow large advertised trailheads to be placed in residential neighborhoods. Please realign the trail if needed. Please provide designated bike lanes wherever possible. Thank you!
• please consider that our canyons need be left as natural as possible that tourist needs and demands are not our first priority
• The Canyon General Plan looks great so far! Thank you for your good work!
• Too many repetitive questions. We need basic transportation and Infrastructure and a short and long range management plan that can be implemented over time in a cohesive fashion
• Goal should be Keep Tourist out Let Utah residents in
• The Cardiff Fork-Donut Falls area is a complete major disaster. There are no accommodations for the immense numbers of people. Many families with children are liable to get hurt on the Cardiff Fork Road. THERE NEEDS TO BE A PEDESTRIAN TRAIL and pedestrians need to be required to use it and respect rights of property owners, among other accommodations. The internet is worse than most third world countries. There is no reason for internet to not be available in the canyons for all residents. In Cardiff Fork, I live 1/2 mile from a fiber optics line, and yet I have snail slow dial-up speed congested internet which I am required to pay for at a broad broadband price It is time to wake up on these two issues.
• Consider the Monument legislation to preserve what wildness remains.
• I believe focus on surrounding areas outside th Canyons will help alleviate overall impact from high use. Most people don’t know what exists outside these Canyons. Let’s help them find those other spots. Let’s improve our trails, parking, and shuttle services. Don’t toll us for having an interest in the outdoors. Find another way to find funding and increasing ride sharing. Keep our free lands free from purchase with resorts. We are small here in the Wasatch and want to have a sense of wild. Not lift service access ruining the aesthetics of this beautiful place. Educate people on how to enter the wild.
• Resorts and the rich white population should not have a greater say on public lands than the rest of the populations.
• Why does it have to be so complicated? Keep it simple. Minimize bureaucracy whenever possible. Open up or expand the Oquirrh Mountain range, Cedar Mountain Range and others to recreation. Reduce Cottonwood/Millcreek Canyons congestion. I once tried to access the Oquirrh mountains from the Tooele side and encountered billboard size no trespassing signs. Access from the Salt Lake County side is even worse. Those are issues that we should be focusing our effort on. The canyon west of Copperton doesn’t even exist anymore. It has been filled in with mine tailings.
The following is a compilation of the Activity Nodes input from public events and online surveys. Participants were asked to identify places of high-level use in each canyon that could benefit from trailhead improvements such as bus services, benches, restrooms, etc.

Each ★ on the map represents an in-person vote. The white circles over each node show the total number of votes for each node from in-person activities and online surveys.

**ACTIVITY NODES WITH THE MOST VOTES INCLUDE:**

**PARLEY’S AND MILL CREEK**
- Pipeline access and Burch Hollow
- End of Road

**BIG COTTONWOOD**
- Donut Falls Trailhead
- S-Curve Hiking Trailheads

**LITTLE COTTONWOOD**
- White Pine Trailhead
- Snowbird
Hello Jake, Hello Krissy, Hello Jim,

This email is to summarize our comments in writing regarding the final Goals Initiative Framework. I am writing them on behalf of Log Haven Restaurant and Flying Cloud Enterprises. I have already mentioned some of them at your second open house.

Our primary remaining concerns relate to Parking Management as it may affect small businesses. As you know, adequate parking is critically essential for the continued viability of small businesses, especially those isolated in the canyons. So we are very concerned regarding the following specific Strategies of Goal #6.

- In Strategy #2, the word “dangerous” is completely subjective and therefore ambiguous. Mitigation for roadside parking should be limited to areas where more than one vehicle accident has occurred during several years. It would be arbitrary and capricious for SLCO to remove or limit a small number of privately owned roadside spaces until SLCO, the State of Utah, and the USFS remove or limit the thousands of roadside spaces on the roads and lands that they own, where the vast majority of accidents occur.

- In Strategy #3, government-mandated redesigns and modifications are a sure way to put small businesses into financial difficulties. Once again, if there has not been a problem at a business, then government should not be requiring a non-problem to be fixed.

- In Strategy #6, what good does it do to impose expensive BMP’s upon small business parking facilities when the real stormwater impacts come from the many many miles of SLCO/State of Utah roads and the adjoining USFS parking facilities? Should you really be trying to solve 0.1% of the problem when 99.9% of the problem remains unmitigated? You addressed the stormwater problem correctly in Goal #4 (Roadway Facilities) when you urged government agencies to use BMP’s when making roadway improvements. The roads and the many USFS parking areas are where this problem exists, and only the governments can make a meaningful difference.

We also have the following comments relating to other issues.

- In Strategy #1 of Goal #9 (Watershed Management), you do not yet know what SLC’s new Watershed Plan is going to say, so how can you blindly call for SLCO to support it? SLC’s watershed management practices are under close scrutiny at the Utah Legislature.

- In Strategy #5 of Goal #9, the word “minimize” should be changed to “mitigate” in any General Plan sections that you write regarding this topic. “Minimize” implies using all BMP’s and other possible mitigations without regard to their cost-
effectiveness.

- In Strategy #5 of Goal #13 (Resiliency Program), incentivizing is good, but requiring upgrades as a condition of approving other improvements is bad. We believe the goal once again should be to call on federal, state and local governments to improve their own public facilities. Why should small property owners be required to make expensive septic upgrades if no leakage problem is shown to exist, when SLC and the USFS are planning to remove their public toilet facilities from the sewer in Big Cottonwood Canyon?

- In the last paragraph of Goal #14, as we discussed Jake, the second sentence about the CWC needs to be corrected. The CWC said the stakeholder’s council will be only an advisory group that may form task forces on various specific issues. All decisions will be made by the CWC Board, which has now been expanded to 10 members.

You have all done an outstanding job of obtaining and listening to comments from all sides of the public and blending them into balanced Goals & Strategies for the General Plan. Thank you for the way that you have incorporated our prior comments. What we are asking now is that you govern wisely in drafting the actual text of the General Plan. Please think about the actual major sources of the problems in the canyons, please urge governments at all levels to acknowledge and improve their own shortcomings, and please impose regulations on private owners only when there is a good reason to do so and only when it will make a meaningful difference. Please also be sure to distinguish between small businesses & private owners as opposed to the very large, increasingly profitable and impactful ski resorts.

As always, we appreciate your efforts and your good will.

Thanks again,

Ed Marshall
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INTRODUCTION

Building on the Vision Document, the five vision statements have been expanded in the following Goal Initiatives. The five Vision Statements, developed through a series of community conversations, represent the aspirational outlook for the Wasatch Canyons' land use and development, environment, recreation system, transportation system, and the broader economy. They are overarching statements that describe the desired future of the Wasatch Canyons based on shared community values. The vision document is available for review on the project website (slco.org/wasatch-canyons).

GOAL INITIATIVES
This Plan focuses on fundamental concepts to make the Vision Statements and Principles materialize. The 19 Goal Initiatives are goal-level statements that highlight a specific subject. The Goal Initiatives have been prioritized by level of implementation importance based on public input and staff review.

STRATEGIES
The Strategies are the last and most specific component within the planning framework. A strategy is a statement of intent or expectation -- a course of action that provides clarity on the type, location, and methodology to accomplish goals. Presented in this document are several strategy choices under each Goal.

DEFINITIONS
A number of acronyms are used in this document for brevity. Those include:

- ADA — Americans with Disabilities Act
- BMP — Best Management Practices
- BSA — Boy Scouts of America
- CRMP - County Resource Management Plan
- CWC — Central Wasatch Commission
- DNR — Utah Department of Natural Resources
- DWR — Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
- FC0Z — The Foothills and Canyons Overlay Zone
- MFZ — The Mountain Resort Zone
- NGO — Non-governmental Organization
- USFS — United States Forest Service
- UTA — Utah Transit Authority
- UDOT — Utah Department of Transportation
- WFRC - Wasatch Front Regional Council

We need your input on the Goals and Strategies! What strategy choices would you support? What is missing? And how should they be prioritized? See page 26 for how to comment and next steps.
1. Recreation Management and Maintenance

Goal 1A: Improve the quality of recreation for visitors and residents while meeting the needs for anticipated future demand.

Strategy Choices
- Overall System
  1. Support the USFS in maintaining a quality trail system countywide.
  2. Establish a volunteer program to lead and train volunteers. Dedicate County staff time to coordinate with volunteer groups.
  3. Concentrate and encourage recreation use in key identified recreation activity nodes.
  4. Promote lesser-used recreation areas in Salt Lake County outside the Wasatch Canyons to provide alternatives to the frequently-used Wasatch Canyons. Alternatives could include the Oquirrh Mountains, Dimple Dell, Ensign Peak, Yellow Fork, etc.
  5. Develop new phone and computer applications to maximize user experience, promote key recreational areas, and provide most updated information.
  6. Work with willing sellers to acquire strategic land or easements for recreation access and management. Promote trailheads as transit-friendly or ride-sharing options.

Recreation Infrastructure
- Overall System
  1. Assist the USFS in implementing their standards for the development of trailheads, parking areas, and other use areas.
  2. Provide and maintain key areas to include designated parking and needed amenities (garbage receptacles, restrooms, parking, etc.).

Trails
- Overall System
  1. Work with the Forest Service to develop an updated trails master plan for the central Wasatch area.
  2. Implement sustainable trail and trailhead design guidelines and work with volunteer trail groups on implementation projects.

3. Complete the entire Bonneville Shoreline Trail for entire north to south system.
4. Enhance selected high use trails (such as Doughnut Falls) to handle significant usage. High use trails whenever possible should be paved or well graded and include amenities such as benches, restrooms, drinking water, bus stops and parking.
5. Focus on enhancing foothill easement acquisition programs and trailhead developments (for areas such as Deaf Smith Canyon).

Goal 1B: Improve public access for recreational opportunities.

Strategy Choices
- Overall System
  1. Establish additional locations for parking lots, recreational access to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail, and other recreational open spaces.
  2. Utilize multiple funding sources to protect and maintain key parcels for open space and recreational access through acquisition with willing sellers or conservation easements.
  3. Pursue acquisitions with willing sellers of land at trailheads for additional facilities and parking.
BACKGROUND

The Wasatch Canyons are a unique recreational amenity close to a major metropolitan area. Achieving sustainable recreation in the Wasatch Canyons will require specific management tools to manage capacity and ensure a high-quality visitor experience.

Sustainable trail development can provide other recreational opportunities while protecting our environment. The intentional design and retrofit of trailheads, use areas, and parking areas can promote sustainability, encourage resiliency, and manage visitation. Additionally, the concentration of use at key recreation nodes can help preserve the Wasatch Canyons into the future.

The 2003 Revised Wasatch-Cache Forest Plan comprehensively addresses recreation access and management on USFS lands in the Canyons. The CRMP identifies management objectives, policies and guidelines for recreation and tourism including:

- Engage recreation users, resource managers, and residents in developing strategies for managing recreation to meet desired future conditions and address recreation pressures and demands.
- Work cooperatively across agencies to support recreation choice and demand. When conflicts arise, pursue practical, lasting, win-win solutions in an atmosphere of open communication, broad participation, and respect.
- Encourage education in values of outdoor recreation.
- Support education efforts about naturalness, solitude, and other backcountry values.
- Recognize the value of outdoor activities in the development of children and young people, and through education and hands-on experience, encourage their active participation.
- Improve the quality of recreation experience for visitors and residents.
- Support the development of funding mechanisms for the creation, implementation, and ongoing operations of needed recreational facilities, transportation options, infrastructure, and maintenance.
- Install interpretive signs in multiple languages at high-use areas, including parking lots, trailheads and viewpoints to foster stewardship, encourage proper behavior, and appreciate natural resources.
- Encourage participation from a diverse range of stakeholders in the development of recreation system improvements, including local governments, private landowners, and recreation groups.

Recreational access to open space is an important component of an open space preservation program. The County is committed to completing the Bonneville Shoreline Trail corridor and trail system and providing for access to the trail at appropriate locations. Additionally, some privately-owned parcels of property are located within the National Forest. Many of these lack potable water and have limited access and development potential, leaving landowners with few options to realize ownership benefits. Access to open spaces and public lands is often through or across private lands which creates difficult challenges for both the property owners and public.

The County could evaluate the utility of acquiring conservation easements, or fee title to strategic properties especially relating to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail, in conjunction with Salt Lake City's land preservation efforts.
2. DEDICATED FUNDING SOURCES

GOAL: EXPLORE AND IMPLEMENT OPTIONS FOR DEDICATED FUNDING SOURCES TO ASSIST THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CANYONS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS AND TO PROVIDE ONGOING SUPPORT FOR MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS TO SUPPORT THE GROWING DEMANDS OF THE CANYONS.

STRATEGY CHOICES

**Overall System**
1. Implement Canyon user fees or roadway tolls, with a portion of the tolls to be used within the canyons for trailheads, restrooms, etc.
2. Create a Regional Wasatch Canyons Recreation District (Local or Special Service District).
3. Apply for grants through Zoo, Arts and Parks Tax (known as the ZAP or RAP tax).
4. Request a portion of Transient Room and Lodging Taxes.
5. Tap into funding resources from foundations, grants, State, federal, and other revenue sources.
6. Implement tax sharing agreements or tax increment financing.

**Background**

Funding for needed infrastructure improvements and ongoing maintenance has not kept up with the growing needs. The types of funding necessary for one-time construction projects are different from sources that can provide long-term revenues for operations and maintenance. To achieve the community's vision, additional funding sources should be evaluated to implement a variety of strategies. Money generated should directly benefit the canyons.

**Implementation of Canyon use fees or roadway tolls.**

While some Wasatch Canyons currently charge entry fees, such as Mill Creek Canyon, others do not. The Utah legislature recently passed legislation that allows UDOT to levy tolls on identified State highways for a variety of purposes. The toll-authorizing legislation is flexible and allows UDOT to use tolls collected to support non-transportation projects, such as expanded recreational facilities, parking improvements and facility maintenance, among others. Dashboard permits are an alternative to fee collection, but the enforcement of a permit system (i.e., bicycle tags, parking permits, etc.) would be costly, and enforcement would be sporadic at best.

The County would work with the USFS, UDOT, and other stakeholders to determine potential sites for tollbooths or potential revenues from permit-restricted programs, based on USFS data regarding use. The Mill Creek fees are collected by the County and remitted to the Forest Service for maintenance projects in Mill Creek Canyon. The County would work with the USFS and UDOT to allocate collected tolls in a manner to address the most pressing demands in the Canyons.

**Create a Regional Wasatch Canyons Recreation District (Local or Special Service District).**

Creation of a Wasatch Canyons Recreation District would provide a stable, predictable revenue source for both operating and capital expenses, and a basis to bond for capital improvements. The process of forming a local district requires cooperation of all cities/counties involved, and creates...
a new taxing authority. Local districts have independent taxing power whereas special service districts must request any taxes or assessment from the governing body that created them.

The County would work with all municipalities in the County to create a local special service district. If the district area is larger than Salt Lake County, the County would work with involved taxing entities to develop and manage the district(s).

**Implement a Zoo, Arts and Parks Tax (known as the ZAP or RAP tax).**

Salt Lake County has already enacted this tax to the full allowable 1/10th of one percent, and the ZAP tax generated approximately $24 million in revenue for Salt Lake County in 2017. The ZAP tax is a competitive process to apply for and receive funds; many other organizations rely on this same revenue source. Raising the limit above 1/10th of 1% would require State legislative approval. The ZAP tax revenues are year by year, and is best utilized for capital improvements.

The County is responsible for reviewing ZAP tax applications and distributing funds. The County could decide to re-allocate some funding to address the Canyons’ issues.

**Implement Transient Room and Lodging Taxes.**

A county may impose a tax on charges for lodging facilities for less than 30 days at a rate not to exceed 4.25 percent. Salt Lake County has already enacted this tax at the full 4.25 percent rate. Municipalities may also enact a rate of up to one percent of the rates charged for fewer than 30 days. An additional transient room tax of 0.5 percent may be imposed under certain circumstances to repay bonded or other indebtedness. There are only two cities in Salt Lake County that are currently eligible to, and have enacted, this tax: Sandy City and West Valley City. Other travel and tourism-related taxes include the resort communities tax, restaurant tax, and motor vehicle leasing tax. The benefits of these taxes include a stable and predictable revenue source, and that tourism and travel-related taxes have been growing in Utah. Raising the tax rate would require legislative approval.

The County would need to allocate funds generated to the Canyons on an ongoing basis. The County could also work with the Legislature to increase the tax rates in Salt Lake County to be used specifically for funding in the Canyons.

**Tap into funding from foundations, grants, State, federal, and other revenue sources.**

**Foundations** - Creating a foundation is one means of raising revenues. The benefits of creating a foundation to raise funds include creating partnerships with the private sector to obtain business contributions, and a sense of ownership by the entire community in addressing Canyon needs. This would not be a steady or consistent revenue source, being dependent on voluntary contributions, and foundation funds are not a basis for bonding. Operating a foundation involves significant administrative costs, unless that work is done by volunteers.

**Grant Funding** - Some of the most popular grant sources for recreation-related projects include the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the Utah Waypoint Grant, the Recreational Trails Program (RTP), and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). Grant funding is a new money source that does not need to be repaid, but is not a steady or consistent revenue source. Grants may also require matching funds or other restriction on use of funds.

The County could devote resources to provide leadership assistance in grant writing.

**Tax shareback agreements or tax increment financing.**

With tax sharebacks or tax increment financing (TIF), revenues are generated through growth in property values or sales taxes. A portion of the revenues received may be paid back to a developer for improvements or to a Redevelopment Agency (in the case of a creation of Project Area) to assist with improvements. Advantages include flexibility in use of funds, and the ability to incentivize development to occur in a particular area.

The County would need to evaluate the creation of a Project Area(s) in the Canyons where tax increment generated funds could be applied.
3. TRANSIT SERVICE ENHANCEMENT

GOAL: SUPPORT ENHANCED YEAR-ROUND TRANSIT SERVICE TO AND WITHIN THE WASATCH CANYONS.

STRATEGY CHOICES

Overall System
1. Support the development of transit centers/hubs outside the canyons, but within a reasonable distance of entrances. Transit centers should provide access to a variety of transportation choices and information and connect to the regional transportation system. Encourage these hubs in mixed-use/business centers where parking can be shared.
2. Assist funding to support UTA with increased year-round bus service.
3. Where possible, develop ride-share and bus pullouts at key use nodes.
4. Incentivize carpooling/share vehicle or programs.
5. Support the development of areas, such as pickup spots, that prioritize rideshare vehicles, transit, and electric vehicles.
6. Support increased transit frequency and additional stops at critical locations in the canyons such as trailheads to improve usability and ridership of public transit.

Mill Creek Canyon
1. Consider voluntary permitted summer shuttle service.

Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons
1. Support the addition of summer UTA bus service and significantly increased winter service to key destinations.

BACKGROUND

Transit serves as an essential tool to reduce single occupancy vehicles and the growing demand of visitors in the canyons. Coupled with parking management strategies, transit allows for the ability to transport visitors and employees while mitigating the need for additional parking. Additionally, bus service can reduce the delay and congestion on the roadways in the canyons.

Public transit in the canyons, in the form of bus service, is currently provided by UTA per their transit plans. During the summer, there are limited public transit options. UTA runs route 990 to Snowbird, which consists of one trip up the canyon in the morning and one trip back down in the evening.

Separate fixed UTA routes are proposed for winter and summer services. Summer services may require additional/different stops than those used for the winter Ski Bus service. Additional bus service would need to be funded through a dedicated funding stream, such as a purchase agreement with the County so that the increased service does not disproportionately affect the overall UTA service area. It should also be noted that transit service expansion at trailheads and recreation areas is directly tied to supporting infrastructures such as restroom facilities and associated operations and maintenance funding.

Mill Creek Canyon currently does not have any transit service. Transit concepts should address parking congestion at key areas in Mill Creek Canyon, and accommodate a range of users and their gear: dogs, bicycles, picnic hampers, skis, snowshoes, and other accessories. The Mill Creek Canyon Transportation Feasibility Study (2012) considered various transportation concepts, including the idea of a permitted shuttle. Salt Lake County could consider a shuttle system to reduce parking demand in Mill Creek Canyon, though banning personal vehicles altogether is not an appropriate solution.
4. ROADWAY FACILITIES

GOAL: SUPPORT ADEQUATE ROADWAY FACILITIES TO ENHANCE SAFETY AND MODE CHOICE IN THE WASATCH CANYONS.

STRATEGY CHOICES

**Overall System**
1. Support roadway design that allows for transit and increased occupancy rates where appropriate. Pursue enhancements to Park and Ride lots.
2. Work with UDOT and UTA to integrate active transportation planning in the Canyons.
3. Utilize appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) when upgrades and enhancements to roads are performed to address stormwater impacts to the watershed and water quality. Ensure there is a funding source for maintenance of BMPs.

**Parley’s Canyon**
1. Support construction of an off-street bicycle pathway (uphill and downhill) connecting Salt Lake County and Summit County via Parley’s Canyon.

**Mill Creek, Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons**
1. Provide a bicycle lane in the uphill direction, where feasible.
2. Provide downhill bicycle shared-lane marking and signage in the Cottonwood Canyons, where possible as much as the terrain and site conditions will allow.
3. Where needed, provide downhill bicycle pullouts and passing areas.

**BACKGROUND**

New types of road facilities will be more consistent with the vision of the Wasatch Canyons while protecting the character and environment, and provide transportation facilities like bicycle lanes. There are a growing number of people road bicycling, mountain biking, and running or walking on the road shoulder. According to the 2017 Cottonwood Canyons Transportation Recommendations, a substantial portion of the Canyons roadways lacks the sufficient shoulder width to accommodate active transportation facilities like bicycle lanes. In addition to narrow shoulders, cyclists must also compete with automobiles using the shoulders for roadside parking. In some cases, cyclists must move into travel lanes to avoid opening doors, parked vehicles, and road debris.

Specific issues include:

- The shoulder is less than 6 feet for most of the Canyons, which is not enough space to accommodate parking, cycling, and pedestrians.
- The walking and biking experience can be uncomfortable and unsafe. In the summer, pedestrians sometimes walk in the lane of traffic or the vegetation if cars are parked on the shoulder. On peak days when the ski resort parking lots are full, skiers often walk in the snowbank or in the lane of traffic with skis and/or with children. High vehicle volumes and the speed differential between vehicles and cyclists degrade the cycling experience and impact safety.

Mill Creek Canyon Road could be an ideal route for road cyclists with proper facility accommodations. The current need to share the roadway with much faster motor vehicles, particularly in the uphill direction, makes for an experience stressful enough to likely be discouraging otherwise interested people from biking into and up the canyon.
5. PUBLIC UTILITY INFRASTRUCTURE

GOAL: MEET THE GROWING DEMANDS FOR RESIDENTS, BUSINESSES, AND VISITORS BY ENHANCING AND IMPROVING PUBLIC UTILITY SYSTEMS.

STRATEGY CHOICES

Overall System
1. Work with agency partners to identify public infrastructure needs to address residential, recreational, environmental, and business impacts.
2. Evaluate infrastructure needs and coordinate agency capital improvement plans (CIPs) to ensure they are consistent with the General Plan. Ensure General Plan projects (to be identified) are in CIPs and prioritize their implementation.
3. Evaluate infrastructure priorities and incentives for development in appropriate areas that achieve environmental protection, recreational impact mitigation, and other goals consistent with the General Plan.
4. Evaluate all funding options to support development and maintenance of needed infrastructure. All funds generated within the canyons should be spent within the canyons.

BACKGROUND
Providers and managers of public infrastructure and services in the canyons include the USFS (trails, trailheads, toilet facilities, picnic areas, parking); the UDOT (roads); the UTA (transit); Salt Lake County (sewer services); other agencies. No centralized public water service is provided in the canyons. Private water companies and individual springs, wells, mine tunnels, and other sources such as cisterns and small storage have been developed by businesses and property owners to meet their water needs to date. Roads and transit are addressed in later sections of the Goal initiatives. These agencies identify infrastructure and service needs and prioritize projects and spending through the development of capital improvement plans. Although several initiatives are underway to address shortfalls, funding for infrastructure improvements and maintenance is not meeting current needs. Ideas to address funding shortfalls are discussed below in Goal Initiative 2. Dedicated Funding Sources for Capital Improvements and Ongoing Maintenance and Operations.

The Wasatch Canyons see many visitors across all seasons, primarily for recreational uses. Targeted new infrastructure development and upgrades to existing infrastructure will be needed to achieve the vision for recreational experience and to support the desired future land uses. Also, visitors and residents can adversely impact the natural environment due to the current lack of infrastructure (sanitation, parking, etc.). A challenge is that agency budgets have not been sufficient to keep up with infrastructure development and maintenance needs, and alternative or additional sources of funding need to be identified.
6. PARKING MANAGEMENT

GOAL: SUPPORT YEAR-ROUND PARKING MANAGEMENT TO PROVIDE PARKING IN DESIGNATED LOCATIONS THAT PROVIDE SAFETY, SCENIC QUALITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION THROUGHOUT THE CANYONS AND FOOTHILLS.

STRATEGY CHOICES
Some parking strategies could apply to all of the canyons in the planning area, while some are canyon-specific.

PLAN-AREA STRATEGIES
1. Collaborate with UDOT, UTA, and the Forest Service to develop a parking system master plan for parking and canyon transportation. Construct parking structures/transit center or park-n-ride near entrances in or nearby cities close to the canyons with connections to transit.
2. Encourage striping parking lots and allowed roadside parking areas to maximize parking availability. In dangerous areas remove roadside parking to minimize pedestrian and vehicle conflicts.
3. For high usage centers redesign parking lots and pedestrian roadway to enhance user experience and safety.
4. Partner with public and private agencies to encourage the more efficient use of parking.
5. Work with ski areas, Forest Service, UDOT, UTA, businesses, and hotels near the canyons to coordinate parking and provide real-time information on lot capacity and areas that are less crowded as well as alternative locations to visit through a website and phone apps.
6. Utilize appropriate BMPs when upgrades and enhancements to parking facilities are performed to address stormwater impacts to the watershed and water quality. Ensure there is a funding source for maintenance of BMPs.
7. Explore the feasibility of dynamic congestion pricing during peak demand days.

MILL CREEK CANYON
1. Consider a shared parking agreement with the Boy Scouts of America for Millcreek Canyon.
2. Consider developing a parking master plan to work in conjunction with a shuttle service for Millcreek Canyon.

BACKGROUND
Parking management is a valuable tool to manage users, provide access, and reduce adverse environmental impacts. Several recent documents have researched parking management solutions in the Wasatch Canyons. These include the 2017 Cottonwood Canyons Transportation Recommendations, The Mountain Transportation Study (2012), and Canyons Parking Study (2012). The USFS policies and guidelines also address parking management and needs within the Wasatch Canyons.

REAL-TIME PARKING INFORMATION
Electronic parking utilization signs, used in a variety of applications to communicate to visitors when lots are at capacity, could be useful for mitigating parking issues. Messaging signs connected to vehicle counters and placed strategically along canyon roads would be able to provide real-time utilization information and direct incoming visitors towards open parking spots. The biggest hurdle to implementing a system of parking management signs is bringing the technology required into a remote area. Vehicle counters and a power source (likely solar) would be needed at each parking lot, along with a cellular or satellite connection to a control center capable of feeding real-time information to each messaging sign.

PARKING OUTSIDE THE CANYONS
According to the 2017 Cottonwood Canyons Transportation Recommendations, to meet the bus and carpool goals for the Wasatch Canyons, about 2,500-3,000 new/additional parking spaces are needed in the valley on the three ski bus routes (estimated cost of $60-100 million). There are currently 2,900 spaces at nine key park-and-ride lots serving the ski bus routes, and they are reaching capacity. It is presumed that many of these lots are being used for carpooling in addition to accessing the ski bus since there are 2,900 spaces and an average of 750-1,500 people into the canyons.
7. ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION

GOAL: EDUCATE AND ENCOURAGE RESIDENTS, EMPLOYEES, AND VISITORS TO ENHANCE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES TO PROMOTE A CULTURE OF BICYCLING AND WALKING.

STRATEGY CHOICES
1. Develop a wayfinding signage program for bicyclists and pedestrians with detailed, site-specific signage that directs users to key destinations within the Canyons.
2. Develop additional wayfinding collateral such as maps or online information to prepare visitors traveling to the Canyons.
3. Provide education on appropriate speed and safety of cyclists and increase enforcement of speed of cyclists.
4. Work with UTA and UDOT to incorporate and enhance bicycle usage on bus and shuttle systems.
5. Collaborate with UDOT and Forest Service to include needed amenities such as bike fix station and potable water at key trail heads or activity centers.

BACKGROUND
Encouraging proper and safe use of trails and active transportation facilities will aid in converting more trips from vehicle trips to non-motorized trips. Wayfinding signage helps bicyclists and pedestrians traveling for transportation and recreation navigate unfamiliar areas. The inclusion of travel time and distance on wayfinding signage has proven to be a positive influence on active transportation activity. Wayfinding information can promote active transportation as a viable method for traveling to or within the Canyons. Wayfinding signage can be coordinated with branding and aesthetic goals.
8. PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES

GOAL: ENHANCE PEDESTRIAN SAFETY AT TRAILHEADS, PARKING LOTS, AND OTHER PUBLIC FACILITIES.

STRATEGY CHOICES
1. Enhance or where appropriate create new off-street trail connections. The USFS would like to see trails connecting to other trails.
2. Implement pedestrian road crossing signs, pavement marking, and traffic controls at key recreation destinations.
3. Implement ADA and senior/child-friendly facilities at key locations throughout the Canyons.
4. Support the replacement and reconstruction of the Silver Lake boardwalk.

BACKGROUND
To provide additional access and reduce roadside parking conflicts with growing number of people walking, running, and bicycling, non-motorized recreation options must be available with the appropriate connections. Pedestrian facilities for persons of all ages and levels of ability should be provided in key destination areas. Although sidewalks are not likely feasible, off-street pathways and on-street crosswalks would improve pedestrian conditions at key locations. Additional concerns to consider are that, other than the ski resorts and park and ride lots, there are limited ADA facilities (ramps, parking spaces, cross-walks) in the Canyons.

The extensive trail network is perhaps the primary feature drawing visitors to Mill Creek Canyon. Due to the Canyon's parking congestion issues, however, some visitors are not able to park in the lot closest to their desired trailhead. Instead, they must drive to a different lot and walk or bicycle in or alongside the roadway to the trailhead. Better pedestrian connections between parking lots and trailheads would make this a much more comfortable experience. The Mill Creek Canyon Feasibility Study identified the Big Water, Church Fork, and Maple Grove trailheads as the most problematic for trail connectivity.

According to the 2017 Cottonwood Canyons Transportation Recommendations, the lack of adequate facilities along or parallel to the roadway make it hard for pedestrian users to access their destination. There is also a lack of safe facilities to bicycle and walk on canyon roadways. Bicycle and pedestrian use of the Canyons contributes to some transportation issues on roads.

Informal trailheads (or social trailheads) created by people straying from official USFS access locations have developed as people access a myriad of dispersed recreational opportunities. Informal trailheads contribute to erosion, mineral soil loss, loss of vegetation, and can be unsafe for users. Unregulated roadside shoulder parking adds to informal trailheads when users are not funneled to official access points. Regulation and control of roadside parking within the canyon can help alleviate this problem.
9. Watershed Management

Goal: Ensure the Management of Watersheds in the Wasatch Mountains to Protect Water Quality and Quantity.

Strategy Choices
Both the 2017 Salt Lake County Integrated Watershed Plan and the 1999 Salt Lake City Watershed Master Plan establish goals and policies for future watershed management and recommendations for implementation of management strategies. Salt Lake City is currently updating the 1999 Plan.

1. Support the continued implementation of the recommendations of the most current Salt Lake County Integrated Watershed Plan and the Salt Lake City Watershed Management Plan.

2. Continue cooperation with the Salt Lake County Health Department, Utah Department of Environmental Quality, the U.S. Forest Service, and Salt Lake City to implement anti-degradation standards, stream setback and environment zones, stormwater Best Management Practices, monitoring programs, enforcement activities, and other canyon watershed policies to maintain water quality in the canyons.

3. Concentrate major developed recreation facilities as much as possible to avoid sprawl and preserve open space.

4. Pursue canyon land use policies which will allow continued use of the canyons for transportation, recreational, residential, and commercial development as long as these activities do not result in deterioration of water quality. Any new or expanding uses in the watershed canyons must be reviewed and carefully scrutinized to determine if the proposed use is consistent with water quality goals.

5. Require recreation facilities to be constructed and operated to minimize both point and non-point sources of pollution. Stream setbacks, protection of vegetation, appropriate siting, and stormwater Best Management Practices are among the factors that should be considered in recreation area construction and management.

Background
Surface water emanating from the canyon watersheds in the Plan area is a critical source of culinary water for 500,000 people in Salt Lake County. Communities that rely on these source waters include Salt Lake City, Mill Creek, Holladay, Sandy, and Cottonwood Heights. Public water suppliers such as Salt Lake City and Sandy City have strict regulatory obligations to meet federal and state Safe Drinking Water Act requirements, and amendments in 1996 to the federal Safe Drinking Water Act recognized the importance of protection of sources of drinking water as critical prevention to protect public health.

Water quality protection is a top priority within the multi-use watershed of the Wasatch Canyons. The health and resiliency of these resources must not be degraded to ensure high-quality drinking water for Salt Lake County in the future. Pressures related to water supplies are increasing due to climate change and population growth, making these water sources more critical, and more in need of protection than ever. Therefore, protection of the current drinking water supplies continues to be a priority.
10. WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES MANAGEMENT

GOAL: ENSURE THAT FUTURE USE OF AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE WASATCH CANYONS IS MANAGED TO PROTECT WILDLIFE, FISHERIES AND HABITAT AND TO REDUCE HUMAN-WILDLIFE CONFLICTS.

STRATEGY CHOICES
1. Support the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (DWR) in the implementation of the Utah Wildlife Action Plan.
2. Work with other agencies to further designate sensitive areas, wildlife corridors, and conflict areas.
3. Identify wildlife protection measures (such as fencing, changes in trails, and wildlife crossings) for key sensitive areas.
4. Review and revise, as necessary, County codes and regulations to support wildlife.
5. Continue to support a science-based data resource to inform decision-making.
6. Work with applicable federal, state, and local agencies to identify sensitive aquatic populations within the plan area and, if needed, explore feasibility related to in-stream flows to protect sensitive aquatic life.

BACKGROUND
Increasing public visitation and vehicle use of the Wasatch Canyons could result in impacts to wildlife. The 2017 Salt Lake County Resource Management Plan (CRMP) addresses wildlife management on public lands in detail, identifying several management objectives with accompanying policies and guidelines. The four most relevant wildlife management objectives include:
1. Managing to keep species off the federal endangered species list.
2. Provide for the sustained diversity of species and maintain communities within their historic range.
3. Support maintenance and improvement of existing aquatic habitats, including riparian and wetland habitats.
4. Coordinate with DNR and the Utah Department of Transportation to reduce wildlife and vehicle collisions on Salt Lake County roadways.
Section 19.72.140 of FCOZ, Wildlife Habitat Protection, establishes development limitations in areas of critical wildlife habitat and provides standards and guidelines to protect wildlife and their habitats.
11. PUBLIC AWARENESS AND STEWARDSHIP OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND RECREATIONAL VALUES

GOAL: ENHANCE PUBLIC AWARENESS AND STEWARDSHIP OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND RECREATIONAL VALUES AND PRACTICES.

STRATEGY CHOICES

1. In cooperation with canyon stakeholders, volunteers, develop a county-wide public education campaign and associated social media and materials to support public education and stewardship of the Wasatch Canyons.

2. Support development of educational materials for school programs and support programs aimed at making the Wasatch Canyons accessible to all.

3. Review and consider the Cottonwood Canyons Scenic Byways Plan signage plan when planning for educational signage.

BACKGROUND

Increasing visitation and use of the Canyons is creating additional impacts to the resources and the recreational experience. Greater understanding by visitors of the function and sensitivities of canyon resources to impacts could reduce those impacts and support better overall canyon visitor experiences. A program to promote environmentally-friendly and user-friendly public activities while in the Canyons and foothills could mitigate adverse impacts.

Visitation to picnic areas and trailheads in the Canyons is increasing rapidly, with accompanying impacts to toilet facilities, parking areas, tables, fire pits and other amenities. Canyon trails are also experiencing an increase in use and incidents of misuse. According to the 2016 report, An Estimation of Visitor Use in Little Cottonwood, Big Cottonwood, and Mill Creek Canyons (Utah State University’s Institute of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism), the estimated annual visitation in the Wasatch Canyons was 4,505,004 total users. Of those users, 30% visited designated resort areas, and 70% were dispersed users. The rate of visitation is expected to continue to increase as the Salt Lake Area population grows. The CRMP addresses environmental education as an element of wildlife and habitat preservation.
12. LAND PRESERVATION

GOAL: MAINTAIN AND INCREASE THE CONSERVATION OF NATURAL LANDS THAT PROVIDE REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE TOWARDS ECOSYSTEMS, WATERSHED, AND RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES.

STRATEGY CHOICES
1. Identify priority areas of natural lands that should be conserved and maintained. Identify the criteria to prioritize areas that are important to be conserved and supported, such as environmental values, ecosystem health, aesthetics, recreation experience, contiguous to trails and open space area linkages.
2. Create a mechanism to fund open space preservation and ongoing maintenance.
3. Utilize all possible funding resources available, such as the County’s Open Space Trust Fund, Salt Lake City, State of Utah, or NGOs, to protect critical parcels. As a last resort, explore other funding mechanisms such as fees.
4. Pursue the State of Utah in purchasing lands for conservation.
5. Promote the use of private land trusts and other groups to facilitate the conservation and maintenance of key properties through donations, conservation easements, and acquisition with willing sellers.
6. Develop resource and stewardship plans for existing open space parcels.

BACKGROUND
A defining attribute of the Wasatch Canyons is the abundance of natural open space for scenic, recreational, and habitat values. The identification and protection of open space in identified locations will forever preserve the character of the Wasatch Canyons and protect sensitive resources.

The Salt Lake County Open Space Acquisition Plan was developed to meet Salt Lake County’s goal of creating a diverse portfolio of conserved lands that improve quality of life and protect ecological health in Salt Lake County. The plan comprises the tools and process by which the Open Space Trust Fund Advisory Committee recommends projects for funding from the Open and Green Space Bond and the Open Space Trust Fund. It contains two major sections: policy and process and land analysis. The former establishes a Project Selection Process and sets priorities. The latter is a GIS-based (Geographic Information System) analysis designed to identify and evaluate open lands in Salt Lake County and recommended acquisition strategies.

The County could also evaluate the utility of acquiring conservation easements, or fee title to lands, in conjunction with Salt Lake City’s efforts.
13. RESILIENCY PROGRAM

GOAL: PREPARE THE CANYONS AND FOOTHILLS FOR POTENTIAL NATURAL HAZARDS AND ADDRESS THE IMPACTS CAUSED BY AGING INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE CANYONS TO REDUCE IMPACTS.

STRATEGY CHOICES
1. Work with corresponding agencies to further prepare the Canyons for the event of a wildland fire, earthquakes, landslides and other natural disasters.
2. Work with the USFS to understand and prepare for the impact of insect and disease issues that may severely impact the forest ecosystem in the near future.
3. Apply adequate resources to fire protection, noxious weed control, and habitat protection.
4. Ensure communities and resort areas have adequate emergency preparedness plans and supplies.
5. Work to develop programs to incentivize the upgrading of existing homes and businesses including septic upgrades and improved water and sewer connections.
6. Explore a tree and mitigation bank for removed trees to help fund restoration work.
7. Work with science professionals to enrich and educate Salt Lake County planners, commissioners, and elected officials on lessons learned through research application.

BACKGROUND:
The long-term health of the Wasatch Canyons’ ecosystems, protection of water quality, and protection of the quality of the recreational experience in the Canyons depend on both future protection and remediation of past problems. Much of the development in the Canyons is quite old, and water, sewer, and utility systems are aging. The climate is changing and better techniques for managing flooding, wildfire, noxious weeds, and other problems are emerging. A program to repair older systems and employ new management techniques would result in better environmental and recreational outcomes.

The CRMP addresses floodplains, noxious weed control, and fire management, setting forth the County’s desired future conditions, management objectives and associated policies and guidelines. FCOZ identifies floodplains and riparian areas as sensitive lands deserving of greater protections in the development process. The CRMP also recognizes agency partners for sustainability projects and efforts. Salt Lake County could develop its own program to incentivize upgrades of private systems and could coordinate with jurisdictional agencies on sustainability programs. The CRMP calls for coordination among the USFS and emergency service providers to prevent and remediate damage caused by fires, flooding, and other natural disasters. The County’s Integrated Watershed Plan identifies strategies to protect water quality in the Canyons. The CRMP addresses explicitly fire management, floodplain management, and geologic hazards, with accompanying goals, policies and management.
14. INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION

GOAL: ENSURE THAT FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL AGENCIES AND ENTITIES WITH JURISDICTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE WASATCH CANYONS PLANNING AREA COORDINATE THEIR EFFORTS AND PLANNING PROCESSES TO PROVIDE FOR EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES AND THE RESOURCES OF THE WASATCH CANYONS.

STRATEGY CHOICES

1. Implement the inter-agency coordination measures identified in the CRMP for fire management, forest management, riparian areas and wetlands, recreation management, and the other resources addressed in the CRMP.

2. Work to establish collaborative goals, action plans and timelines among jurisdictions, including the County, USFS, towns, cities, and community councils.

3. Work with the partner agencies and the Wasatch Front Regional Council on updates of their development and management plans and any corresponding amendments.

4. Work with the USFS, Army Corps of Engineers, UDOT, and UTA on any implementation level projects, so they meet the Wasatch Canyons General Plan’s vision.

5. Include the USFS, towns, metro townships, cities, community councils, UDOT, CWC, and UTA on County level plans, studies, and projects to ensure all activities are coordinated.

6. Invite participation of the Scenic Byway Councils through the State of Utah Office of Tourism in future planning efforts.

7. Coordinate with WFRC and UDOT to get transportation projects and appropriate funding in RTP and Unified Transportation plans.

BACKGROUND

Successful planning for management of the lands and resources in the Wasatch Canyons will require a general plan area-wide approach across jurisdictional boundaries. The CRMP identifies inter-agency coordination as key to successful planning and management of resources related to public lands, notably the National Forest. The CRMP calls for active engagement in forest planning and in other agency planning efforts. The CRMP calls explicitly for intergovernmental coordination on fire management, fisheries, forest management, noxious weeds, recreation and tourism, riparian areas and wetlands, water quality and water rights, wilderness areas, and wildlife management.

The Central Wasatch Commission (CWC) has been created as an inter-local entity by agreement among jurisdictional agencies and stakeholders. The CWC will be governed by a 28-35 person diverse stakeholder council and may decide to function as an intergovernmental coordination committee, although that determination has not yet been made. It is essential for the County to engage in future updates to the Forest Management Plan, city and community council management plans, and UDOT and UTA planning and approved implementation level actions.

What "may decide?" CWC or stakeholder council?
15. REGULATORY TOOL REVIEW

GOAL: AS NEEDED, REVIEW AND UPDATE COUNTY ORDINANCES TO FURTHER IMPLEMENT THE VISION, GOALS, AND STRATEGIES OF THE GENERAL PLAN.

STRATEGY CHOICES
1. Consider the need to periodically update County ordinances like the Foothills and Canyons Overlay Zone (FCOZ) and the Mountain Resort Zone (MRZ) to meet the General Plan Vision and County leadership goals.
2. Consider the need to periodically update County ordinances related to development siting, access, floodplains, water protection, and the structural design of buildings to ensure that health and safety requirements are met while allowing appropriate development to meet State Code.
3. At the General Plan draft level and adoption, review the FCOZ and MRZ to compare goal and strategy alignments or conflicts.
4. Review progress and update the Wasatch Canyons General Plan every five years to better understand progress and work towards goals.
5. Plan for a complete General Plan update in the 15-20 year time frame (2033-2038).

BACKGROUND
The Foothill Canyons Overlay Zone (FCOZ) and the Mountain Resort Zone (MRZ) were both adopted before this General Plan update process began. Both will be significant plan implementation tools and may need to be modified to implement the objectives of the General Plan. Significant revisions were recently made to the FCOZ, and the ordinance addresses current needs of the County; however, the General Plan update should consider the FCOZ and MRZ updates to aid in plan implementation. Potential revisions to the FCOZ and the MRZ should be carefully considered to accomplish General Plan goals without revisiting previously settled issues.
16. BRANDING, AESTHETICS, AND CHARACTER GUIDANCE

GOAL: RAISE APPRECIATION AND STEWARDSHIP OF CANYON BEAUTY THROUGH BRANDING, AESTHETICS, AND DEVELOPMENT GUIDANCE.

STRATEGY CHOICES:
1. Consider creating design guidelines/standards for the commercial development, gateways, and public areas that include consistent design quality, materials, and placement.
2. Work with stakeholders, communities, and businesses to implement comparable aesthetic plans.
3. Consider the implementation of unique canyon branding, similar to national parks, which promotes a sense of place, stewardship, and heritage (i.e., signage, architecture, wayfinding, entry features, benches, etc.).

BACKGROUND
The beauty and physical aesthetics of the Wasatch Canyons are an essential factor to the success of the region. Guidelines for public and private improvements can support the preservation of its character. The County's CRMP identifies visual quality goals and policies including, “Encourage the enhancement of the aesthetic beauty of our built environment.” Section 19.72.170 of FCOZ establishes design standards for private lands and development in the Canyons to preserve and enhance the beauty of the landscape; encourages project planning and building design that protects natural terrain; manages development in sensitive lands; and steers development toward the most suitable areas. FCOZ and WRS also set forth mandatory and advisory design guidelines to address structures, siting, vegetation, screening and other aspects of development in the Canyons.

The USFS needs to be engaged to ensure that branding, aesthetics, and character guidance are consistent across County and federal lands, including UDOT highway easements throughout the area. Also, recommend coordinating with the Utah Office of Tourism Scenic Byway Program in regards to the State Scenic Byway status of SR-190 and SR-210.
17. VOLUNTEER AND CITIZEN GROUP SUPPORT

GOAL: SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT OF CITIZENS' GROUPS AND VOLUNTEERS IN PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES IN THE WASATCH CANYONS.

STRATEGY CHOICES

1. Identify the citizens groups, community councils, property owners associations, and other similar associations active in each canyon, and meet with them regularly to identify opportunities for the County to support their activities, enhance communications, and define common objectives that align with the Wasatch Canyons General Plan.

2. Commit staff time and/or funding to these groups in the form of grants for activities that support the implementation of the General Plan.

3. Sponsor a forum of volunteers and community groups to coordinate communications and interactions with the County and other agency stakeholders.

4. Track service projects, hours, and efforts to show progress and gauge involvement.

5. Using a County website, list citizens groups and government agencies to provide resources for the County to better coordinate with and utilize existing groups.

BACKGROUND

There are many citizen-led organizations with interests in the Canyons. These groups serve many valuable roles, but coordination among them is generally limited to addressing specific issues as they arise. Small organizations and groups may not have the ability to address systemic issues efficiently; a larger pool of resources and funding are often necessary to accomplish this task. In the long term, these coalitions need resources and organizational support to maintain viability. The County could act as a facilitator in improving communication, coordination, and partnerships among community organizations that represent the needs of specific interests on an ongoing basis.
18. ECONOMY

GOAL: SUPPORT THE CONTINUATION AND VIABILITY OF CANYON RESORTS AND BUSINESSES. WORK TO CONSERVE THE NATURAL FEATURES AND RECREATIONAL ATTRIBUTES THAT MAKE THE CANYONS A VITAL ECONOMIC DRIVER IN UTAH.

STRATEGY CHOICES:
1. Review County FCZ, MRZ, and other relevant Salt Lake County development codes to ensure they meet the goals of the Wasatch Canyons General Plan.
2. Focus on the environmental and scenic preservation of the Wasatch Canyons as an economic development strategy. Encourage businesses to have the proper business permits (guiding, shuttle, etc). County should work with businesses and public to assist in reporting violation of laws, policies, respecting private property, etc.
3. Coordinate transportation planning and implementation with canyon resorts and businesses. If tolling is used as a transportation tool request that a portion of the tolling money be used for assistance with transit, parking, activity center trailhead, etc.
4. Include tourism and economic groups in planning, coordinating and implementing the Wasatch Canyons General Plan.
5. Regulate through business licenses the use of short-term rentals. Work with short-term rentals and hotels to understand necessary canyon policies for parking, watershed protection, and permits.
6. Support appropriate ski area/Forest Service land exchanges.

BACKGROUND
The economic benefits and opportunities related to the Wasatch Canyons can be generally characterized in two categories. The first is the economic activity that occurs within the canyons and the economic benefits that canyon activities, such as destination tourism, create for the County as a whole. The second is the value of the canyons as a lifestyle asset that supports recruitment of new businesses and skilled employees.

Figures reported by the Utah State Tax Commission indicate that the tourism-related tax revenues realized by Salt Lake County in 2017 totaled approximately $53 million. While that figure includes all tourism-related activities county-wide, a significant portion of that can be attributed to recreation activity in the Wasatch Canyons.

Based on a 2014 study, sales revenues from Big Cottonwood Canyon were $471 million; Little Cottonwood Canyon, $365 million; Parleys Canyon, $217 million; and Mill Creek Canyon $123 million. The Wasatch Canyons Tomorrow study reported that revenues generated by jobs and wages paid by canyon businesses totaled approximately $150 million in 2010, and are projected to increase to $220 million by 2030 assuming no ski area expansions occur.

Recent studies have shown that approximately 55 percent of Utah skier-days are due to out-of-state and international visitors. A 2016 research paper reports that $895 million was spent by nonresident skiers and snowboarders in 2015 with an average daily per person expenditure of $315.

The second economic benefit category is harder to quantify. The Wasatch Canyons are an asset to both Salt Lake County and the State in addition to their attraction as a premier recreation destination. The natural beauty, recreational opportunities and proximity of the Wasatch Canyons to the Wasatch Front are a significant attraction for new businesses and businesses that are recruiting skilled employees. The canyons therefore have a substantial impact on the Utah economy as a whole.
19. BROADBAND AND COMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE EXPANSION

GOAL: SUPPORT THE EXTENSION OF BROADBAND AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS HARDWARE TO ENHANCE COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES IN THE WASATCH CANYONS.

STRATEGY CHOICES
1. Evaluate and modify, if necessary, communications infrastructure and CIP plans so that they are consistent with the General Plan.
2. Incentivize development of communications infrastructure in appropriate areas and achieve other goals such as public safety improvements and environmental protection.
3. Investigate other methods of providing broadband services (preferred providers, county partnerships, etc.)
4. Ensure that new communications infrastructure is designed and installed per General Plan goals regarding aesthetics, environmental and water quality, and character of the canyons.
5. Implement improvements in broadband and telecommunications in Mill Creek Canyon.

BACKGROUND
Enhanced electrical capacity and improved fiber optic, wireless, and broadband are critical to support year-round employment, local businesses, quality of life, tourism, and public safety. The Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) has recently installed real-time traffic monitoring equipment in Big Cottonwood and Little Cottonwood Canyons, which includes wireless communication capabilities. These improvements have expanded and improved cell communications in the Canyons.

In pursuing communications infrastructure upgrades, emphasis should be placed on broadband services to Big Cottonwood Canyon and improved cellular services to Mill Creek Canyon, which have significant gaps in coverage or available providers. Providers’ facilities should be consolidated or co-located.
JOIN US!

We are looking for your input on the Goals and Strategies and how best to achieve them. Please join us at one of the three open houses listed below. You may also submit your comments online using the Online Survey which will be available on July 23rd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Open Houses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dates</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday, July 26</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15 - 7:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday, July 31</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15 - 7:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday, August 14</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 - 7:00 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLCO.ORG/WASATCH-CANYONS
September 28, 2018

Jake Young
Salt Lake County Regional Transportation, Housing & Economic Development
2001 State Street S2-100
PO Box 144575
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4575
JAYoung@slco.org

Dear Mr. Young:

Salt Lake City Department of Public Utilities (the City) would like to offer the following comments to each of the sections of the draft Wasatch Canyons Master Plan Update Goal Initiative Framework. We understand these comments will be used to help Salt Lake County (County) prepare a draft of this document for public comment, and we anticipate providing additional comment during that time. We appreciate the opportunity to serve on the Steering Committee for this process, and we hope to enhance this planning effort through our participation. Please share with the Mountain Planning Commission members if appropriate for their continued discussion.

Section Recommendations

Section 1: Recreation Management and Maintenance, Goal 1A

1. Under Overall System, the City recommends adding a Strategy Choice that requires new trails and recreation infrastructure not be implemented without corresponding ongoing funds for operations and maintenance in place to manage the additional recreation.
2. Under Overall System, the City recommends a Strategy Choice requiring that recreation facilities and systems be managed and maintained in a way that protects open lands and natural resources.
3. Under Trails, the City recommends adding a Strategy Choice that directs where possible, trails be kept out of riparian and stream areas.
4. Salt Lake City recommends that Recreation Infrastructure Strategy Choice #1 include not just assisting the U.S. Forest Service, but other agencies and stakeholders that manage recreation and own land and facilities in the Plan Area. For instance, Salt Lake City owns significant land for watershed protection and infrastructure purposes within the study area.
5. Salt Lake City recommends that Trails Strategy Choice #1 read something to the effect of “Work with the Forest Service, state and local jurisdictions, and property owners to develop an updated trails master plan for the Central Wasatch Area.”
6. Under the second-to-last paragraph in Background, the City recommends it read simply, “Recreational access to open space is an important component of an open space preservation program. The County is committed to completing the Bonneville Shoreline Trail corridor and trail system and providing for access to the trail at appropriate...
locations. Additionally, some privately-owned properties are located within the National Forest. Many of these lack potable water and have limited access and development potential, leaving landowners with few options to realize ownership benefits. Access to open spaces and public lands may occur through or across private lands, which creates difficult challenges for both the property owners and public.”

Salt Lake City’s concern with the third and fourth sentences in the paragraph above is that it may create the mistaken impression that canyon landowners are being deprived of their property rights.

7. Salt Lake City is interested in exploring land acquisition opportunities with the County and other stakeholders, as described in the last paragraph under Background. However, it should be noted that the Salt Lake City Watershed Purchase Fund can only be used to acquire lands for water quality and watershed protection.

8. Note that any trail improvement proposals that cross Salt Lake City property must be coordinated with Salt Lake City, and any approved use will need leases and/or permits with Salt Lake City.

9. This General Plan Update should consider the distinction between managing demands for recreation use and development in the Plan Area versus inducing additional demand for recreation use and development. These are two distinct scenarios for the future of the Wasatch Canyons, with different scales of impact to the environment, watershed, public budgets, and quality of life. It is not clear which scenario the Goals in the document are trying to achieve. Goals and Strategy Choices related to recreation, transit, and transportation should consider and account for the impacts of both managing and inducing this demand.

Section 2: Dedicated Funding Sources

1. Salt Lake City recommends that this section provide guidance on how funds should be spent and how projects should be prioritized. It should ensure that funding be guaranteed not just for new recreation opportunities and capital projects, but also for operations and maintenance, and natural resource restoration and protection.

2. We recommend adding a Strategy Choice that ensures that funding be available to mitigate the impact of recreation activities on open space, water resources, and natural resources.

Section 3: Transit Service Enhancement

1. Salt Lake City recommends adding a Strategy Choice requiring that new and enhanced transit must not degrade watershed health or water quality.

2. Similar to Comment #9 above, the City recommends this section consider whether transit enhancements are intended to manage use of the canyons, or if they are intended to induce new use of the Plan Area. It is not clear which scenario this Goal is meant to achieve. Depending on which scenario the County selects, it should be carefully evaluated to understand impacts and how the scenario may interface with other General Plan goals.

3. Salt Lake City encourages referencing the Mill Creek transportation and parking study that was performed by Salt Lake County Engineering.

Section 4: Roadway Facilities
1. Salt Lake City encourages referencing the Mill Creek transportation and parking study that was performed by the Salt Lake County Division of Flood Control and Engineering.

Section 5: Public Utility Infrastructure
1. Under Background, the City recommends a recognition that the boundaries of water infrastructure is limited by contract, and sewer/septic improvements are regulated by the Salt Lake County Health Department and Salt Lake City. Such a clarification will help manage expectations about what kind of improvements and changes can be made to that infrastructure.
2. Under the first sentence of Background, we recommend inclusion of Salt Lake City, as we own land and infrastructure in the canyons, and cooperate with the U.S. Forest Service and others with respect to recreation management.
3. Salt Lake City recommends adding a Strategy Choice that protects water resources when utility infrastructure is repaired or developed.

Section 6. Parking Management
1. Salt Lake City recommends adding a Strategy Choice requiring new or enhanced parking lots and systems do not degrade watershed health or water quality.
2. Salt Lake City encourages referencing the Mill Creek transportation and parking study that was performed by Salt Lake County Division of Flood Control & Engineering.

Section 7. Active Transportation
1. The City recommends that Strategy Choice #5 read “Collaborate with UDOT, Salt Lake City, and the Forest Service to include needed amenities such as bike fix stations and potable water (where available and feasible) at key trail heads or activity centers.”
2. Salt Lake City recommends that this section take the opportunity to address e-bikes and scooters, including direction on how to manage such emerging uses.

Section 9. Watershed Management
1. Salt Lake City recommends the County add a Strategy Choice to identify impaired reaches of stream for funding to implement restoration.
2. The City recommends including a Strategy Choice that encourages landowners, developers, utility providers, and government agencies to follow environmental best management practices for design and construction of canyon development.

Section 12. Land Preservation
1. Salt Lake City agrees that acquisition of natural areas is important, and cautions against identifying specific parcels of land in public documents in order to avoid manipulation of land value.
2. In addition to identifying criteria to prioritize areas that may be conserved under Strategy Choices #1, Salt Lake City recommends developing a system by which lands would be evaluated for purchase.

Section 14. Intergovernmental Coordination
1. We recommend that Salt Lake City be added to Strategy Choice #4, as we are partners in the implementation and management of many canyon projects given our watershed and water resource roles, budget impacts, and regulatory jurisdiction.
Section 15. Regulatory Review

1. Salt Lake City recommends the County add a Strategy Choice to streamline and clarify the FCOZ/private property development process, as many citizens and business entities have expressed frustration and confusion with the process as it exists now, particularly with respect to coordination between jurisdictions. Salt Lake City is willing to participate with Salt Lake County to evaluate and better coordinate our combined review and permitting process in the future.

Section 16. Branding, Aesthetics, and Character Guidance

1. The City recommends both Keep It Pure and watershed messaging continue to be considered a component of the branding of the canyons in order to further public education in watershed values. The U.S. Forest Service is a partner in this branding, and the City would like to include the County as an additional important partner in continuing this public watershed education.

Section 18. Economy

1. The Background section currently discusses only two categories of economic benefits and opportunities related to the Wasatch Canyons—economic activity in the canyons, and benefits to quality of life. Therefore, the City recommends this section include a third fundamental benefit—the significant economic benefit associated with protecting the watershed in order to ensure clean water resources to the canyon communities and Salt Lake Valley. We are willing to work with the County to find the best way to include this principle to this section.

We appreciate the opportunity to participate in this process, and hope our comments are helpful. We understand that the protection of the watershed and water resources is an important consideration for Salt Lake County, along with many other public values associated with these canyons. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or would like to discuss further.

Sincerely,

Laura Briefer
Director

cc: Krissy Gilmore, Logan Simpson
    Marian Rice, Salt Lake City
    Karryn Greenleaf, Salt Lake City
    Patrick Nelson, Salt Lake City
    Carly Castle, Salt Lake City
MEETING MINUTE SUMMARY
MOUNTAINOUS PLANNING DISTRICT PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Thursday, September 6, 2018 4:00 p.m.

Approximate meeting length: 1 hour 43 minutes
Number of public in attendance: 11
Summary Prepared by: Wendy Gurr
Meeting Conducted by: Commissioner Johnson

ATTENDANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioners</th>
<th>Public Mtg</th>
<th>Business Mtg</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEIL COHEN</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICOLE OMER</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD YOUNG</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBBY ELLIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINDA JOHNSON (VICE CHAIR)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON DESPAI (CHAIR)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REID PERSING (CHAIR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATHERINE KANTER</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES PALMER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTIE HUTCHINGS</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAYNEE JONES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning Staff / DA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Staff / DA</th>
<th>Public Mtg</th>
<th>Business Mtg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Gurr</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis Woodward</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Nakamura</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake Young</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zach Shaw (DA)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BUSINESS MEETING

Meeting began at – 4:01 p.m.

1) Other Business Items (as needed)

Jake Young provided an update to the Wasatch Canyons General Plan and goals. Consultant is working on the draft of the plan and he doesn’t know when it will be done. It will come in chapter by chapter and asks the commission if they want to see it chapter by chapter or the complete document. Commissioner Omer advised she would like to see a few chapters at a time and the commission agreed. They have only received very few surveys. They have stakeholder email lists to share with communities. Cities have published in their community newsletters. Closing the end of this month on comments.

Commissioner Omer motioned to open the public hearing, Commissioner Despain seconded that motion. Commissioners voted unanimous in favor (of commissioners present)
PUBLIC HEARINGS
Hearings began at – 4:09 p.m.

30722 – Shaun Hoggan is requesting a conditional use for a 2-unit dwelling group in the Foothills and Canyon Overlay Zone. **Location:** 6954 South Mt Aire Rd #86. **Zone:** FR-0.5. **Community Council:** Parleys. **Planner:** Jim Nakamura

Salt Lake County Planning and Development Services Planner Jim Nakamura provided an analysis of the Staff Report.

Commissioner Johnson asked if the land would be subdivided. Mr. Nakamura said it isn’t. Commissioner Hutchings said there are two spaces in the garage and two others and asked whether there is fire turnaround. Mr. Nakamura said he has adequate spaces. Commissioner Omer asked about internal property lines and where will the fence go. Mr. Shaw asked if FCOZ would apply. Commissioner Young asked where a fence would go per the underlying zone. Mr. Nakamura said within the property lines and would designate where the road is, but in FCOZ a fence is not allowed, except for 42 inches or less wood fence. Commissioner Omer said fences should not be there unless recommended. Mr. Shaw said FCOZ is an overlay zone and is an additional requirement over the underlying zone and must be followed. Commissioner Hutchings asked how much taller the new structure is. Mr. Nakamura said he’s rebuilding the existing structure and will be larger.

PUBLIC PORTION OF MEETING OPENED

Speaker # 1: Applicant
**Name:** Shaun Hoggan
**Address:** 3103 Silverhawk Drive
**Comments:** Mr. Hoggan said he had grown up in the canyons and gained experiences. Acquired property and wants to rebuild the existing structure. It’s mainly the same size with an exception of stairway extended out. In the design, the structure would be in the same footprint. Asking for additional living space, the existing footprint doesn’t allow room for existing family and wants to use additional space above garage.

Commissioner Johnson asked for square footage of main dwelling. Mr. Hoggan said designed at 3,000 square feet, currently 750 square feet. New one is stacking the same structure on three layers. Commissioner Cohen asked how you enter from Parleys. Mr. Hoggan said three to five miles up Parleys, Ranch 132 and travel another two miles on seasonally accessed road, non-plowed inaccessible in winter. Not designed as a permanent dwelling and would go up there for holidays. Commissioner Cohen said building is a three-season home and a guest house. Commissioner Despain asked square footage of space two, applicant said 1,000 square feet. Commissioner Omer asked if many neighbors with homes in that area. Mr. Hoggan said he does. Commissioner Johnson asked of any animals traveling. Mr. Hoggan said that no fencing would address, and there is quite a bit of wildlife.

Speaker # 2: Citizen
**Name:** Mark Elieson
**Address:** 2845 South Buccaneer Drive
**Comments:** Mr. Elieson said he is familiar with this canyon and his grandfather had property at the ridgeline. There is an immense amount of wildlife. Growing up on the hill, a lot of rattlesnakes. He is in favor of project going through, well thought out and has probably played on that spot. Beautiful canyon and hopes they enjoy and he is in favor.
Speaker # 3: Applicant
Name: Shaun Hoggan
Address: 3103 Silverhawk Drive
Comments: Mr. Hoggan said he wants to thank the council and appreciates time and county through the process. Will take time, but outcome is ultimately better and thanks the effort.

Commissioner Cohen asked his experience with the revised FCOZ. Mr. Hoggan said it was difficult and challenging and time consuming. FCOZ can be a detractor and could be a good or bad thing but adds extra steps. Commissioner Young asked if there is a benefit of having FCOZ in place. Mr. Hoggan said it provides a guideline for certain people in the area and his height restriction he didn’t like, but outcome was positive. Commissioner Young said FCOZ was designed to benefit everyone, and there are protections in there for you and your neighbors. Mr. Hoggan said he has been communicative with the neighbors and FCOZ did guide a lot of his ideas. FCOZ is designed to protect the land and property owner rights. Hard for anyone to have restrictions placed on them and have additional costs; with a budget you would have a problem, but someone with larger capabilities and access, not a big problem and protecting the environment.

Commissioner Young motioned to close the public hearing, Commissioner Hutchings seconded that motion. Commissioners voted unanimous in favor (of commissioners present)

PUBLIC PORTION OF MEETING CLOSED

Motion: To approve application #30722 as presented without requiring fencing and comply with FCOZ standards.

Motion by: Commissioner Omer
2nd by: Commissioner Despain
Vote: Commissioners voted unanimous in favor (of commissioners present)

BUSINESS MEETING

Meeting reopened at – 4:37 p.m.

2) Approval of Minutes from the July 5, 2018 meeting.

Motion: To approve minutes from the July 5, 2018 meeting as presented.

Motion by: Commissioner Despain
2nd by: Commissioner Hutchings
Vote: Commissioners voted unanimous in favor (of commissioners present)

3) Historic Preservation Commission training for the Mountainous Planning District and Salt Lake County Planning Commission members.

Commissioner Elieson and Commissioner O’Meara sat in from the Salt Lake County Planning Commissioner.

Mr. Woodward provided an introduction of Zach Shaw and State Historic Preservation Office.

Mr. Shaw provided a handout of the Salt Lake County Ordinance and read the changes.

Commissioner Kanter arrived at 4:43 pm.
Roger Roper with the State Historic Preservation Office provided an analysis of programs for grants.

Commissioner Omer excused herself at 5:25 pm

Mr. Roper said there is a workshop on the 27th of September in the Rio Grande with five to six sessions.

Commissioner Despain motioned to adjourn, Commissioner Young seconded.

**MEETING ADJOURNED**

Time Adjourned – 5:44 p.m.