

## **Comments on SLC Bike/Ped Master Plan Draft for the Planning Commission**

Submitted by Dave Iltis, Cycling Utah, Stakeholder Committee Member, and former chair of the Salt Lake City Mayor's Bicycle Advisory Committee. December 26, 2014. Resubmitted to the Planning Commission on January 28, 2014.

Contact information: Dave Iltis, [dave@cyclingingutah.com](mailto:dave@cyclingingutah.com) , 801-328-2066

**Recommendation: The SLC Walking and Biking Plan is not adequate in its current form. It is not ambitious enough nor up to the level that we need to carry Salt Lake City forward as a cycling city. It is missing much too much for it to be passed.**

**I would recommend against passing this until further revisions and additions are made.**

**I would also recommend taking more time to solicit comments from the public, and in particular the cycling community.**

General Comments: The draft master plan is a pretty good document that should help guide Salt Lake City over the next 5-10 years. However, it is not nearly ambitious enough in the timeline for implementation nor in the reach of the programs.

The following are comments on the good parts of the plan, sections that need improvement, and the many missing areas that should be included in the plan. There are far too many missing sections of the plan for where we need to go as a city with bicycling and walking. If time would allow, there are other areas that need to be mentioned as well.

### **The good:**

1. The protected bikeway network. This is a huge advance for Salt Lake City and should be implemented as soon as possible. Since cost is an issue, bollards should be used now rather than the concrete barriers. Until the program and/or streets are dialed in, the bollards allow changes in design.
2. Most of what is in the plan is good and some even great. It is what is missing and not included that is the issue.
3. I'm appreciative that the Recreational Bike Routes program is included.

### **Needs Improvement**

1. The vision needs to be grander. It needs to include something to the effect that it will become part of everyday life to a much greater extent than it currently is. It really should be rewritten.
2. The timeline is way too long. The plan needs to be implemented much sooner.
3. Schools – much more is needed in working with the SLC School District, SNAP, and Safe Routes to School for education, programs, etc.
4. Bus Driver Training
  - a. This should be implemented tomorrow. SLC's part should be a letter to UTA asking them to improve the training program regarding cycling. There is no need to wait until 2018 for this. This is not a program that SLC can implement – they can only ask UTA to do so.
5. Bulbouts – these are generally not good for cycling. This needs to be stated that they are a tradeoff.
6. Pedestrian timers – The current timers are poorly implemented. Some of this is a problem with the engineering of the signals themselves, but as they are implemented, they encourage

jaywalking, and make civil suits problematic on fault. They are NOT pedestrian friendly as implemented as they are too car centric. The plan makes it sound like pedestrian buttons are good. Where is the evidence for that? Why make pedestrians push buttons to cross? This is way too car centric.

7. Section 5.3.4 Bus Shelters – please add benches to this section.
8. Table 8.3 – the legend could use a little more explanation, particularly ‘mileage range’. If indeed there is only 1-5 miles of signed shared roadway, this seems really low. Similarly, 25-35 miles of conventional bike lanes seems really low.  
Are the totals in this the totals of the miles proposed in SLC?
9. Recreation Needs to be added as a goal. Roughly 50% of cycling trips are for recreation, and this needs more attention in the plan. Racing also needs to be a part of this. Racing is not mentioned anywhere in the programs, despite Salt Lake City’s history as a racing hub for the world.
10. No mention of developing bicycle related industry, shops, and commerce in the programs. It’s in goal 1, but there’s no corresponding program.
11. Goal 1: Why is just reaching Gold Level Bike Friendly City the objective? Why not Platinum or Diamond? The current plan is adequate in working towards gold, but not adequate in working towards platinum.
12. More information is needed regarding Bike Friendly Business Districts and the program for this. It is not enough to just work on Bike Friendly Businesses. Please add this, and the link to Long Beach’s BFBD program: <http://www.bikelongbeach.org/welcome/bike-share-program/bicycle-friendly-business-district-program>
13. There is no mention of Contraflow bike lanes. Additionally, the timeline for bike facilities to connect the Avenues across S. Temple is far too long. Waiting 10-20 years for a safe connection across S. Temple to the Avenues is not acceptable.
14. Working with UDOT is mentioned in Goal 1, but there doesn’t seem to be any plan or program to achieve this. UDOT roads are for the most part subpar for bicycling in SLC. This needs to be a high priority as they control most of the arterials.
15. While there is mention of reducing puncturevine on pathways, there is no mention of a general puncturevine control program in SLC (where they are a problem not just on trails and pathways). They are extraordinarily detrimental and a barrier to cycling. They are also on the SL County Noxious weed list.
16. Streetsweeping – there is no mention of how UDOT roads are swept.
17. An interim bypass route is mentioned regarding 1300 S and that a proper route may take years or decades to implement. This is not adequate. 1300 S was just repaved without adequate bike or pedestrian facilities. It’s not clear why there wasn’t a better implementation, but the interim idea should be short term, not years or decades.
18. On the Low Stress Network Map, fig 6-7a, there needs to be a route from N. Temple and 600 W. to the Front Runner Station on 300 W and about 500 S. This is a simple extension of the Low Stress System that needs to be included.
19. SmartTrips – is this program still in existence? Salt Lake City Green is no longer doing this. What will replace it?
20. There is not enough mention of connections to the University of Utah. There is only reference to the Downtown to University Route (which is great), but not all of the other entry points to the U.
21. More detail is needed on which ordinances might be updated. The complete streets ordinance is highlighted. Others that need updating include bike parking, traffic code relating to bikes, bikes on sidewalks, and building zoning code related to bike parking.

22. While I really like the history of cycling in Salt Lake City, and feel this is a great addition to the plan, it should not be there at the expense of missing planning information. If there's a choice between the history and the planning to keep the plan short, please add more planning information. If not, then please include both.

**Missing Altogether from the Plan and that need to be added:**

1. The Bike Count program (section 6.7) is not adequate. It needs to be a Bike Data program including.
  - a. Bike Theft
  - b. Bike accidents
  - c. Bike usage
  - d. Economic Impact
  - e. Implementation score of the bike master plan
2. Program and infrastructure tracking
  - a. A method is needed to inform the public of the progress of various projects, programs, and needed maintenance.
3. Standards guidelines
  - a. Lane widths – there is no mention of lane widths. This is a problem since they mean the difference between implementing bike lanes or not. For example, State Street (UDOT road) could have had bike lanes if the NACTO standard (which SLC is part of) were followed.
  - b. Traffic calming – indirectly talked about.
  - c. Speed Limits – more attention needs to be paid to these.
4. The I-80 frontage road, and improvements to that are missing from the map.
5. Is there a project list (not map based)?
6. No mention of mountain biking or trails.
7. Little mention of bike parks.
8. No much mention of a wayfinding program for bikes.
9. No mention of UCATS. This is a huge omission. <http://www.ucatsplan.com/> See below on integration with regional planning.
10. No mention of a bike friendly airport or a proposal for this.
11. Little mention of safe and clean bridges for cyclists.
12. No mention of a bike training facility for kids.
13. Many of the goals are great, but no mention of programs to implement them.
14. There doesn't appear to be any mention of a safe bike or pedestrian crossing of 700 E. between and including 900 S and 1300 S. Having been hit on my bike at this intersection, I would strongly request safer accommodations.
15. There is no anti-bike theft program. With over 400 bikes a year stolen in SLC, this is a huge omission.
16. There is no mention of a Trails Master Plan (which should include Mountain Biking). Nor is there mention of existing unpaved trails including the Bonneville Shoreline Trail and how they tie in with the walking and biking network.
17. There is no mention of Salt Lake City's existing Bike Park Plan.
18. There is no mention of a Wayfinding program for bicyclists (there is for pedestrians). Since SLC has worked on this before, it's not clear why there is no program for this.

19. There is almost no mention of bridges, especially those across I-15 and improving them since they are a barrier to cycling in SLC. Most bridges are UDOT bridges and this requires better planning with UDOT.
20. There no mention of reducing speed limits on arterials.
21. There is no mention of tracking implementation and effectiveness of infrastructure, spot improvements, and programs and keeping the citizens of SLC informed. There is no Action Item list either.
22. There is no mention of how Salt Lake City's Plan fits in with WFRC and Salt Lake County and other regional planning efforts such as UCATS (there should be a section 1-5). There is no background on this, and only brief mention of fitting in as a sub-goal of Goal 1. This is an odd omission since this was part of the 2004 Bike/Ped Master Plan. There's little to no mention on working with adjoining municipalities (West Valley City, North Salt Lake, South Salt Lake, Salt Lake County).
23. No Mention of SLC's membership and endorsement of NACTO standards (see above).

**Corrections needed:**

Section 1.1 Spelling – Marshall “Major” Taylor

Citations are needed for the figures

A clickable table of contents is needed.

Please don't store the draft or future files on google drive. It makes it really hard to read them from anything but a desktop computer.

p. 36 – Skateboards is misspelled.

P. 44 – use of the word 'recalled'. Please clarify or define this for the non-engineers reading the document.

Section 8.1.1 refers to an 'Accelerated Repaving projects shown in Chapter 6" but there is no mention of this in chapter 6.