

Comments on SLC Bike/Ped Master Plan Draft

Submitted by Dave Iltis, Cycling Utah. December 26, 2014.

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 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.

Needs Improvement

1. The mission needs to be grander.
2. The timeline is way too long.
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?

Missing:

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. Not much mention of a wayfinding program for bikes.
- 9. No mention of UCATS.
- 10. No mention of a bike friendly airport.
- 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.

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.