

SALT LAKE CITY

BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the December 15, 2014 Meeting

Present from the Bicycle Advisory Committee were Denise Hunsaker, Elicia Cárdenas, Jason Hamula, Jason Stevenson, Mark Kennedy, Scott Lyttle, Shaun Jacobsen, Suzanne Stensaas and Todd Hadden.

Absent from the Bicycle Advisory Committee was David Brooks.

Also present were Katie Lewis, Phil Sarnoff, Amy Pufahl, Becca Roolf and David Rasmussen.

The meeting held at the Transportation Division Office, 349 South 200 East, Salt Lake City, Utah, was called to order at 5:05 p.m. by Scott Lyttle.

Welcome and Introduction of Members and Guests – Scott welcomed all attendees and everyone introduced themselves.

Open Meetings Act Training – Katie Lewis, Salt Lake City Attorney's Office

Katie Lewis provided the Committee with their required annual Open Meetings Act training. Under City code, a public body that is created by ordinance, is a citizen staffed group to advise or make final decisions and assist on behalf of the City is required to follow the open meeting laws. A meeting is defined as the convening of at least a quorum of the public body for the purposes of discussing, receiving comments from the public or acting on a matter over which the body had jurisdiction. A quorum varies by how many members are currently appointed to that public body. When the Committee decides to hold a meeting they are required to provide notification to the public which includes an agenda with reasonable specification for the topics, the date, time and location of the meeting. In addition, the public body needs to post an annual notice of where all of their meetings will held for an entire year. This posting requirement does not apply to emergency meetings so if there is a time when they have to get together to discuss something they have jurisdiction over on an emergency basis, the only requirement is that the Committee give the best notice practicable of the time, place and topics of consideration at that meeting. A public body cannot take final action on a topic in an open meeting unless that topic is listed as an agenda item although that does not apply for emergency meetings. If a topic is raised by the public that was not on the agenda, the public body may discuss it but cannot take final action on it until it's been added as an agenda item for a future meeting. All meetings are open to the public unless they meet one of the exceptions for closing a meeting under the Open Meetings Act. Those exceptions are fairly limited and there is a specific procedure for closing a meeting. There must be an open meeting with a quorum present and then 2/3 of the

Committee present must vote to close the meeting with an announcement as to the reason why they're closing it. For an open meeting, both written minutes and a recording must be kept but if the Committee were to go on a tour or site visit they can choose between the recording or the written minutes but no final action should be taken during this time. Once the draft minutes have been reviewed and approved by the public body, they become final and are posted for the public. In a closed meeting, the Committee is required to keep a recording and may keep written minutes unless the closed meeting is to discuss an individual, deployment of security devices or to obtain legal advice. State law says that a public body cannot hold an electronic meeting unless the city has adopted an ordinance allowing that to happen. Salt Lake City has adopted an ordinance that says the committee may hold an electronic meeting if a majority of a quorum is physically present at the anchor location. In that instance, other members may participate electronically. As far as electronic communication between members, if a staff member sends an e-mail to the entire group and a Committee member responds to all, it is considered a public meeting. If it is something someone feels is important to get to their staff or Committee members they have two options. They can send a specific reply to just the staff member or they can send an e-mail to less than a quorum. If a meeting ever becomes controversial and someone is disruptive to the point that the public body cannot conduct their business in an orderly way, that person may be removed from the meeting. When an appointed member's term ends, if leaving would put the group in a bind due to lack of members or they really still need you until they can replace you, you may continue to serve until your replacement is found.

Public/Open Comment

David Rasmussen, the owner of E-Spokes which is an electric bicycle dealership introduced himself as a resource for the Committee. As electric bicycles are becoming more popular, many issues have risen. He feels he has a lot of information and years of experience as far as who buys them, how they ride them and what is happening in the industry right now. There has been some controversy on a national level relating to where electric bicycles are allowed to be used. They are allowed to go on all motorized trails but a discussion is being had regarding classifying these types of bikes to make it easier for municipalities to decide what they will allow on regular bicycle trails and what will only be allowed on motorized trails. Currently both the Federal law and the Utah State code say electric bicycles are still considered bicycles as long as they meet three criteria. Those are, e-bikes are limited to 20 mph, they have operable pedals and their motors are limited to 750 watts which is the majority of electric bicycles but there are some that do not meet those criteria. Phil Sarnoff announced that January 15, 2015 is the deadline for the next round of bicycle friendly business applications. He said Salt Lake City is currently in the 10th spot with the League of American Bicyclists. He has reached out to many businesses but would appreciate the Committee's help if they know of any other businesses who might be interested. There is no fee to apply, the application only takes about one hour and it really helps put Salt Lake City and Utah on the map as a bicycle friendly communities.

Approval of Minutes – Motion: Suzanne Stensaas moved to approve the minutes of the November 17, 2014 meeting. Shaun Jacobsen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Announcements and Connections

Jason Hamula will be participating on a committee that Intermountain Healthcare is putting together regarding clean air. It will be mostly internal throughout the company but there will certainly be some outreach to the community. The chair of this committee is a physician who is really pro active transportation so there may be some opportunities for the BAC to interact with this IHC committee. Becka said the City had a meeting last week with South Salt Lake, Salt Lake County and UTA to talk about the interim connection between the end of the S-Line and Central Point station. It will be an interim initially, there are some private property issues that will prohibit a quick trail connection but at least the involved entities are talking about it and Becka is hoping they'll end up with something that can be published on the new bike map as well as the website to give people some guidance on getting from point to point. Transportation is actively working on the Bicycle Friendly Communities application and while that BAC work group hasn't met yet, they will be soon. She let Elicia, Scott and Jason Stevenson, the work group members, know that she would be contacting them soon as the due date for this application is sometime in February. She said that Transportation is continuing to work on the bike map and trying to get their ads sold this month. There are still an additional two or three ads so she asked the Committee members to let her know if they were aware of anyone who might be interested in advertising. A small ad is \$395.00 and a large ad is \$595.00. Denise asked if there were any statistics on GREENbike. Becka said there are many statistics and she would be happy to invite the Director of GREENbike to a future meeting to give a presentation. Elicia discovered the answer to a question that Suzanne had asked at a prior meeting regarding why she couldn't call the ride services and get a pickup with her bike. Elicia said it does exist in other states and is called UberX. Shaun noticed that the separated bike path is free of glass which got him to thinking about a recent City Council agenda, there was additional funding for bike lane infrastructure and he was wondering what the result of that was. Becka said that was a budget amendment which to her knowledge did pass and will be partially for correct sized equipment for maintaining the protected bike lanes and partially for the staffing to do that maintenance. Jason S said the McClelland trail will run kind of from 9th & 9th to Brickyard and that if anyone is interested in updates they can send an e-mail to urbantrails@slcgov.com and you will be added to the mailing list. The McClelland Trail has an interesting dynamic in that it is an old canal right of way that has been residential for a long time and trying to figure out how to weave it through people's backyard and so on is going to be a bit challenging. He also said that today is the last day to sign up for health insurance if you want it to begin on January 1st. If you go to www.takecareutah.org you can find free assistance with that. Suzanne said there has been some progress getting both sides of the sidewalks plowed on Foothill from 800 South to Thunderbird. This has been an ongoing problem for pedestrians, cyclists and handicapped people so they agreed to do it on a trial basis. She and Shaun also attended a party of the Salt Lake County Bicycle Committee. She would like the BAC to stay connected to that group as they seem to be very active and engaged in the bicycle

community and she feels as though there may be some projects that the two groups can coordinate on.

Sidewalk policy work group update

Recommendation on bicycling on sidewalks downtown

Shaun hoped the group had a chance to read this proposal again. Unless someone had a change to propose he would like the Committee to vote on it. No changes had been made since they last reviewed it but he did scan the letter from the Downtown Alliance onto the body of the proposal. Elicia's only concern is that while she appreciates the Downtown Alliance weighing in on this change, she's bothered by the last line of their letter which implies it is too dangerous to ride bicycles anywhere other than sidewalks. Although it bothers her, she recognizes that it can't really be changed at this point and thinks there is value in keeping momentum. Suzanne would like to see it move forward to the Transportation Advisory Board to see what they thought. Just for clarification, Shaun said that once the BAC voted on it then at some point it would be put on the TAB agenda for discussion. Becka said at that point it is up to TAB to decide to do from that point but she anticipates that it will come back to the BAC with some comments and questions. Scott asked how it was going to be presented to TAB, what the headers would be and if it would come from the BAC and list the names of the subcommittee. Becka said she would give that some thought and clarify this for them but felt that they may want to include what research was done and who they spoke with and let them know that this wouldn't likely make it to the TAB agenda until February as their January agenda is already full. Jason thought they should go ahead and vote on the substance of the letter and then get further input about the header of the letter or summary of the process at a later point. They could view the cover letter at a later date without having to vote on it. Suzanne said the cover letter could say what the process was, how they researched it and studied over a period of time, that there was a sub-committee of four people, that it was discussed as a group, modified and approved. Becka encouraged the BAC to be cautious in their approach and take the time to bring this proposal to TAB with the civility and decorum that it deserves and be patient from one committee to another.

Motion: Todd Hadden moved to approve the letter recommending that bicycling on sidewalks be allowed downtown. Jason Stevenson seconded the motion. The motion passed with one disapproval from Elicia Cárdenas.

Pedestrian/Bicycle Master Plan

The Pedestrian/Bicycle Master Plan has been out for review for close to three weeks now. It's on the agenda with the idea that there may be some discussion and/or recommendations on behalf of the BAC and Becka said this would be an appropriate time to discuss and decide if that's something the Committee can or wants to offer the City. She said it's also very tight to the deadline so formal comments from individuals can be submitted through open city hall which has so far had 170 visitors and is the City's preferred method for receiving comment. She encouraged the Committee to send this along to their connections again in hopes of receiving additional comments. Elicia asked whether Becka or the City would like for the BAC to discuss creating an open

letter saying they are in support of the draft. Becka said she didn't think that within the City they would need a letter but that it would be good if some of the Committee members could attend some of the formal hearings for the plan and/or officially send a spokesperson on their behalf. She felt turning up for some of the meetings would actually be better than a formal letter. Scott had a few comments, he said that since the goal of the City is to get to diamond status as far as being a bicycle friendly community there are a few things within the plan that seem contrary to that goal. The plan says that by 2035 85% of the City's arterial streets will have bike lanes but for diamond status 90% is required. He also had questions as to whether or not the 220 miles of bicycle network talked about within the plan coincide with the diamond status saying that 70% of the street network should be bicycle friendly. Becka felt he raised a good point about the arterial percentage but believes they will be able to meet the 70% street network as that is not specific to arterial streets. Suzanne felt that the 55% of UDOT roads being bicycle friendly as indicated in the plan was quite low but Becka said that in some places she believes that is from having parallel routes. Scott and Shaun brought up their concerns regarding education not being addressed in the plan in very specific terms. Scott would like the plan to have more established goals in general as far as addressing crashes, fatalities and ridership. Elicia felt all of those things are difficult to put into a plan such as this one without using caution because as ridership increases, fatalities and crashes also increase no matter how good your facilities are. Becka encouraged the Committee members to submit their questions and concerns to open city hall so they could be further reviewed. Todd didn't see anything about rail crossings other than TRAX and said that is kind of an issue in the Rose Park area as there are so many. He would like to see bicycle/train issues better facilitated. There was some discussion regarding specific train crossing areas and Todd said he would still really like to see an overpass on 300 North if possible to make the bicycle system an easier system. The Planning Commission will receive a briefing on this plan on January 14th and will have a hearing on January 28th which is when they will take input from the public and may take formal action. Suzanne would like the plan changed in several places where it specifically addresses pedestrians or bicyclists to say pedestrians and bicyclists and she would also like the legislature to discuss tougher penalties when a pedestrian or bicyclist is hit by a vehicle as well as requiring pedestrian and bicycle education when a driver's license it obtained. She would also like the City to consider combining bicycle and pedestrian paths by possibly marking and widening the sidewalks to be shared by both as is done in some European countries. Suzanne would like to see some sort of solution for 2100 South as well. She said there is no safe way to get from Foothill Drive to State Street. Shaun asked if there were any further comments and Suzanne had a comment on Foothill. She said it's going to be studied until 2035, by 2035 it is still under study she wanted the Committee to notice, and she feels as though that is outrageous. She feels the lack of a solution on Foothill is derelict. Becka said that just because a project is being studied for a long period of time does not mean that nothing is going to be done during that time period. It is just saying that the corridor does need future study before a solution can be proposed. These are places where the City will need to make trade-offs. If a corridor is studied 10 years from now, the circumstances might be different and there could be better solutions. Jason S brought up planning for the future in places like the airport. With the changes they are making, he would really like to see them

considering bicycle and pedestrian ideas as well rather than adding them afterwards. It would be great to see those added in the beginning to make them better accessible and would likely save money too.

Minor updates / Follow-ups – Transportation Division Staff

500 North design

There was no significant update on 500 North other than that they are working with UDOT on that design. When Transportation has further information she will update the Committee.

Capital Improvement Program funding applications

Becka thanked the Committee for their CIP suggestions at the previous meeting. She said it was very good timing and Transportation has started the process of working on these applications. The suggestions were very helpful developing funding proposals.

BAC member vacancies

The member vacancy sub-committee met shortly after the last BAC meeting and suggested a total of six names for their three current vacancies. These people were chosen from the original list of applicants from when the Committee began. The sub-committee members reached out to those people and found that one was no longer able to serve and several had follow up questions. The names of the individuals who are still interested will be sent to the Mayor's office for his consideration. Once he has determined who he would like to recommend, he will send those recommendations to the City Council for their review and possible appointment. Committee openings in the future will likely not be pulled from the original applicants but instead, there will be an open call for interested parties to apply.

Meetings in the New Year – schedule and format

Becka suggested a review in the New Year of what the Committee is doing well at and what they could do better. She also sent around a poll to determine what dates the Committee would like to meet in January and February due to their regular meetings falling on holidays. After some discussion the Committee members decided to meet on January 12th and February 23rd in lieu of their regular days.

Motion: Suzanne Stensaas moved to adjourn the meeting. Denise Hunsaker seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 6:34 p.m.

(A recording of this meeting will be available for one year)