

Name	Comment
John Barnhill	The intersection of 2300 East/2100 South/Parley's Way in Salt Lake City is dangerous to pedestrians. It is an uncomfortable and unsafe pedestrian crossing environment. The intersection is highly skewed, and the crosswalks are incredibly long. The four crosswalk lengths are as follows: 117 feet, 143 feet, 90 feet, and 81 feet. None of these crosswalks have medians, thus, there are no median refuges. Traffic speed on 2100 South and Parley's Way is completely uncontrolled. The curve of the road actually encourages eastbound traffic to speed up through the intersection. Traffic law enforcement is non-existent. This intersection needs to be re-designed and re-constructed, and please, not with a roundabout.
Buck Swaney	<p>1. Check out Strava's heatmap. http://labs.strava.com/heatmap/#12/-111.95198/40.66036/blue/bike. I've clipped and attached an image too. Look at how 900E is used by cyclists...it is the only roadway in the interior of SLC that runs N/S through the city in a quick, efficient line, and that actually gets used. The use is heaviest in the south, toward Draper/Sandy, where infrastructure exists. It stays strong through SLCO, essentially until it arrives at SLC where it is then neglected as a route, and cyclists disperse. They disperse because they are routed elsewhere, even though the corridor remains extraordinarily bike-friendly.</p> <p>2. 900E is fast. It is the only corridor on the east side of SLC that bicycles can use and achieve competitive commuting times. It takes me 25 minutes in my car and 32 minutes on my bike. Any other route adds at least 10 additional minutes. 900E has far fewer lights and stops, and far fewer cars than all other routes that have been identified – it is NOT CAR FRIENDLY, which makes it by nature bike friendly. This is the closest thing SLC has to a "bike highway". I cannot emphasize enough how great that is, and how carefully it should be guarded.</p> <p>3. 900E is a critical regional route. It is identified as a class 2 or 3 route in the SLCO CCP, it is the ONLY route mentioned in Murray's General Plan. What other street in SLC could you say: "Oh, you're downtown and you want to ride to Draper? Take XXX street and stay on it."? There is no single street, other than this one, that you can safely get on, stay on, and connect the ends of the valley without tricky routing.</p>
Chris Frazier	<p>First, I want to thank everyone involved in making this a better city for cyclists and walkers. I am a commuter cyclist now recovering from a complete hip replacement related to a driver trying to "share" my biking lane. I swerved to avoid the collision from behind and fell. The accident was preventable from my perspective and the driver's perspective. The driver did not stop; however, I look at this as a no fault situation and, at the least, the type of situation that begs for increasing public awareness. I think awareness is generational (hopefully) and will improve based on more people riding and walking (confidence in using the available infrastructure) and out reach in the schools.</p> <p>Street lighting in unincorporated areas is the area of concern I didn't see addressed in the plan. I live in unincorporated Millcreek. The street lighting along main and artery roads is lacking and if lighting is present, it seems to be a dull lighting (as if the county is trying to money through wattage). Also, I'm not a proponent of bike lanes separated from the main road by berms/parking, although I noted that I'm in the minority with this opinion. I understand why some people like a protective barrier but I tend to avoid them (car doors opening, congestion). Finally, is a plan for the University separate? Due to a close encounter with a skateboarder, I am leery about using the bike trail that winds through the campus. Any</p>
AJ Smith	I am adamantly opposed to this master plan! Although I have logged thousands of miles on a bicycle and I am a runner, I believe that this is an unconscionable use of the public trust as well as public funds. Necessary services that benefit ALL citizens of Salt Lake have been eliminated or drastically reduced for the benefit of a very small special interest group...bikers. Certainly, millions of dollars have been spent painting traffic lanes green, building concrete barricades to divide bike lanes, for bike signage, and painting bike lanes on roadways. Those same funds could provide great public benefit to all citizens. Instead, a well financed and over-represented special interest group has put a "spin" on the facts to make this master plan seem like a wonderful panacea to all of our problems...pollution, health, transportation, etc. It is not! Salt Lake's proud heritage of wide streets with excellent traffic flow has been sacrificed to make it one of the worst cities to navigate. All this to benefit a very vocal and engaged, but small segment of the population. The city hails Third South as a wonderful accomplishment. Anyone who uses an automobile (as nearly all of Salt Lake's citizens do) would consider it a disaster! Traffic engineers work to create what we used to call "gridlock,"
Brandon Westman	Hello. I am very supportive of this project. I would like to maximize my contributions. I was nearly killed one year ago last night. You may or may not be familiar with my story and may have attended my meeting with mayor Becker, Chief Burbank and some other udot and bicycle pedestrian representation. For addition info see Trauma Whiskey on Facebook or ask Rachel in the Mayors office as she has followed my story as a friend of mine from childhood. I have signed up for email updates already. Please advise on an additional ideas, support or promotion for this initiative. My idea, that I will pitch in a next public meeting is: Legal codes creating similar consequences and rules in busy populated areas as school and work zones. This may require a new type of speed limit signage similar to school zone with flashing yellow signs or road work with orange signs and flags.
Ellie Hardman	<p>I live just south of the horrible things on 300 East. I didn't want to jump to conclusions about the new concept so I have been observing. It hasn't gotten better in my opinion.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> When a car is backing out of a driveway they can't see the cars driving on the street and the drivers can't see them clearly. I've never seen a bike passing while someone is backing out, but it must be more difficult to spot bikes while worrying about backing through parked cars to the traffic on the street. When cars are parked on both sides of the street it is very difficult to discern a car moving out of a driveway between those cars. When a driver is turning left he/she has to watch not just the lanes of traffic and pedestrian crosswalk but also the bike lanes, which are already obscured by parked cars. When a driver is turning right s/he has to stop for the crosswalk, then at the corner for the bike lane, then at the other side of the parked cars. It is VERY difficult to see pedestrians on all the corners; there is way too much visual disruption. People in motorized chairs go to the Senior Center on 700 S and sometimes the visibility at the corner of 300 E and 700 S is horrible. <p>I really think the worst part is the individual driveways. Backing out of your driveway is dangerous for pedestrians on any day. Backing out while looking for peds, bikes and the parked cars crowding you in... I'm surprised there have not been more accidents.</p> <p>It was disappointing when 900 South was changed from 2 lanes in each direction. Driving east from 900 W the traffic backs up badly between</p>

Jennifer Garner	<p>Salt Lake has plenty of bike lanes, what we need are better bike routes. For 15 years, I lived near Hawthorne Elementary between 600 and 700 East. In the middle of that time, one lane from 7th East was removed for a bike lane. This made traffic on 7th during rush hour much worse and it became very difficult to make a right turn from my street onto 700 East. I never used this bike lane because, frankly, it was scary. 600 E was a much safer, calmer option although it didn't have a dedicated bike lane. I have very rarely seen bicyclists using the lanes on 700 East. We need bike routes that I am not scared to let my kids ride on.</p> <p>Also, I am concerned about the proposed Parleys Trail route connecting Tanner and Sugarhouse Parks. I now live on Hillcrest Ave. along the temporary route. The plan is presently to make the path run next to I-80 behind the houses on my street. Hillcrest Ave. runs parallel to I-80 and the freeway is quite noisy. Many mature trees grow between the yards and the freeway which greatly help to muffle the sound and sight of that busy road. One of the great things about this area is all of the different species of birds that can often be spotted. The area where the trail appears to go is a very narrow stretch especially in some areas and I fear that many trees will need to be removed. This will, most importantly, make the freeway sound much louder and also displace the birds. The trail plans do not include a soundwall.</p> <p>I don't understand how there will be room for a trail in some spots because the terrain is steep especially near Hillcrest Park and also by the Tennis Club. It really won't be pleasant to walk right next to the freeway. The signs weren't clear about how streets will be crossed, but I really don't want any tunnels in my neighborhood as they seem to be a magnet for graffiti and homeless people. Except for 23rd East where the</p>
Steve Boulay	<p>I am in highly supportive of the current Salt Lake City Pedestrian & Bicycle Master Plan as has been shared via the Open City website. I make these comments as a business owner downtown, a resident of the Avenues and a parent. Quality of life for our citizens, my customers and employees included, as well as for myself and my family is a big part of what makes Salt Lake City the kind of place people want to live, work and enjoy. The Salt Lake City Pedestrian & Bicycle Master Plan adds much to the other very progressive and positive ideas unfolding in Salt Lake whether you are a bike commuter like I am as are several of my employees, a parent with kids who bike to school (as mine do), or simply a person who wants a walkable, bike able city as my wife and dogs would readily attest to. Hurrah for this kind of forward-thinking governance and planning. You have my full support for this work and my encouragement for more of the same.</p>
Suzanne Stensaas	<p>Executive summary: I was happy to see that shared use bike paths had just as good a survey rating as protected bike lanes (Page es2)</p> <p>It is sad to think it will take 20 years and we still will only have 55% of UDOT roads included. These are the most dangerous as you point out as the faster speed limit on these streets results in a much higher morbidity and mortality rate. Great comparison of the cost of all this compared to one mile of freeway.</p>
Suzanne Stensaas	<p>Chapter 2 begin p. 26</p> <p>Police should enforce the violations of laws that result in endangering cyclists and pedestrians. Not just pedestrians. Add that should educate school children, drivers and pedestrians that riding on the sidewalk is legal and to be alert. State legislature should pass laws that make killing cyclists manslaughter and charge, investigate and convict or clear each and every driver. I think this is already so for pedestrians, but if not, include them too. Keep statistics on bike and pedestrian accidents with each other and with vehicles. Publish yearly. Better sidewalk repair and maintenance. Force homeowners to repair their share.</p>
Suzanne Stensaas	<p>p. 66</p> <p>In many cases it is much cheaper to sign a sidewalk for multi-use than to create a protected bike lane in the street. On occasion the sidewalk will need to be widened. Signage makes it clear that biking is allowed and peds should be aware of their presence and that cyclist should be cautious and yield to pedestrians. I feel the city needs more multi-use or shared sidewalks, preferably wider than the standard, to make cyclists feel comfortable and safe in getting around the city particularly on arterial roads. We need to do it soon to get people using bikes and keep our air clean. This is "low hanging cheap fruit" compared with the cost of protected cycle lanes, which involve designing the entire street.</p>
Suzanne Stensaas	<p>p. 69</p> <p>Currently major E-W streets have bike lanes except 2100 S. Why? See fig 6-3.</p>
Suzanne Stensaas	<p>p. 70 fig 6-4</p> <p>I am sick and tired of Foothill Drive "needs further study". This has been studied, and as far back as 1970 protected bike lanes were recommended on Beck Street and Foothill Blvd. Now Foothill is so congested that a protected bike lane is out of the question, but a shared ped-bike path on both sides utilizing the sidewalk and leveling and widening in some place could be achieved NOW.</p> <p>Even in 2035 there is no solution for 2100 south from 1300 E to State Street right through Sugarhouse.</p> <p>So in 20 years the 9 line still does not connect to the Trax Interpointe Hub? That should happen in 2015!</p>
Suzanne Stensaas	<p>Fig 6-10</p> <p>1300 S Interim bypass includes widening sidewalk to accommodate eastbound traffic. So there is precedent when wanted. Why can't this be done on Foothill Blvd now?</p>
Suzanne Stensaas	<p>p. 71 Have questions about pedestrian and bicyclist's rights on the driver's license test. Put this information in the driver's handbook that people study from before taking the test.</p>

Suzanne Stensaas	p. 107 Why should bus driver training wait until 2018? Why should school bike trains wait until 2017 Both should start immediately
Suzanne Stensaas	Table 7-1 Acquire rights of way now for shared multiuse paths.
Suzanne Stensaas	Not in plan but neglected on the maps is completion of the Parley Trail: A comment about the so-called Parley's Trail. A real trail needs to be completed now that runs from the Bonneville trail down through the canyon and past the Salt Lake Country Club golf course and enters the east end of Sugarhouse park going through the 1300 E tunnel with a marked, protected bike path to the S line and finally completion of the S line to the 2100 S Trax station. This would be great for both commuters and recreationalists. Eventually , maybe to the Jordan River Parkway if it is not overgrown with goat heads (puncture vine).
Tim Bardsley	Parking strip landscaping can have a direct impact on bike safety. For example on west bound North Temple (and a few other places I have seen). The area around Sutherlands has large cobble in the parking strip. This is constantly pushed out into the bike lane by turning vehicles. Other landscaping, like that just added along north temple with the trax construction, tends to grow into the bike lane and sidewalks. It is great to have low maintenance and low water landscapes, these also need to consider bike and ped safety.
Tim Bardsley	Railroad crossings need to be improved for bike and ped access from the west to east side and vice versa. UP trains frequently stop and park on the traks stranding bikes and peds on either side. I've seen many bikes and peds dangerously cross between cars in frustration. This happens when the trains are in the process of moving both directions. I personally spent 1.5 hours stuck on the west side of 1700 and the train still had not moved. I have also seen many cases when the crossing signals drop and no train crosses. This is particularly prevalent at the 200south crossing, and may contribute to people not taking crossing gates seriously. I realize this is not a simple problem to solve, but it is critical to having safe and reliable bike and pedestrian transit from east to west and vis versa. Perhaps a ped/bike bridge or tunnel at a couple of key crossings?
Tim Bardsley	I'm guessing there is something in there about improvements including signage to the Jordan River parkway.
Tim Bardsley	There should be a cross walk at the north side of North Temple at 2200 West. This is getting increased use with the Trax, but the closest cross walk is inconvenient and not used. I've offered to adopt this if it is built, but have not heard from anyone.
Tim Bardsley	The westbound railroad crossing at 200South and ~ 650West has a large hole in the bike lane at the trax.
Dave Iltis	Make the TOC clickable links.
Dave Iltis	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.
Dave Iltis	The good: 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.
Dave Iltis	The mission needs to be grander.
Dave Iltis	The timeline is way too long.
Dave Iltis	Schools – much more is needed in working with the SLC School District, SNAP, and Safe Routes to School for education, programs, etc.
Dave Iltis	Bus Driver Training: 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.
Dave Iltis	Bulbouts – these are generally not good for cycling. This needs to be stated that they are a tradeoff.
Dave Iltis	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.
Dave Iltis	Section 5.1.3.4 Bus Shelters – please add benches to this section.
Dave Iltis	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?
Dave Iltis	The Bike Count program (section 6.7) is not adequate. It needs to be a Bike Data program including: Bike Theft, Bike accidents, Bike usage.

Dave Iltis	<p>Things that are missing:</p> <p>Economic Impact</p> <p>Implementation score of the bike master plan</p> <p>Program and infrastructure tracking</p> <p>A method is needed to inform the public of the progress of various projects, programs, and needed maintenance.</p> <p>Standards guidelines</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Traffic calming – indirectly talked about.</p> <p>Speed Limits – more attention needs to be paid to these.</p> <p>The I-80 frontage road, and improvements to that are missing from the map.</p> <p>Is there a project list (not map based)?</p> <p>No mention of mountain biking or trails.</p> <p>Little mention of bike parks.</p> <p>Not much mention of a wayfinding program for bikes.</p> <p>No mention of UCATS.</p> <p>No mention of a bike friendly airport.</p> <p>Little mention of safe and clean bridges for cyclists.</p> <p>No mention of a bike training facility for kids.</p> <p>Many of the goals are great, but no mention of programs to implement them.</p>
Dave Iltis	<p>Corrections needed:</p> <p>Section 1.1 Spelling – Marshall “Major” Taylor</p> <p>Citations are needed for the figures</p> <p>A clickable table of contents is needed.</p> <p>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> <p>p. 36 – Skateboards is misspelled.</p> <p>P. 44 – use of the word ‘recalled’. Please clarify or define this for the non-engineers reading the document.</p> <p>Section 8.1.1 refers to an ‘Accelerated Repaving projects shown in Chapter 6’ but there is no mention of this in chapter 6.</p>
Dave Iltis	<p>The city’s press release says that the plan includes a comprehensive look at the City’s urban trail network. Maybe I’m missing it, but it doesn’t appear to be in an obvious place in the plan. Can you point me in the right direction?</p>
Elicia Cardenas (CD 3)	<p>I did not see plans that include end-of-trip facilities for bicycles, specifically adequate bicycle parking. While the existing program is robust, there should be language about ensuring that adequate and reasonable bike parking needs are met as ridership increases in areas other than at UTA stops (although those facilities are important too). This includes innovative parking structures such as on-street bicycle “corrals” as well as art racks.</p>
Elicia Cardenas (CD 3)	<p>I am highly supportive of increasing low-stress bicycle routes with an emphasis on bicycle boulevards and neighborhood routes.</p>
Elicia Cardenas (CD 3)	<p>Education programs should include partnerships with after-school programs, including programs run by the United Way and Boys and Girls’ clubs.</p>
Elicia Cardenas (CD 3)	<p>I am strongly in favor of bicycle signal heads and phases where appropriate, as well as signal detection confirmation. In addition, adding radar and other passive detection that is equipped for bicyclists (as opposed to loop detectors which may or may not detect cyclists) is one more way to make the city more bike friendly.</p>
Elicia Cardenas (CD 3)	<p>I would like to see stronger language regarding funding of programs such as all youth education, Winter Riding, Smarttrips, and Women on Bikes; these programs are data driven and have resulted in increased ridership in other localities, and are vital to a bicycle friendly community.</p>
Elicia Cardenas (CD 3)	<p>As a former instructor for the Portland (OR) traffic diversion class referenced in the draft plan, I can attest to the power of this mode of education. I can not recommend this program (which benefits all road users equally) enough.</p>
Sonja Heuscher	<p>I’ve been a bike commuter/bike rider in Salt Lake City for over ten years. I’ve read through page 79 of the Master Plan. So far so good except for the protected bike lanes. The protected bike lanes will work if the bike in the bike lane can remain easily visible to traffic. If the biker is not visible to traffic, then you create a dangerous situation at all intersections (this includes driveways and turns into parking lots when cars cross the bike lane!) because cars will not see bike coming in the protected bike lane when they turn to cross it. If you put parking in the protection zone, you will greatly reduce visibility of the biker in the bike lane to traffic. This is fine if there are no places where a car may be crossing the bike lane, but in a city this is almost always not the case! I do not like the protected bike lane on 300 E for this reason.</p> <p>For busy intersections SLC may want to consider installing protective barriers at the corners of these intersections.</p>
Vicki Mori	<p>I think we are moving in a good direction. Most of the people I asked to review the design and new ideas were impressed.</p>
Jen Colby (personal comments – not representing U of U)	<p>I am writing to extend my support for an updated Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan for Salt Lake City. I was honored to serve as a member of the University to Downtown Focus Group, and also attended one of the public open houses, responded to the survey, and attended staff briefings to TAB and BAB that were provided during the process.</p>
Jen Colby	<p>P. 36, Section 4.3, fourth line: typographical error, “skateboars” should be “skateboards”.</p>

Jen Colby	Given the length of the document, the language and text is otherwise clear and readable. Some of the specific text and fonts in figures are a bit small and light in print (for example, the graphic under “Outreach” in the Executive Summary), and so are a bit hard to read. Prior to releasing the final document, please have an editor run a print copy and be sure all the figures, captions, and smaller text are readable – make bold or increase font size as needed. Also, please check all color choices for accessibility; for example, in the same figure on ES-2, the colors are red, green, and mustard in the pie charts, which may be largely unreadable for someone with red-green colorblindness.
Jen Colby	<p>P. 1, Introductory Section (and Plan overall): This section—and the Draft overall—barely touches on access for people with limited mobility and those in wheelchairs, whether in the context of ADA or overall compatibility. There are a few mentions, such as the Objective under Goal 2 (good) and section 4.3, but it seems like it deserves a mention sooner and more regularly. I suggest strengthening this and better integrating universal design into all projects. Unfortunately – especially in hilly or sloped terrain – ADA requirements can be perceived to conflict with bicycle ways. This doesn’t need to be the case with good overall design (see bikeway and ADA ramp between the U of U Thatcher addition and the old Field House as a good example of figuring out how to do both). The worst case scenario is putting in stairs that effectively block both wheelchair users and bicycles (and people with strollers, etc.) – but as long as they have railings, stairs, oddly, can meet ADA standards.</p> <p>Good pedestrian, bike, and transit systems are extremely important for the large – and growing – population of people who do not have a driver’s license or access to a private vehicle, whether due to age, ability, choice, or economic circumstances. Elderly people should be able to age in place without a car wherever they live in Salt Lake City, and this Plan will help improve their chances if implemented. Also, people who use</p>
Jen Colby	1.1 The History section is useful and interesting background, but there is an odd gap between 1910 and 1970 (nothing at all happened for peds and bikes? How about massive investment in cars, removal of streetcars, and the dominance of the auto at the expense of all other modes? some positive bike actions -trails, events, etc?) Please add a few other points of interest in more recent years. Some of these are referenced elsewhere, such as Bicycle Friendly designations. Creation of BAB from MBAC? Jordan River Trail? PRATT? Bonneville Shoreline construction? Local boys in the Tour de France? Things like the Tour of Utah and other events might also be mentioned. Surely there are fun facts to add in more recent years.
Jen Colby	1.3.5 – Bicycle Counts: If at all possible, please add in 2014 data before publication, as it should be ready to integrate at this point.
Jen Colby	Vision Statement: Consider adding a reference to universal access (ADA). I am not sure what the best term is, but consider adding something like “transportation options that connect people /_ of all abilities /_ to places ...”.
Jen Colby	Goals and Objectives general comment: in the final document, please sub-number or letter the Objectives to make them easier to track and reference, especially as implementation moves forward.
Jen Colby	Goal 2 Objectives (p. 24): Add a specific goal to expand bicycle parking options, both public and private, in the City. This should include secure, covered parking areas wherever possible (existing ramps, perhaps new facilities in places like downtown Sugarhouse and SLC). Lack of parking/rack facilities remains a serious issue in many locations.
Jen Colby	<p>Goal 3 Objectives (p. 25):</p> <p>First Objective, sidewalk shoveling: consider moving enforcement from zoning to parking enforcement. Sidewalks should be considered just as vital to access as car parking stalls, and the city already has a crew of trained enforcers out there on the streets who could just as easily be enforcing sidewalk shoveling in addition to parking. I highly endorse this objective, as well as the following one.</p> <p>Street sweeping objective: This is really important for both bikes and watershed protection, since whatever is on the streets washes into the Jordan River during rain events and causes serious water pollution. I strongly support this.</p> <p>Winter plowing: I hope the snow event pilot works well, but so far this year it hasn’t seemingly been implemented (due to Xmas?). Already, the 200 S bike lanes were icy, snowy and really would have benefitted from being plowed. As a former skeptic, I now strongly support this program and hope it is expanded.</p>
Jen Colby	<p>Goal 3 Objectives (p. 25):</p> <p>“Undesirable plant growth” objective – multiuse paths: add “and city streets, sidewalks, and private property” or similar. Puncturevine (aka goathead) is spreading wildly in the parking strips in my neighborhood and I have seen it other places, too, not just along the JRP. If possible, tie into the anti-spurge campaign so homeowners know to eradicate it when they see it.</p>
Jen Colby	Goal 5: Add a goal to consider “MAX” type bus- (and maybe bike) only lanes on key routes, and avoid crossover conflicts between bike lanes and buses (or worse, buses stopping in the bike lanes rather than pulling over to the curb). This section, oddly, doesn’t mention anything about on-road integrated or complimentary bike and bus (or streetcar/rail) designs. Please add.

Jen Colby	<p>As a specific project, please consider a test reconfiguration of 200 S between 500 E and 900 E that would put bus-only lanes curbside so the buses don't have to pull in and out of traffic, and are entirely out of the regular traffic lane. Given the decreasing width of 200 S in steps moving east, here is an idea (sorry no diagram).</p> <p>Westbound: curbside full 11' lane, for both buses and bicycles since downhill overall and buses are not that frequent in this section (sadly!) parking strip for cars (with some kind of barrier or buffer) 10 or 10.5' traffic lane 10' center turn lane Eastbound traffic lane parking strip full bike lane bus lane. Would this all fit? It could make the buses, the traffic flow, and the bikes much better. Reduce speed limit to 25 east of 500 E, too, and time lights to work well for drivers at 25 and cyclists at about 12-14 mph.</p> <p>If this works perhaps it could be extended to State Street. Then we just need UTA to run buses after 8 PM and on Sundays. A lot of cyclists also use the #2 to get a lift for their bikes to campus; 3-bike racks should be a priority on this route.</p>
Jen Colby	<p>4.4 – Speed limits: The transportation engineers and planners must shift from vehicle throughput at high speed as the primary goal of design. This has wreaked enough havoc already on lives and quality of life. I know this is changing, but must be emphasized. “Road diets” will help, but also the city really needs to enforce speeds and rolling right turns, as well as texting/distracted driving. I disagree that only engineering should address speed limits – there are many places where limits should decrease already. Consider 20 MPH in some areas. Why is 300 W between N Temple and 600 N (and further) a 40 MPH street? As business development grows, this section should be both re-engineered and speeds decreased.</p> <p>There are also many places where “stop” signs should be replaced with yields (an analysis should be done, but start in the Avenues). This does not seem to be mentioned as a strategy, but would help a lot until the state adopts “Idaho stops”.</p>
Jen Colby	<p>Also, every remaining street with a 2-2 (2 traffic lanes each direction, no center turn lane) should undergo a 4-3 conversion with bike lanes ASAP. This is far better as a driver to be able to see pedestrians in crosswalks and also turn left, and avoid getting rear ended, as well as trying to avoid cyclists who don't have a lane.</p>
Jen Colby	<p>Figures 5-2 and 5-5: Good typologies overall, but just be sure than bulb-outs for peds allow for continuous bike lanes – such as the bike lanes transecting them – rather than narrowing down the road and having the dread disappearing bike lane/traffic merge, which is common now. Overall, narrowing space for traffic is very important.</p>
Jen Colby	<p>5.4 - Having had the misfortune to spend several years working at an office at the International Center, I strongly endorse retrofits to Suburban Business Parks, and to require these for any new developments, too. At least there are some bike lanes at the IC, but otherwise it was a depressing wasteland for attempted lunchtime walks and general non-driving circulation. Transit access was terrible (extend the TRAX to the IC please!), and vast acres of parking lots (often underutilized) were a waste of space and added to heat island effects. Car parking minimums should be eliminated, and other access required.</p>
Jen Colby	<p>In general, I strongly endorse the expansion of low-stress and on-street bicycle facilities on the large number of big wide streets all over our fair city. If not here, where? Specific to the Downtown to the U route, the first phase is terrific, and I encourage SLC to fund the eastern section implementation in the next budget cycle. Implementation and design details will get smoother over time.</p>
Jen Colby	<p>Overall, looking at the maps, there are few peculiar gaps that I would encourage the City to fill in for the final Plan. Specifically, S. Temple is an excellent grade and key linkage for cycling – and walking – and the low-stress bikeway should extend west beyond 700 E. 200 S could also be transformed into a transit and bikeway with only 1 lane of traffic each direction, at least east of State.</p>
Jen Colby	<p>Foothill Drive also is a serious problem for cyclists and transit riders alike. SLC should work with UTA to get a TRAX extension funded somehow and also improve cycling lanes.</p>
Jen Colby	<p>Chapter 7: Programs – I endorse the expansion and addition of programs listed and encourage SLC to find funding to help partners implement these. Specifically, please help refugees and especially women with cycling skills and equipment and greatly expand walk- and bike-to-school programs.</p>
Jen Colby	<p>Chapter 8: Implementation – In addition to the funding options listed, the City should investigate more public-private funding options, especially for trails. How might impact fees or similar be tapped? Please expedite this plan and develop annual implementation targets and funding.</p>
Jen Colby	<p>In Conclusion: My husband and I relocated from Alta to East Central Salt Lake City in 1999, uncertain if we could stand the air quality issues or such an urban lifestyle after so many years in a tiny ski town. We quickly adapted to city living – though we still miss the skiing and the stars and the camaraderie. As a one-Subaru family, we chose to live near-downtown so that one of us would always be able to get to work without a car. At the time, between the two of us, we owned one mountain bike. For years, I found myself the car commuter in the family, first to the International Center, then to Kamas, for work. After years of 100-mile-per-day driving, I gratefully took a job within walking/biking distance of home and never looked back. Improvements in city cycling infrastructure and our increasing comfort on road/town bikes – as well as the U EdPass - have transformed our lives, and our car mostly lives in the driveway. The fleet of bikes has rapidly expanded. We ride recreationally, and also commute, shop, and socialize by bike – or on foot or UTA –most of the time. It is important to share similar “conversion” stories so others who may be currently car dependent or fearful of change can see that ordinary people like themselves can and do find</p>
Keith Alleman	<p>General Comment #1. This is a well-done plan. I mean, it is professional and polished.</p>
Keith Alleman	<p>General Comment #2. As a cyclist (or pedestrian, too), when I look at all the potential investments to spend money on, to me the least valuable is wayfinding signage. It should only be used in areas with high tourist traffic. For locals, if you don't know where Sugarhouse Park is compared to your current location, or where the U is, or where the baseball park is, then you have bigger obstacles to overcome than your reluctance to use a bike. Or let me soften my comment a bit. Wayfinding signs are good when they are of really good quality. The hand-scrawled ones out now are less than optimal. To have destination-oriented ones in tourist areas is good. To have really nice ones on multi-use paths (like what Utah County has I think on the Murdock Canal trail, with distance to the next major trailhead and such) is good.</p>
Keith Alleman	<p>General Comment #3. There is, however, one spot that I can think of where wayfinding signage for locals would be VERY valuable. That would be signage that indicated to a user of the Jordan River Trail how to connect from south of 300 South to north of North Temple. The presence of the fairpark makes this quite confusing, and it may be some years before the path is fully completed (as far as I know anyway) so signage would be an excellent interim solution. It is akin to the situation with the PRATT east of 1700 E.</p>

Keith Alleman	General Comment #4. I'm still not clear on what the Transvalley Corridor <u>is</u> . Is it a multi-use path? Is it just signage?
Keith Alleman	General Comment #5. Things I would have expected to see covered somewhere in the master plan: bike racks, mandatory provision of bike valet at permit-holding events, GreenBike, seasonal bike corrals.
Keith Alleman	General Comment #6. It would be better if there were a clear mapping of the spot improvements sprinkled throughout the narrative in Sections 5 and 6 to the specific categories used on the maps (Fig 5-1, 6-9), and cost estimates (Tables 8-1 and 8-2). For instance, is a HAWK an "enhanced crossing" or is it an "intersection, signals, & signage" improvement? What is a "structure improvement"? It is likely not clear to the average reader, and might be forgotten over the lifespan of this master plan.
Keith Alleman	SECTION 2.2 (p. 22). I would prefer to strike "and economic development" from the vision statement. When considering walking/bicycling investments, it makes sense that a discriminator might be which projects do a better job of connecting people to places, or better foster recreation, or better improve personal health, or better contribute to environmental quality, or ultimately which projects better elevate quality of life. But I don't think a discriminator should be which projects better foster economic development. Sometimes, concessions have to be made to economic development (e.g., routing a trail around an in-progress office complex site), but it isn't something the government needs to foster in its vision for walking/bicycling. When I read that, it makes me think of the people that want to turn the Jordan River Parkway into San Antonio's Riverwalk, and that's not a vision that I support.
Keith Alleman	SECTION Goal #1, Objectives (p. 23). This bullet is too narrow: "Partner with clean air advocates and health insurers to increase walking and bicycling rates." It should be more like "Partner with advocates and stakeholders to increase walking and bicycling rates. Partners may include advocacy groups (clean air, public health, cycling, neighborhood revitalization, and other), community leaders, private health insurers, and others."
Keith Alleman	SECTION Goal #2, Objectives (p. 24). Should add an objective "Undertake initiatives to address potential barriers to use of multi-use paths by the general public, such as personal safety concerns, trailhead facilities, wayfinding, and physical characteristics that make cycling more difficult (e.g., slick surfaces, poor sightlines)."
Keith Alleman	SECTION Goal #2, Objectives (p. 24). Add objective "Provide wayfinding, location awareness, and distance awareness along multi-use paths to support use for commuting and exercise." (FYI when I say "distance awareness" I mean something like mile markers every half mile or quarter mile along a path. The ATT in Durham, NC, is a good model to follow if distance signage is a problem... just simple paint. And when I say "location awareness" I mean when you intersect a road, you should know which road it is. Like when I go in The Draw I should see something on the overpass saying that that's 1300 East that I'm about to walk under.)
Keith Alleman	SECTION Goal #3, Objectives (p. 25). Add objective "Maintain the usability of multi-use paths for the casual cycling public. Establish a system to identify, prioritize, and address issues (gravel, potholes, asphalt broken by tree roots, etc.)." Note that I used to have puncturevine in this suggestion too but I see it has its own objective, so that's OK.
Keith Alleman	SECTION Goal #4, Objectives (p. 26). Add objective "Increase the proportion of bicycles in the City that are licensed."
Keith Alleman	SECTION Goal #5, Objectives (p. 27). One objective reads in part "Work with UTA to install bike racks capable of holding three bikes on all buses in the City..." Change to say "capable of holding at least three bikes..." If this plan is really going to provide guidance for 20+ years, then why limit ourselves? Maybe in a decade some crazy innovative design will come out that allows six bikes to attach to a bus, and we don't want to say "No, only three, only three...".
Keith Alleman	SECTION 4.4, Speed Limit Policies (pp. 36-37). Section states "Research shows that pedestrian fatality risk increases dramatically as vehicle speeds increase. The risk at 30 mph is more than twice as high as 25 mph and more than five times higher than the risk at 20 mph." Fatality risk in this context has two components: (1) the probability of a pedestrian being hit by a moving vehicle, (2) given that the pedestrian has been hit, the probability of that pedestrian dying as a result. Without having looked at the source study, I am guessing that the statistics here are only referring to the second component. Consider rewording these sentences to make it more clear one way or the other. For example, if the study is encompassing both components, it might be like "Research shows that pedestrian fatality risk along a roadway increases dramatically as vehicle speeds on that roadway increase. When vehicles travel at 30 mph, the fatality risk is more than twice as high as 25 mph and more than five times higher than the risk at 20 mph (due to impacts being both more likely and more dangerous when they do occur)." And for example, if the study is only encompassing the second component: "Research shows that the pedestrian fatality risk when an individual is struck by a moving vehicle increases dramatically depending on the vehicle's speed at impact. When an individual is struck, the risk of a fatal result to the pedestrian when the vehicle is going 30 mph is more than twice as high as 25 mph and more than five times higher than the risk at 20 mph."
Keith Alleman	SECTION 4.4, Speed Limit Policies (p 37). In the last paragraph, consider rewording to replace the two uses of the word "arbitrarily." If speed limits were lowered without physical roadway changes, the lowered speed limits would not be arbitrary. They would still be purposeful. They just wouldn't match how fast drivers perceived they could safely go.
Keith Alleman	SECTION 5.2.7 (p. 47) Another pedestrian signal recommendation should be that regardless of whether an intersection is using recalled or actuated pedestrian phasing, any time when the system knows that the light is going to be green long enough for foot traffic to cross, it should display a WALK signal appropriately. Here is the scenario that I'm trying to address. Person A walks up to the intersection on the left-hand side of the road and pushes the pedestrian button. A few seconds later Person B walks up to the intersection on the right-hand side of the road and does not push the pedestrian button. When the light turns green, the left-hand side of the road shows a WALK signal (for Person A) but the right-hand side does not, even though (in this hypothetical let's say there's no turn pockets or vehicle turn arrows or such) both sides of the street have the same amount of time available for foot traffic to cross. Yesterday I saw this happen (the person crossing 700 E on the north side of the intersection got a WALK signal while the person on the south side did not) and the guy was so filled with the cognitive dissonance of it that he threw his arms up in exasperation. And I see it happen semi-
Keith Alleman	SECTION Figures 5.2 to 5.7. I just wanted to say these pages are really well done. They are clear and informative and just well designed as a plan product.

Keith Alleman	SECTION Figure 5.4, Suburban Business Park Without Sidewalks (p. 52?). This page got me thinking that there should be an objective for sidewalk coverage throughout the City. Perhaps under Goal #2, there should be an objective saying to drive toward at least X% of streetsides in the City having a sidewalk, and/or saying to drive toward having a sidewalk along every streetside that meets criteria XYZ (e.g., every street with a speed limit greater than 35mph, or more than four travel lanes, or something to that effect.... this would be to address and include locations that have very low pedestrian demand, but when a pedestrian is stuck there it is super uncomfortable to not have a sidewalk available).
Keith Alleman	SECTION Figure 5.5, Protected Bike Lane Streetscape (p. 53). Another point to consider with protected lanes is that they make it less convenient for a cyclist to access a mid-block destination that is on the left side of the road.
Keith Alleman	SECTION Figures 5.6 and 5.7. These two are different than 5.2-5.5, which looked totally conceptual and general. These two include maps of real locations, and some of the language is declarative. For example, Figure 5-6 has a callout box saying "Install new crossings and add curb extensions..." with a line leading to a real spot on the map. It isn't clear if the plan is saying that the City really plans to install a new crossing at that location, or if the discussion is still meant to be conceptual only. In Figures 5.2-5.5, the same callout box might have been phrased like "The use of new crossings and added curb extensions can provide such-and-such benefit..."
Keith Alleman	SECTION 6.1 Bikeway Type Descriptions (beginning p. 64). Be aware that on low-traffic streets, a striped bike lane can actually make travel worse if it guides the rider over a multitude of manhole covers and such. I see that in the short-term one improvement is to put striped lanes on Amelia Aerhart (Fig. 6-4), for example. and that's a place where a striped lane might actually make cycling there more annoying, depending on whether the bike lane has smooth pavement or has bumps and manholes, etc. Same deal with Harold Gatty (Fig. 6-5). Striping those two roads would only add value if the bike lanes avoid all manhole covers.
Keith Alleman	SECTION 6.1.2.3 Buffered Bike Lanes (p. 65). Another important difference between a buffered bike lane and a protected bike lane is that for a buffered bike lane, the bike lane is in between the moving vehicle lane and any on-street parking. Typically for a protected bike lane, the moving vehicle lane and any on-street parking are adjacent to each other, then the separation, then the bike lane.
Keith Alleman	SECTION Figure 6-6. Consider extending the bike boulevard on 800 E farther south. It could go all the way to the street just north of I-80, then signs could direct users eastward to Fairmont Park (if that's their destination) or to 900 East, under I-80 and back over to 800 East, where the boulevard could continue all the way to 3300 S (or the city limit anyway).
Keith Alleman	SECTION 6-9. Another spot for a little paving is on Redwood just north of Warm Springs. There's a spot where the Jordan River Parkway comes with a few feet of Redwood. Right now they're separated by gravel and a set of ornamental boulders. It would be nice if a 4' wide bit was paved right there, for the people who use that spot to switch between road and path.
Keith Alleman	SECTION Figure 6-9 versus 6-10. If Figure 6-10 is showing an actual plan of action for that segment near 1300 S, then I would expect its intersection elements to be reflected on Figure 6-9 as recommendations, but I don't see any dots at the two HAWK locations mentioned in 6-10.
Keith Alleman	SECTION Figure 6-10 (p. 72). I think it would be better for east-west cyclists if the two envisioned HAWK signals (at 300 West / Lucy Ave and at State / Kelsey Ave.) were full-up regular traffic signals that could be triggered by cyclists. I just don't know that I would trust a HAWK when crossing streets that wide. Also I would make it crystal clear whether the investments in Figure 6-10 are just a hypothetical for illustrative purposes, or whether they are a specific recommendation for implementing at that location. If they're a real recommendation, then reflect them in the appropriately (e.g., the intersection changes should be visible in Fig 6-9).
Keith Alleman	SECTION 6.6.2 Confirmation Lights (p. 90). Those sound awesome.
Keith Alleman	SECTION 6.6.4.1 Minimum Green Time (p. 92). The second bullet, about a minimum green time when a cyclist is detected, should be tried for north-south cyclist travel on 800 East trying to cross 400 South. The short green time is definitely a problem there, and there is the infrastructure to separately detect a waiting cyclist.
Keith Alleman	SECTION 6.6 Traffic Signal Considerations. This seems to be where intersection considerations are discussed as well (e.g., queue boxes). I'm surprised there was no discussion of bike boxes (the thing that looks like a queue box and lets cyclists traveling straight assume a position ahead of vehicle traffic waiting at a red light). Even if the City rejects them, the discussion and rationale should be in this plan.
Keith Alleman	SECTION 6.6.6 Bike-Related Signal Recommendations (p. 93). In fifth bullet, "LPI" should be "LBI."
Keith Alleman	SECTION 7.1 Multi-Modal Programs (begins p. 96) through 7.3. This comment applies to the whole section. The whole thing needs to have clearer wording to indicate whether these programs are (1) things currently happening in SLC, (2) things recommended for development in SLC as part of this master plan's recommendations, or (3) a listing of the universe of possible programs that exist anywhere, just as background. The introduction (p. 95) indicates that they are all recommendations. But inside some of the descriptions, the wording gets squirrely. The first one says SLC "can" do XYZ, the second that SLC "should" do XYZ, the third just says that an event was held in 2013 but never says that SLC will, can, or should do it again on a regular basis. For items like the Walking School Bus and Park(ing) Day, no role for city government is mentioned. They are just things that happen.
Keith Alleman	SECTION 7.1 "Open Streets" (p. 97). Is there no after-action report from the May 4, 2013, event containing an event summary and lessons learned for the future, something that could be cited here?
Keith Alleman	SECTION 7.1 "Police Training" (p. 97). For transparency, include the month-year of the training event. Don't just say that it has happened ever.
Keith Alleman	SECTION 7.3 Bike-Specific Programs, "Recreational Bike Routes" (p. 104). The wording in this one is particularly confusing. The first sentence makes it sound like this is a program that exists and is being implemented right now. Then halfway through the paragraph it all switches to conditional tense... Named routes WOULd BE created and so on.
Keith Alleman	SECTION 7.3 Bicycling-Specific Programs (begins p. 102). If I were y'all I would count those seasonal bike rack corrals as a program. If for some reason you think seasonal corrals aren't a program while wayfinding signs are, then you should still mention those corrals somewhere. As near as I can tell they aren't mentioned in the master plan at all (nor is bike rack policy, for that matter... like enforcing zoning requirements for bike racks..... nor are bike racks addressed as cycling supportive infrastructure, like back in Section 6 maybe?).
Keith Alleman	SECTION 7.3 Bicycling-Specific Programs (begins p. 102). Another program to mention, even though it is probably plenty in-place, is bike valet for large permit-requiring events in the City (although if it already fully in place and there's no recommendation to expand it in the next five years, then no you wouldn't need to mention it... this is different than the seasonal bike corrals, which the master plan should recommend expanding to more locations over the next five years).

<p>Roger Borgenicht (CD 4)</p>	<p>The design and implementation of bike way infrastructure such as buffered bike lanes and separated cycle tracks should use common street vocabulary and imageable route finding to define the separate street real estate for bicycles. Examples include the elegant buffered lane on 300 East between 400 and 500 South that uses parking space T's to define car parking spaces separated from the buffered bike lane by a 6 inch gap. These parking place "T's" provide a common understanding for drivers, walkers and bikers and keep the street vocabulary simple to understand and the T's provide intuitive protection from parked car door openings and can be used to set back parking space from driveways when low stress curb side cycle tracks are used. (The tan paint on the 300 South separated bike way that sometimes confuses drivers could be more simply defined by parking T's and would provide a more integrated streetscape that doesn't call out unusual configurations. In addition the placement of bicycle path symbols is inconsistent and irregular sometimes with three symbols on one intersection crossing. The elegance of design and consistency of street painting execution is important to making bike infrastructure an integrated part of our newly emerging streetscape that will engender acceptance and</p> <p>I believe that presently 300 East from South Temple to 400 South is one of the most awkward street configurations that can be improved as an east side low stress separated bike way and provide a good bike filter north-south into downtown as 300 East is the eastern CBD boundary. Removing diagonal parking in the middle of the street and adding separated low stress bike lane could complete the priority bike treatment for east of downtown bike travel. Linkages could make "Third and Third" an effective priority bike route for those riders looking for connected, protected ways to bike to and thru downtown Salt Lake. In closing I am impressed by the commitment and success so far of adding separate real estate on our streets for bicycle travel for many who are interested but concerned but feel that clear, imageable design and project implementation will be critical to our long term success.</p>
<p>Anonymous (CD 5)</p>	<p>Hope the money that is being spend on paths for the 2% that ride a bike is coming from the surplus being generated by the tax on street lights. \$1.5 million every year over and above what the cost is to run the lights. The streets are in third world country condition but we gotta have a path for bicycles. Can't wait for the High-intensity Activated crossWalk (HAWK) light to be installed at the 800 S mid block cross walk, right in front of the East High school doors. This new light will be high entertainment and special use for those attending religious indoctrination courses on released time and those sluffing school to go the 7-11. Too much effort must be made to go to the corner and cross with the existing light. From 1300 E to 1100 E this will make the 5th traffic light, school zone, Hawk light, and cross walk light. If your're lucky you could stop 5 times within that two blocks. The motto for SLC should be "Sustainable Stopping". They try their best to make you stop while they do the least to keep the air clean.</p>
<p>Mike Christensen (outside SLC)</p>	<p>The Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan is well put together, but I feel that it is lacking in providing a transformational vision for Salt Lake City. I feel that vision needs to center on the downtown. I have the following recommendations regarding downtown:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Downtown should be the central focus of our pedestrian and bicycle efforts, which will hopefully result in a strong core of pedestrian and bicycle activity that will expand throughout the city. 2. In the downtown core, pedestrians and bicyclists need to be given priority over automobile traffic. 3. Traffic speeds in the downtown should be less than 20 mph (ideally 15 mph). 4. Pedestrian crossing pushbuttons should be eliminated. 5. Traffic signal loops should be retrofitted to detect bicycles. 6. Traffic signal timings should be adjusted to minimize the wait time for pedestrians and bicyclists. 7. Given the wide streets of downtown Salt Lake City, most streets have sufficient right-of-way to accommodate automobile travel lanes, on street parking, protected bike lanes, and ample sidewalks. 8. Consideration should be given to removing general automobile traffic from Main Street between South Temple and Broadway (300 South). <p>Regarding my own neighborhood near North Temple and Redwood Road, consideration should be given to recommendations that I made back in</p>
<p>Anonymous (CD 5)</p>	<p>I commend SLC for tackling an integrated transportation plan. I have been a bicycle commuter in Salt Lake City for 13 years. I would like to see even more buffered bike lanes and regular bike lanes, but NO protected bikeways. In my experience, the protected bikeways are dangerous because the visibility of riders in the bikeway by the automobile drivers is blocked by parked vehicles. Intersections and driveways are very dangerous because auto drivers have a much more difficult time seeing cyclists in the bikeway than in a regular or buffered bike lane. I AVOID riding 300 E and 300 S for this reason. Thank you for allowing comments through Open City Hall.</p>
<p>Katherine Erickson (CD 7)</p>	<p>I would like to see consistency with how crosswalks are treated through out the city. I live in Sugarhouse and crossing 21st South is always an adventure. It was my understanding that if a pedestrian is at a crossing, the vehicle must yield to the pedestrian. I would count a dismounted cyclist as a pedestrian in this situation. The only time I see vehicle's yielding to the pedestrian with any consistency is at the HAWK crossing, near 13th East. It's rare for vehicles to stop at the Toucan crossing at 11th East, and even more rare for cars to stop at any of the marked crossings that extend from 11th East west to 7th East. In fact one of the hardest places to cross is in front of Guthrie Bicycle on 8th East and 21st South. There is a crosswalk there, 8th East is a frequented pathway for cyclists, yet, neither pedestrian's or cyclists can cross the street at this location, because the vehicular traffic does not stop. The vehicles do not respect those crossings. What is being done to address this lack of compliance? I like that the cars stop at the HAWK crossings, but does their use cause drivers to ignore other types of crossings because there is no bright red flashing light telling them to stop?</p>
<p>Jacob Sorensen (CD 5)</p>	<p>I love the new expanded bike and mult use plans the city has. More streets like 300 S will motivate me as well as others to ride more often without the danger of cars. Also the pathway to connect to the shoreline trail around 20th south through Tanner Park would be amazing.</p>
<p>Anonymous (CD 4)</p>	<p>Great plan, but it could almost pass as a bicycle (and bicycle only) master plan. It seems like there are a sufficient amount of pages dedicated to bicycle infrastructure and not enough about pedestrian amenities. Why does the bicycling section have fancy pie charts from surveys while the pedestrian section does not? And why are sidewalk options not discussed as much as bike lane options?</p>

George Chapman (CD 5)	<p>This just bicycling. Where is pedestrian, wider sidewalks, real complete streets. This a bastardization of complete streets.</p> <p>Vision - walking and bicycling plans should not increase congestion and pollution protected bike lanes are not very usable to bicycle commuters road diets should not be implemented if air pollution increases mid-block signals and crosswalks and other amenities should not increase air pollution, bulb-outs stop right hand turns until after left turns and can increase pollution cost benefit analysis should be done when comparing freeway and road miles versus bikeways, the question should be what will reduce pollution more complete streets should start with wider sidewalks and bike lanes, and not just push bike lanes alone where are the wider sidewalks with more density development why "a 20-year build-out of bicycle facilities" only - what happened to complete streets pedestrians? Recent studies show only a minimal decrease in driving in 3 cities (Census just released "Young Adults: Then and Now). In some major cities, it increased 8%.</p>
George Chapman (CD 5)	<p>1.2.2.3 "Walking and bicycling are affordable transportation options" unless time is important. Not just sidewalks but wider sidewalks. If you really believed surveys, then SLC wouldn't do road diets that increase pollution and stop people from pulling safely out of their driveways and decrease bicyclist safety. Types of bicyclists should include commuters and those who regularly ride more than 5 miles a day. They should not be classified as strong and fearless. If SLC residents take 3-4 times more walking trips than bicycling trips, why aren't wider sidewalks encouraged 3-4 times more than bike lanes. Sidewalks are used more.</p> <p>Again air quality should not be downgraded with bicycle and pedestrian amenities. Causing 100 cars to wait for one person to cross the street creates unacceptable pollution. The original Sugar Hosue Circulation and Streetscape Amenities plan that incorporated complete streets had 12-15 foot sidewalk widths. During snow times, except for bicycle commuters, bicyclists avoid riding. And bicycle commuters like riding in the street more than on cycle tracks. I know some people are upset about bicyclists not following rules but honestly, they only hurt themselves while drivers kill. The small percentage of dangerous bicyclist on sidewalks should be focused on. Bikeway maps should be produced with safety coded colors (like Portland). Residential neighborhoods should not have to host bicycle parking/locks. UTA should focus on bus and TRAX service and</p>
George Chapman (CD 5)	<p>ADA/motorized wheelchairs should be given more consideration. Police should not hassle people who have to use roadways due to inadequate sidewalks. If the City were really interested in noise levels, they would have the State outlaw loud vehicles and motorcycles (I am not suggesting that it is realistic.) 20 mph is ridiculously slow when time is important. The reason people use cars is that it saves time. If you lower speeds that much (even to 25 mph) you can increase pollution (it is on the line between gears) and frustration of drivers who will drive away to other areas and increase pollution even more.</p> <p>NYC has a much better mass transit system than SLC, despite management earning less salary. UTA keeps trying to do other things like build apartments instead of service.</p> <p>Minimization of pedestrian crossing distances can increase pollution.</p> <p>Traffic circles and roundabouts are too expensive and cost-benefit analysis would show that wider sidewalks would make better use of taxes.</p>
George Chapman (CD 5)	<p>If SLC really wanted to encourage walking, they wouldn't allow full blocks of car lots. Pedestrian countdown lights are set for too high a walking speed. This is a problem with UDOT and SLC Traffic Engineering. 4 feet per second (the MUTC speed) should be much lower in snow conditions and when women or children or older people walk in the area. Example (UDOT) allows only 16 seconds to go east to west on 200 East and 400 South (they have a work order to check it). There are many lights in the City like that. Old people get run over when they can't cross fast enough (twice by buses!). Scrambles should only be used if pollution is not increased. Some mid block pedestrian lights do not indicate when pedestrians will get a chance to cross. The light on McClelland and 2100 South doesn't give an indication of when to cross. SLC should aggressively adopt adaptive control traffic light systems that detect bicyclists and traffic and change the lights to consider throughput to decrease pollution along with recognizing bicyclists, especially late at night.</p>
George Chapman (CD 5)	<p>Figure 5-2 Wider bike lanes are better than an unusable vegetated median. Instead of colored paving, use money for more effective projects. Angled parking is unsafe for bicyclists. If a large vehicle is next to the vehicle, there is no visibility for safe pullout. Curb extensions block right hand turns until the left hand vehicle gets through, and increases pollution. Bike lanes should not increase pollution or congestion. Outside travel lanes can be safer for commuter bicyclists than a road diet that backs up traffic. Flipping can decrease sidewalk width (real and perceived) which is counter to complete streets.</p> <p>Figure 5-4 Where are the sidewalks!!!!?? Why not provide a wide sidewalk and pedestrian amenities like a store or restaurant instead of a project that discourages walking (like an block long car sales lot).</p> <p>Figure 5-5 When I rode bikes, I didn't want to ride at 20 mph next to a bunch of planters. They are very unsafe to bicyclists. A wider bike lane would be safer.</p> <p>Figure 5-6 Center raised median for safe crossing should be accessible to ADA.</p> <p>Figure 5-7 Bicyclists would rather have wider lanes than a center planting. Colored concrete or brick is too costly and roundabouts confuse pedestrians and</p>

George Chapman (CD 5)	<p>Shared lane markings for bicyclists should not increase congestion. Bicyclists should not backup traffic, especially on hills. Put in a bike lane. Utah law says keep 3 feet from bicyclists when passing. That should be enough. Lowering speeds on streets for bicyclists is wrong on so many levels.</p> <p>"Surveys both nationally and locally show that 50-60% of people say they would ride more (or start riding) if they had access to bikeways that provide more separation from traffic, lower traffic speeds, and lower traffic volumes." But the question should be framed to not elicit a yes answer. The question should be what would it take for you to bicycle more and give options like road diet, etc and add what would you find unacceptable for vehicles (road diet, speed limits etc).</p> <p>Sunnyside and other streets should not get lane reductions without a vigorous public debate and consensus. They should not increase congestion and they should not decrease bicyclist and pedestrian safety. 6.4 Implementations should not be done if they are "difficult" and give preference to bicyclists over vehicles.</p>
George Chapman (CD 5)	<p>Figure 6-9 I don't see Richmond repaving?? I don't think 2100 S. can allow a bike lane without a road diet and significant increase in pollution. Putting an east west bicycle lane across 700 East in the middle of Liberty Park when there is 900 South bike lane is a waste and incomprehensible. It will increase pollution by stopping hundreds of cars on 700 East (for one bicyclist???!). This map should not be used for projects.</p> <p>Figure 6-10 No more bicycle boulevards please. People idle their cars for minutes trying to get out of their driveway on 1300 South. The 4 lanes were safer for bicyclists and less polluting (just like the 1300 East road diet). 300 West protected bike lanes only if vehicle lanes aren't restricted. Most of the businesses require a vehicle to buy their goods and take them home. Bicycles don't work. Where are the wider sidewalks?</p>
George Chapman (CD 5)	<p>6.6.4.3 "15MPH" is too slow and should not be acceptable. Commuter bicyclists go at least 20 mph on straight roads. Parklets benefit adjacent businesses and they usually pay for the benefit. It could be for more than one day. I still think that a bicycle map should be color coded by safety. "Winter weather is a pervasive barrier to bicycling for transportation" because it is unsafe. Why encourage unsafe behavior. If a buffered or conventional bike lane costs a tenth or less than a protected bike lane, why not do fewer protected bike lanes and do more wider sidewalks? This is not a pedestrian plan. This is a bicycle plan. Just a couple of pages talked about pedestrians and skipped the complete streets wider sidewalk almost completely. This is a bastardization of complete streets. This is just bicycles and not pedestrians, bicycles and vehicles. There is a big difference between complete streets and this plan.</p>
George Chapman (CD 5)	<p>I recommend that this plan be shelved. It increases pollution.</p>
Phil Sarnoff (CD 7)	<p>Overall, the concepts in the plan seem sound.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I would strongly recommend bolstering your plans for infrastructure projects on the west side of Salt Lake City. Routes on the west side of Salt Lake City are often used out of necessity and the density of this part of the network should be given priority. 2. In regards to a bicycle education program, it seems too late to focus on middle and high school students. Most school-based, bicycle education programs focus on 4th-5th graders as they are more receptive to the concepts and have a greater length of time until they are able to drive. By the time students are near driving age, they are usually not focused on using a bicycle as a means of transportation. 3. Thank you for the increased focus on maintenance. Given the proper education and equipment, Salt Lake City is an easy climate in which to ride year-round. 4. I would encourage broader utilization of automated counters. Volunteer counts, such as with the weather in 2013, lost an entire year of accurate data. It doesn't hurt to have counters out there more frequently and will buttress data when circumstances with volunteer counts don't cooperate. 5. I would encourage increased outreach to the bicycling community in order to get them engaged in supporting broader initiatives. Thank you for your efforts and keep moving forward.
Anonymous (CD 7)	<p>I very strongly support the plan. I walk and bike in SLC a lot, very much support the improvmenets proposed in the plan and would very much like to enjoy them all! It is a move in the right direction for our city and the health of our communities. Bring it on!</p>
Todd Hadden (CD 1)	<p>One source of deaths for bicyclists and Pedestrians is Railroad crossing there are around a dozen of these all on the Westside and they divide the city East from West and Rosepark from Glandale. They need attention either overpasses (Jordan River Trail) or keep trains from parking on the crossing (3rd North and 17th South).</p>

Anonymous (CD 6)	<p>Having just read the comments on open city hall and looking over the Executive Summary, I am very interested in this issue. My husband is an avid cyclist. I'm strictly recreational. I stay clear of heavily traveled collector and arterial streets! While I fully intend to make use of my bike for casual transportation and recreation, I don't ever see myself using as a means for commuter transportation.</p> <p>I'm seriously concerned as a motorist for the safety of cyclists on shared streets. Considering the number of deaths in the last couple of years, in various locations of Salt Lake City and Salt Lake County, of a cyclist being hit by motor vehicles it seems that a serious investment in education is in order for both motorists and cyclists.</p> <p>Someone else mentioned in a statement that proper clothing and lighting of bikes should be required. I totally agree! I have too many times come upon cyclists and pedestrians in dark clothing without any kind of light or reflective help. They simply cannot be seen!! I don't mind sharing the road and I never want to have an accident with a pedestrian or cyclist.</p> <p>Maintenance of the bike ways for safety is critical. Road debris is a serious hazard to a cyclist. I would also suggest that cyclists be required to have a license for themselves and their bikes to use commuter lanes. There needs to be some way to report effectively those who create safety problems for others on the roadways. It doesn't have to be costly. It seems only equitable that those using the roadways on bikes have part in</p>
Anonymous (CD 4)	<p>I am very pleased to see so many great ideas for improving and expanding cycling in SLC. A few comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -traffic lights could be timed better to discourage cars from speeding, which would make biking safer. -bike lanes installed on roads with heavy bus traffic is rather scary as a biker (and I imagine as a bus driver too). I prefer bike lanes on quieter streets. - there are lots of interesting techniques other cities are implementing to encourage biking (eg. In seattle they have two way bike lanes, much like a bike-only road) that could be useful in some places in SLC. I'm not sure how much study there has been of other cities (what has worked and what has not) but there are lots of options to consider! -It can be hard to connect biking with other mass transit options (bus, trax) as there is not always space for bikes. Adding more bike space would make long distance bike commuting easier. The easier and safer it is to bike, the more people will do it. This is a really cheap way to have a huge impact on transportation in our city. Keep up the good work and thank you for working to improve our transportation system.
Anonymous (outside SLC)	<p>I like what you are doing to expand bike paths. I'd like to see you speed it up some. I agree many more people would bike if they thought it was safe and protected from vehicle traffic. Keep it up. Good use of money.</p>
Anonymous (CD 6)	<p>I'm excited about the plan and applaud the efforts. Please proceed sooner rather than later adding more bikeways of all types, reducing traffic speed and implementing bike sensors at signals. And education and promotion of cycling! The more bikes on the road the safer we will all be. A couple of items I think that should be added:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lighting for bikeways - especially if you want to encourage Winter cycling. I stop commuting in Winter specifically because I don't feel safe riding in the dark even with a bright headlight, flashing rear light and small side lights. Better street and intersection lighting along bikepaths would help greatly. 2. Safe storage for bikes and/or better policing of bike theft. I can't bike if I can't securely leave my bike when I get to my destination. Too many bikes are stolen. <p>I would also like to point out that the bike path needs attention at the East-most terminal/end of the Sugarhouse S line in order to continue east on the shared use/bike path. Crossing the intersection to cycle on the a-typical side of the street is confusing to motorists and cyclists. I have yet to figure out how to make this crossing safely as it is an extremely busy intersection. The best alternative seems to be to get in line with the traffic going South in order to turn east - but this requires riding the wrong way on the road until I reach the end of traffic. To be able to cross</p>
Anonymous (CD 6)	<p>First fill in the missing connections in existing bike paths, like between Parley's and Sugarhouse park. Next add safety lights on dangerous intersections, HAWK signals, Wakara and Foothill for instance. Traffic calming measures like bulbouts on 2100 South would help pedestrians tremendously. Keep up the good work.</p>
Shane Graham (CD 5)	<p>Yes! I love it. Yes to the overall Complete Streets vision. And yes specifically to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> --As many protected bike lanes as the city can afford to build. --Turning 600 E into a bike boulevard. --Two-stage left turn queue boxes. Especially on, say, 800 S. --Bulbouts. --Putting in mid-block crosswalks, especially to get across 700 E at 1900 S and 1500 S. Better yet, build pedestrian bridges so one could get across 700 E without having to stop traffic or wait for the light! --More roundabouts! And while you're at it, that roundabout in Sugar House that's been turned into a 4-way stop (on Hollywood? Ramona?) drives me crazy. Turn it back into a roundabout; we're all grown-ups, we'll figure it out. <p>I'm fairly new to SLC, and don't know the west side very well, but I second the earlier post calling for equal attention to be paid to cycling infrastructure there. While I'm here, let me ask: is there any plan to better connect the S-line greenway to Hidden Hollow? The greenway is fantastic, and the Draw is awesome, but getting from 900 E to Hidden Hollow requires some death defying feats of bravery, especially getting across Highland and through the Petco parking lot. Also, I tend to use the bike lane along Sugarmont rather than the last stretch of greenway, but</p>
Anonymous (CD 3)	<p>Please carry this out as soon as possible. We need good interconnected bicycle paths that cross the city in several places from East to West and from North to South, to make it safe to cycle whatever direction we need to go in. One location that is difficult to negotiate on a bicycle is along Foothill Blvd, up to where the Bonneville bicycle path starts. Thanks for being cyclist-friendly. This needs to happen.</p>
Brendan Nicholson (CD 5)	<p>I support this plan and the overall expansion of bike paths and protected bike lanes in Salt Lake City.</p>

Missy Berkel (CD 5)	I support the bikeway network project. "The entire [Salt Lake Valley] 220 mile bikeway network could be build for the same amount of money as widening 1.3 miles of freeway." This seems like a no-brainer to me. I was recently in the Boulder, Colorado area (Erie, CO) and was amazed by the amount of open space and trails, both paved and dirt that are mixed in with the subdivisions. It really adds to the attractiveness and healthy community to have this type of transportation and recreation option.
Anonymous (CD 4)	As a cyclist first and a motorist second, I have to applaud the efforts of this plan -- both intent and execution. That said, one crucial aspect that I see under-emphasized is the need to discourage and eventually eliminate the common practice of wrong-way cycling ("salmoning") in SLC. Salmoning is one of the most dangerous behaviors a cyclist can adopt and puts themselves, drivers, and pedestrians in harm's way unnecessarily. This plan absolutely needs to include specific mitigation strategies for confronting this issue in productive, respectful, and effective ways. SLC can make great strides with respect to signage, directional arrows, public education, officer education, and, where necessary, enforcement. If we cyclists truly want equal rights on the road, we must begin by taking responsibility for our own actions and, ultimately, SLC's cycling culture. The time to curtail this behavior is now, and this plan should detail the first steps in the process.
Anonymous (CD 4)	Let's do this! Seeing the city become more and more bike friendly has been fabulous. As someone who enjoys biking, but is nervous about safety concerns, I can honestly say that I haven't biked much in the last five years -- until this last summer. The bike lanes make getting around so much more convenient.
Anonymous (outside SLC)	My husband and I are both over 60 and enjoy riding the Jordan river trail. We love to connect with the front runner and hitch rides back to where we sTart, usually at a station. One thing lacking on the trail is signage to the train stations. Also safe ways to leave the path and get downtown. Signage please. Love the report,
Craig & Toni Carter (CD 6)	Interesting NY Times article about lighting of bike paths in Copenhagen. Considering that Salt Lake has been a commuter community I doubt that we'll ever get a majority of people (regardless of age) riding bikes. ...however, if I were faced with gas prices as high as Copenhagen (\$5.93 per gallon) I would begin to consider alternative forms of transportation. On a recent recent drive through downtown on 300 South, we experienced a line of traffic both in front and back of us with no bike riders on the street....we all were stopped at numerous stop lights all the while our cars had to idle. This is only contributing to the pollution in the valley. These bike lanes needs to be re-thought out for traffic sake not just for bikers. Also pedestrians have done OK on sidewalks for years.
Diane Whittaker (CD 6)	Before we invest in new bike lanes, let's fix the lanes we have, now. Many bike lanes stop just prior to an intersection or stop where there is a cross street. We need to have the the bike lanes continue through all intersections and dotted lines where there are cross streets. The east bound bike lanes on Sunnyside and Foothill Boulevard were fixed this fall ... hurray. Let's spend a little more and paint out all bike lanes at intersections. I am all for more and safer bike lanes in our city. The lanes should be on through streets, but not the high traffic arteries for cars. I believe more people would commute on a bicycle if there are safe options. Also ... front and rear bike lights should be required on all bicycles that are ridden at night. Helmets should be required at all times. Helmet lights (front and back) should be required for rides after dusk and before dawn. Time after time we see bicyclists riding on streets at night wearing black clothing and no lights, or a very small light. This is very risky for drivers who can't see the bicycle until the car is just a few feet away.
Nikki Parsons (CD 7)	I absolutely love the bike lanes and center parking strips/walkways on Broadway. Please do this everywhere. Most of all I'm excited to hear about the use of bulbouts. I wish EVERY intersection had them. They shorten the distance pedestrians are exposed to traffic. They slow down right-turn traffic to give drivers enough time to spot pedestrians. And they create a physical barrier to keep drivers from parking too close to stop signs and other important signage. Not too mention the opportunity they bring to further expand and beautify public spaces. So, above all... Bring on the bulbouts!
Elizabeth Braymen (CD 6)	Excellent job! I'm looking forward to watching this come to fruition.
Anonymous (CD 7)	The plan looks like a good one if it actually is implemented. I have seen the city produce master plans in the past that were never carried out. I prefer to cycle to work despite being in my 80th year. The problems I face are: 1. No bike lanes on Foothill Blvd. despite the heavy traffic coming from the southeast part of the county to the University and downtown. 2. There is terrible street lighting in Salt Lake and in winter with the shorter daylight times this makes bicycling even more dangerous. 3. When biking on the sidewalk on Foothill Blvd. the cross streets are a problem as cars can come out at high speed. All these streets need a stop sign if no traffic light and a raised area where pedestrians and bicycles can cross and at the same time gently force cars to slow down and stop. 4. Pedestrians and cyclists should have paths separate from motor vehicle traffic lanes. Riding on the Green Lanes in the midst of moving automobiles is scary to say the least. In some areas barriers have been set up and this is preferable to Green Lanes amidst the traffic. Thank you.
David Davis (CD 3)	"The entire 220-mile recommended bikeway network could be built for the same amount of money as widening 1.3 miles of freeway" DO IT. DO IT TOMORROW! This would have SUCH a huge positive impact in the daily life of everyone in the valley, making cycling safe and accessible for families and average people, not just those brave enough to jump in with motor vehicles. When I look at the current infrastructure vs. what's planned, the main thing I see is continuity through all the major connectors for cyclists, which would both benefit casual riders (all roads lead to parks well) and crosstown commuters. One thing I remember from the community open houses was infrastructure planning that extends through the entirety of Salt Lake County. These developments need to be taken as part of a whole, especially when we have county leadership that is committed to expanding bikeways. If bicycle routes from far ends of the valley are completed, signed, and maintained, more people who currently aren't bicycling will have encouraging options, while improving the quality of life in their neighborhoods. A city document could be considered best practices for county-wide improvements in this regard. Thanks for all your work and consideration of these public

Amy Kopischke (outside SLC)	<p>Since 2000, bicycle commuting is on the rise: http://bikeleague.org/content/bicycle-commuting-data</p> <p>People are even more likely to commute by bicycle if there is infrastructure in place: http://www.peopleforbikes.org/statistics/category/facilities-statistics#if-you-build-it-they-will-come</p> <p>Commuting by bikes is good for individuals: http://www.youcanbikethere.com/bike-commute-calculator</p> <p>Commuting by bikes is good for communities: http://1776dc.com/news/2013/11/06/cities-attract-companies-small-and-large-with-improved-bike-infrastructure/</p> <p>We should do all we can to continue to strive toward the bikeway improvements outlined in the Ped and Bicycle Master Plan for the improvement of our community.</p>
Kevin Bell (CD 2)	<p>I'll be excited to see the overflow canal get paved to connect the Jordan River Parkway with the 9 Line and eventually the International Center! This link will connect the industrial workforce to the residential areas in a nice way. Please put this on the top of the list!</p>
Lucy Knorr (CD 3)	<p>I would love to see SLC as bicycle friendly as possible and I appreciate the on-going efforts towards that. The protected bike lanes are a great start. The bike trails in Victoria, BC have places where the cars stop at bike crossings, not the bikes. It's a fantastic city to bike in. Please also address safety in neighborhoods more in your plan. To get to the downtown bulb outs, protected lanes etc, one must navigate cars running stops and turning right. The Avenues have confusing alternating stops on various streets, parking is allowed right up to intersections restricting visibility, and it lacks painted limit lines to help alert drivers unfamiliar with the area which makes biking dangerous. I also like the idea of recognizing that not everyone wants pavement to bike on and I hope there will be more options preserved than currently listed in the plan. However, if the city doesn't think SLC is fit for horses, how can we possibly allow humans to be on the streets breathing the same fumes and in all kinds of that same weather? And what about the poor dogs submitting to the same? I'm sure SLC will code in an appropriate ban to protect humans, including the pedicabs and legal couriers, and dogs from exercise in extreme conditions, ban them from mixing with traffic, and make</p>
Jonathan Echlin (CD 2)	<p>As a resident of the east side of Salt Lake, I think it is great that the city is interested in building the infrastructure required to this side of the city bike friendly. But as someone who works and spends much of their day on the west side of the city, I believe they are missing an opportunity to really improve areas that are tremendously unserved by bike paths. For many residents of the west side of Salt Lake City, biking is not a choice, but a necessity to get to work, shop and socialize. The city would be well served to concentrate their efforts on bringing the west side, specifically on 900 W between 2100 S and North Temple the same amenities they are so ready to give to us east side residents. Our elected officials should be careful not to be blinded by the demographic studies and surveys completed by the consultant on this project. I encourage them to act in the best interest of the entire city, not just the part of the city that looks good in photos.</p>
Scott Lyttle	<p>The plan does not appear to get us to "platinum or diamond" bicycle friendly community in terms of measurable goals:</p> <p>Plan shows that by 2035, 85% of arterials will have bike lanes. Diamond status is 90%</p> <p>How does the total miles of the bicycle network compare to the total street miles in SLC? Diamond status is 70% of total road network.</p> <p>Only 55% UDOT arterial roads will have bikeways -- these are typically the most dangerous roads, and thus the ones most in need of facilities.</p> <p>Education in secondary schools (and primary schools) should be established as goals in the plan.</p> <p>What are SLC's goals for reducing crashes and fatalities? 20% ridership for BFC Diamond -- what are SLC's goals for mode share?</p>

Name	Comment
Evelyn Tuddenham	<p>I looked at the short-term draft map (10 yr. plan). This is what pops out to me (there may be other areas as well):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) 700 E., 300 S. to 2100 S.; on-street, low stress bikeway (bufferd bike lane, bikeway etc.) 2) Redwood Road, 2100 N. (?) to 2100 S.; bike lane 3) Bangerter, I-80 to 2100 S.; on-street, low stress bikeway 4) University streets; on-street, low stress bikeways 5) Beck Street; on-street, low stress bikeway
Vincent Liu	<p>Page 23 - Goal 1: Need uniformities on design Page 26 - Goal 4: Educate bicyclists and Pedestrians to obey traffic laws</p>
Danny Page	<p>Page 36, Table 4-1 Percentage of Roads with Bikeways: Where are they pulling this information from?</p> <p>Page 37, Section 4.4 Speed Limit Policies – The advice of lower speeds to the downtown area less than 25mph, a statement should d be included about what this does to congestion through the downtown area and how the increased congestion also affects the air quality.</p> <p>Page 41, Section 5.12.1 Cross walk flags – there has been evidence supplied to the contrary that these X-walk flags provide a false sense of security for pedestrians – This sentence should be evaluated for inclusion in this document.</p> <p>Page 43 Section 5.2.1 Pedestrian Countdown Timers “Many UDOT owned ... signals in some locations”. Should be re-written to explain that “as UDOT upgrades pedestrian facilities that count down times are installed.”</p> <p>Section 5.2 Page 43 – The word UTAH should be placed in front of the MUTCD</p> <p>Section 5.2.5 – A sentence needs to be added at the end of this paragraph for consistency since UDOT is mentioned in other areas where pedestrian signal detection. “UDOT also install these devices where there is an indicated need as well.”</p> <p>Page 65 Section 6.2 the statement “It also supports business employment of highly educated professionals who are often more interested in bicycling to work”. What is the statement based on, fact or opinion?</p> <p>Section 6.4 Interim Bypass Routes -It would be good to mention that SLC does not have jurisdiction on the State Routes within SLC, but SLC and UDOT work collectively work together on projects within SLC.</p> <p>Page 82 – Section 6.5.1 Maintenance Recommendations – No mention of the conflict between winter maintenance for on street parking and bicycle lanes where they co-exist on the same routes. How does SLC handle this?</p> <p>Figure 6-9 – Bicycling Spot Improvement Recommendations Map – does this incorporate the UCATS maps?</p> <p>Page 91 – What cities have adopted specific warrants for bicycle phases and bicycle signal heads and what are those warrants? These should be included in an appendix to increase the readers knowledge of what it takes for improvements to be made.</p> <p>Page 92 – Last paragraph - Strike the language "SLC does not have authority to make signal timing changes". This statement adds no value to the reader and it should state that UDOT is willing to evaluate signal timing changes that do not place unnecessary delay within a corridor.</p>
Matt Sibul	 <p>December 17 2014</p> <p>Dear Robin,</p> <p>UTA appreciates the opportunity to provide comments and feedback on the Salt Lake City Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan.</p> <p>UTA is encouraged by the fact that the integration of pedestrian and bicycle facilities with transit routes, stations and stops is one of the top five goals of the plan. UTA believes that “first and last mile” connectivity to the transit system is an integral part of the vision of Salt Lake City to create “viable transportation options that connect people to places, foster recreational and economic development opportunities, improve personal health and the environment, and elevate quality of life.”</p> <p>UTA supports the multi-modal sensitivity in the programs being proposed. This approach offers opportunities for the city to partner with other transportation agencies, such as UTA and UDOT but also acknowledges that “transportation” is not one dimensional. This multi-modal approach also allows for joint funding opportunities, such as grants, right-of-way dedication and other revenue streams to support this plan. UTA looks forward to the improved coordination, planning, design and implementation that this plan will bring forward.</p> <p>One of the key components of UTA’s first and last mile strategies includes the recently introduced GREENbike bikesharing program in Salt Lake City. UTA was curious why this particular program was not explicitly, or even tangentially acknowledged in the plan. The GREENbike program offers so many benefits that appear to compliment to goals of the Salt Lake City Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan, such as mobility, health and air quality. While UTA understands the that GREENbike program is an independently owned and operated 501(3)c foundation, but would strongly recommend that the program be mentioned, at the very least as a part of the description with the objectives of Goal #5.</p> <p>Again, UTA applauds the efforts of Salt Lake City to make the community a better place for all of it’s citizens.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p>  <p>Matt Sibul Chief Planning Officer Utah Transit Authority 669 West 200 South Salt Lake City, UT 84088</p>

Name	Comment
Becka Roof	On the 0-10 year bikeways map, the existing bike lane on 400 South from ~950 west to Redwood Road is missing.
Steering Comm (individual not specified)	<p>Only one pedestrian map but there are many, many maps for bicycling – How do we explain that sidewalks are on most City streets have been developed over the last 100 years and that less work is needed on peds</p> <p>Would like to see a definition of pedestrian in that chapter so that we know if this covers ADA, other wheeled, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Glendale Park and Warm Springs Park plans are ongoing o Parks and trails connectivity to encourage people to get to the park by some other mode than their car o How to get people between Warm Springs Park to Ensign Peak – crossing Victory – from a recreational but also a preservation perspective o How to make parks well-used and connected destinations • Should current ADA ramp and accessibility work be mentioned and discussed in a paragraph? (Lynn’s work) (The City currently has 1,400 miles of sidewalk and the objective of the City is to work toward complete accessibility to all sidewalks...) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Do we have language about how the City is filling in the gaps in sidewalks or accessibility to all people of varying abilities? o They’ll submit this comment via email
Steering Committee (Lynn Jarman)	In the public input process, did you just reach the special interest groups (bicycle clubs, etc.) that support the plan? Does the public input represent the general public?
Michael Stott (with add-ins from Lynn Jarman, and references that Michael attached to his comments)	<p>In the Vision on ES-1, pg 22, elsewhere(?), there is a mixing of adjectives referring to “walking and bicycling” as “safe, convenient, comfortable” and a noun referring to “walking and bicycling” as “viable transportation options.” Consider rewording. Try, “Walking and bicycling in Salt Lake City will be safe, convenient, and comfortable, and will include viable transportation options that...”</p> <p>In this statement on ES-1, consider saying, “...can be used by all City residents of all abilities including the very young and very old, people with disabilities, and bikers who are not comfortable riding in traffic.</p> <p>In this executive summary on E-2, create a second paragraph to add a note on the term “walking” to be more inclusive throughout the plan. Say, “In this plan, the use of the terms “pedestrian” and “walking” are meant in a broad sense to include pedestrians who use wheelchairs, scooters, strollers, or other mobility devices or aids. The City is inclusive of a diversity of types of pedestrians, and the City will upgrade existing facilities and install new facilities to meet the needs of all kinds of pedestrians.”</p> <p>In this section on pg4, add a bullet point saying, “In 1990, the federal government passed a civil rights law called the American’s with Disabilities Act (ADA) that prohibited discrimination based on disabilities. This federal law requires municipalities to improve facilities such as sidewalks to make them usable by people with disabilities. In compliance with federal requirements, Salt Lake City performed a self-evaluation of all public sidewalks to determine barriers to accessibility and establish a Transition Plan to install accessible ramps and create accessible pedestrian routes throughout the City.”</p> <p>...another bullet point: The United States Access Board, federal agency responsible for developing design guidelines to assist state and local governments in meeting ADA requirements, established the Public Rights-of-Way Access Advisory Committee in 1999. Salt Lake City’s public way accessibility standards are based on publications authorized by this federal advisory committee.</p> <p>Near this section on pg11, add a section about “Types of Pedestrians” which expounds on the distinctions made in a previous point. Include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Walking: People on foot. They walk with little difficulty. o Walking with effort: People on foot. Walking takes extra effort. They may have mobility disabilities and use mobility aids such as canes, crutches, or walkers. They may have sensory impairments such people who are blind or visually impaired, or people who are deaf or hard of hearing. Steps and uneven surfaces may be a challenge. Wayfinding may be a challenge. Traveling with other pedestrians may be uncomfortable. The pace is likely slower. o Rolling assistance: People with mobility disabilities who use wheelchairs, mobility scooters, or other mobility devices, and people with strollers. Steps and uneven surfaces are a challenge. The pace may be slower. o Rolling recreation: People using forms of recreation other than a bike such as scooters, skates, and Segways. <p>In this section on pg24, second bullet point, replace “disabled persons” with “people with disabilities.” (**and do that throughout the plan**)</p> <p>...rephrase this point to say, “Conform to pedestrian design standards that promote accessibility for people with disabilities. Implement innovative ideas that enhance the pedestrian experience for a diversity of types of pedestrians.”</p>

	<p>In this section on pg40, add under this Sidewalks section a statement about the miles of sidewalks in the city (ask Lynn Jarman). State that “While City Ordinance makes adjacent property owners responsible for sidewalk maintenance, the City provides some sidewalk maintenance assistance such as a concrete saw-cutting service to level steps created by broken or lifted sections of sidewalk. (insert a fact from Lynn Jarman about the quantity of saw-cuts made annually.) The City also utilizes federal and other funding as available to replace failed sidewalk in priority and qualifying areas. Some improvements are made directly while others are made through a matching program with the adjacent resident.”</p> <p>... add another paragraph, maybe with a pic that says, “Many residential streets in the city are lined with large trees in the park strip. However, trees can lift sidewalks making it difficult to use the sidewalk. In these cases, the City’s Urban Forester and Engineering Divisions work with the property owner to identify a solution.”</p> <p>In this section on pg41, create a new subsection called “Curb Ramps” which states “The City will continue to place high priority on increasing accessibility by converting step-up curbs to curb ramps. Approximately 200 accessible ramps are installed annually.”</p> <p>In this section on pg45, change the term “Disabled Persons” to “People with Disabilities”</p> <p>... also add a sentence at the ends that says, “The City will consider upgrades to signals and other devices as advances in technology emerge. For example, there are now signals that verbally describe the active direction to cross at an intersection and the number of seconds in the count-down timer.”</p>
Allen McCandless	<p>I completed the review of the Draft SLC Pedestrian & Bicycle Master Plan and have a comment involving the maps on pages 49, 71, 72, and 73 of the draft. This is in reference to the path marked as “UP&L Powerline Corridor Path” that is shown on the west and on the north sides of the Airport. Please note that the Salt Lake City International Airport, Airport Layout Plan, shows a future runway that would be constructed west of the airport’s existing runways. This future north/south runway would be in this general location where the bike path is shown. A new runway would take out the west leg of this bike path as it is shown on these maps. I recommend that the City does not install expensive bike path improvements along this corridor that would later be removed for a runway and associated improvements. The timeframe for this future runway is unknown. Additionally, we do not know if the FAA would allow a bike path on airport property in this location with security being an important issue.</p>
Kate Lohnes	<p>I have a thought/concern to share with you regarding the SmartTrips program. I know Transportation does not have the capacity to take on SmartTrips at the moment, as confirmed by Robin, however SLCgreen currently has no plans to continue it either.</p> <p>Considering the priorities outlined in the Master Plan specific to outreach and engagement, SmartTrips is a great fit. Is there any conversation about capacity building within Transportation to take on this type of proactive engagement program that aligns so well with the master plan?</p>
Cabot Jennings	<p>The maintenance costs are unique and “interesting”. Should a protected bike lane be less to maintain than a painted, conventional bike lane? Perhaps if it’s a concrete, protected lane that doesn’t need paint or planters or much maintenance at all.</p>
Becka Roof	<p>Revise the bicycle boulevard route on Starcrest to instead go through the Utah State office complex and connect to 1950 west and provide access to TRAX station. Note we have other routes (like Surplus Canal Trail) that are on land owned by other agencies or institutions.</p>

All comments on this page were contributed by the Planning Division staff.

Type or section	Comment
General	Should use more pictures. The ones in the plan are often used multiple times which detracts from the plan. Do you have pictures of non city employees on bikes?
General	Please reference the Mid-block Walkways Design Guidelines, which are part of the Downtown Community Plan.
General	- The first/last quarter mile connections and connections to transit needs more attention in the plan.
General	- Conflict points between pedestrians and cyclists need more attention in the plan.
General	- Guidelines for when we want to put in a new facility like HAWK, mid-block crossing, bike facility, etc: what are places/streets that are good candidates (near a school, link to mid-block walkway, etc) for these v poor candidates (too many driveways, prioritized vehicle streets, etc)?
Exec Summ, p. 1	- Call out the need to connect home-based work trips and the ability for people to conveniently and safely get to work without driving.
Exec Summ, p. 1	- Greater mix of land uses –particularly local serving retail and community services-- increases proximity and the likelihood that shorter trips will be active trips.
Exec Summ, p. 1	- Shared use paths is the only outreach response measured for ped ideas.
Exec Summ, p. 1	- Access to all: Emphasis is on biking (second sentence). Consider adding sentence about people with disabilities and how an improved public realm can benefit their comfort and safety. Access also includes ped access to services, businesses, etc. as well as into other buildings (zero entry access)
Exec Summ, p. 1	Personal Health: spelling error, second sentence the word “by” should be changed to “be”
Exec Summ, p. 1	- Economic Health: Keeping household cost of transportation low is an important reason to invest in active transportation.
Exec Summ, p. 2	- Walking section: while we have a lot of existing infrastructure, our pedestrian experience is hampered by our large blocks and wide streets. The plan should identify this and be creative about how to address crossing streets that have a perceived (actual) travelling speed that is not safe for pedestrians. The walking section takes up about 1/3 rd of the page while bicycling gets a full page. The start of almost every trip made is as a pedestrian
Exec Summ, p. 2	- and it seems like the plan just defers to existing infrastructure
Exec Summ, p. 2	- Typologies graphic is illegible.
Exec Summ, p. 2	The City has a long history of planning for pedestrians, including in the Urban Design Element that links urban design to streetscape and function. It could add a lot to this plan simply by updating those policies.
Exec Summ, p. 2	- The Mid-Block Walkways System was initially proposed in the 1962 Second Century Plan, again in the 1995 Downtown Master Plan, and further defined in Towards a Walkable Downtown strategy (2000). It has yet to be fully implemented. Mid-block routes serve as important inner block connections, expanding the Downtown pedestrian network while supporting the formal nature of the grid. Though some new walkways and streets have been developed in recent years, many mid-block walkways are neglected and under appreciated, with poor lighting and badly maintained paving. These routes are important because they increase the permeability of the downtown for pedestrians and vehicles alike –providing more choice in route options— as well as represent an opportunity for economic development.
Exec Summ, p. 2	- Include pedestrian-related results from the public outreach.
Page 1	- “Innovative facilities the City now constructs were not even invented a decade ago.” Statement conflicts with timeline showing protected bike lanes from the 70’s. This should be correlated.
Page 1	- There is virtually no discussion of pedestrians and how SLC is becoming more urban, how more than half of the commute trips in downtown are by foot (only 3% by bike).
Page 2	- History section says that sidewalks were built when cars started to come about. Actually boardwalks were constructed prior to the car so people did not need to walk through the mud and filth that was in the dirt streets. This happened almost from the beginning of the City.
Page 2	- City was not intentionally designed to be urban, but as a farming community. This resulted in an urban form of large blocks and wide streets, which are not inherently designed for the pedestrian. Many of our city streets (particularly in and around the downtown) are 132 feet wide and are characterized by a sense of grandness and vehicular capacity. As social spaces, however, their design often fails to provide pleasant and convenient use by pedestrians. Complete street walls, trees and landscape, benches and other amenities work to temper the impacts of vehicular traffic on portions of Main Street and a few other streets in the downtown but not all.
Page 2	- The last paragraph on page 2 is out of place. The page should only talk about the history related to that time era and not mix modern issues. It jumps from 1890 to today.
page 4	- This is the period that the City started to get street lights, primarily to make the streets safer for pedestrians. It should be mentioned. I also believe that the first traffic signal using lights was installed at Main St. and 200 South in 1912.

page 4	- Missing is 1910-1970. It is ok to say that the public spaces started being taken over by cars and the space for pedestrians and bicycles were reduced. Include other significant transportation events, such as the closing of the trolley system in 1941. The section post 1910 is really weak and seems to indicate that nothing happened, even though we built sidewalks, developed neighborhood shopping districts, and expanded as a City requiring new sidewalks in new subdivisions. Also, what about the most recent improvements?
page 8	- 1.2.2.3 More emphasis may be placed on household transportation cost reductions and benefits to smaller scale business supported by bike ped traffic
page 10	- Many of the "Look" markings have been paved over.
page 10	- Orange crossing flags demonstrated reduced pedestrian/vehicle collisions when they were first installed, does the City does not have current data.
page 12	- Results from the 2012 Utah Household Travel Survey from 2012 claim that Utahns take 3-4 more times more walk trips than bike. This suggests that a greater emphasis on the walking environment and our urban form is warranted in this plan.
page 13	- Change "Bicycle Infrastructure Focus" to "Bicycle Infrastructure Development" to reflect that the trend in city management of bike infrastructure has shifted from painted lanes to low stress bikeways.
page 16	- Relationship to Other Plans section needs to include Downtown In Motion and other transportation master plans. Also, the Urban Design Element should be considered as it relates to the influence urban design has on infrastructure.
page 16	Plan Salt Lake includes a number of initiatives that relate to this plan. Those could easily be identified as things that the bike/ped plan is working towards accomplishing. <u>Recommended additions:</u> Plan Salt Lake identifies connectivity and circulation as a necessary component of sustainable growth. Plan Salt Lake and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan share the goal of providing transportation options and improving connections. Plan Salt Lake also identifies key initiatives related to the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan, including providing a complete network for all modes of travel and making walking and cycling viable, safe, and convenient transportation options in all areas of the City.
page 23	- Goal #1 Inclusion of Bike Ped facilities in land use ordinances... Complete streets with good LU mix
page 23	- 9 th bullet: change "BFC" to "Bike Friendly Community."
page 23	- What about an objective of linking infrastructure to adjacent land uses and scaling the infrastructure to match the intensity of adjacent land use?
page 23	- Continue to develop the mid-block walkway and crossing system.
page 24	- Mention connection to places people need to go- like work and school.
page 24	- More emphasis on work trips, including employer bike programs.
page 24	- 8 th bullet: in high pedestrian areas, design the street to reduce motor vehicle speeds, such as with smaller turn radii, pedestrian refuges, bollards, lighting, etc.
page 24	- 9 th bullet: Conduct seasonal bike <i>and pedestrian</i> counts.
page 25	- Add priority to elimination of standing water and ice dams obstructing ped facilities. Identify and eliminate unsafe/ deteriorated/ non ADA compliant facilities.
page 25	- Continue to maintain sidewalks to remove trip hazards and other barriers.
page 25	- As pedestrian activity grows, ensure that sidewalk width and amenities (benches, etc) in business districts are adequate.
page 25	- Study how snow and ice not removed from travel lanes effectively promote pedestrian comfort, visibility and safety by reducing crossing distances, improving sight lines, and slowing turning vehicles. A lot of focus on winter related issues, which is fine, but snow and ice also show how the roadway could be reduced without too much impact. Example, at corners snow is rarely plowed to the curb, which effectively reduces the turn radius for cars, allows pedestrians to safely move out away from the curb to better determine if it is safe to cross, etc.
page 26	1 st bullet: ...enforce against driving <i>and bicycling</i> practices that endanger pedestrians.
page 26	- Promote dialogue about maintaining visual transparency from sidewalk into stores and vice versa, including lighting for optimal nighttime light spill and daytime solar shading to enhance the quality of the pedestrian experience. Window displays that stimulate interest in products or services is encouraged.
page 26	- Discourage blank walls along pedestrian-oriented streets.
page 26	- Provide buffer between pedestrians and vehicles to promote feeling of safety and security of people on sidewalks. (Relates to survey preference of sidewalk buffering)
page 26	- Continue to develop the mid-block crossing system.
page 26	- 4 th bullet: Change "disseminate" to "distribute."
page 26	5 th bullet: Encourage pedestrian and bicycle-friendly <i>commercial / residential development and business practices through zoning requirements and encouragement incentives</i> . (Zoning is not an appropriate tool to encourage "business practices.")
page 26	- 7 th bullet: Pedestrian maps are not appropriate, but signage is. Add: Develop a coordinated and universal signage and wayfinding system for all modes of travel to guide people to key destinations, including parking, transit stations, major event centers, major commercial centers, public spaces, and government centers.
page 27	- 3 rd bullet: Work with UTA to redesign TRAX platforms and bus stops to better accommodate people and bikes.
Chapter 3	Chapter 3: Seems out of place. Could this be an appendix? The Plan already summarizes the key parts of the engagement process.
page 36	Section 4.2 - 3 rd bullet: define "agency."
page 36	- 7 th bullet: Define or elaborate on what "context sensitive design" means.
page 36	- Missing discussion on street design policies and considering safety of others, not just meeting ASHTO standard. Things like reducing curb radii go along with reduced speed limits in making a complete streets network.
page 37	1st paragraph: "behavior" sp

page 39	- 1 st paragraph/list: Add street lighting, relationship to adjacent land uses, sun (winter months) and shade (summer months)
page 39	- 2 nd paragraph/list: Add: Turn radii, corner design that directs pedestrian crossing appropriately (particularly for the hearing and sight-impaired).
page 39	- In general, we should be prioritizing strategies that influence driver behavior –alerting them to the presence of bikes and peds and slowing them down-- over strategies that influence pedestrian behavior.
page 40	Replace picture of Ogden with SLC picture.
page 41	- 5.1.2.1 We should be designing the pedestrian environment to eliminate the need for crosswalk flags in the future.
page 41	- 5.1.2.2 Include “barriers to pedestrian crossing” (i.e. underground infrastructure, overpasses, at-grade infrastructure, political will) in prioritization factors.
page 42	- 5.1.3.1 Bulbouts: Bulbouts are also an opportunity for creating space for people to gather (mini plazas) and ecological infrastructure.
page 43	- 5.1.3.6 “The most effective expenditure of funds to improve a street would probably be on trees.” (Allen Jacobs. Great Streets. P. 293) Trees provide comfort (shade), interest (color, movement, delight), rhythm, protection from traffic, and oxygen (important ecological service). PLEASE do not undersell trees!
page 43	- Add: Ground floor building transparency along sidewalks and walkways: Visual transparency from sidewalk into stores and vice versa, including lighting for optimal nighttime light spill and daytime solar shading enhances the quality of the pedestrian experience. Window displays that stimulate interest in products or services promotes walkability and interest. An animated public realm does not have blank walls and instead incorporates architectural design features and ample clear, non-reflective glass at the pedestrian level in order to provide a high degree of ground-level transparency between indoors and out.
page 43	- 5.1.3.6 “neat paint?” General maintenance of storefronts
page 43	- 5.1.3.7: Lighting should be designed for pedestrians and cyclists first. Prioritizing sidewalk lighting would be major improvement to the pedestrian experience and address perceived safety concerns. This section is confusing: what is an existing City policy or objective and what is a basic statement of fact about current practices? It sounds like we are more concerned about lighting the street for cars than for people.
page 43	
page 44	5.2.2 Talks about the areas in downtown that do not have push buttons and how it is bad in certain times of the day. If we are trying to create a more 24/7 Downtown that has people out and about in early mornings, late into the evening and on weekends, we should maintain timing for the pedestrian (based on typical walk speeds) and not say what this paragraph says. It conflicts with other City goals. Consistency of signals for pedestrians, particularly in the downtown, is important to providing a pedestrian experience that is comfortable and predictable 24/7, particularly with the high number of visitors and tourists who may not know about push buttons.
page 45	- 5.2.6: What is a toucan signal? Please define technical terms like this.
page 47	- 5.2.7: The Planning Division disagrees with the first bullet. Consistency of signals for pedestrians, particularly in the downtown, is important to providing a pedestrian experience that is comfortable and predictable 24/7.
page 49	- Fig. 5-1: More detail needed for ped spot improvements. Most are misc bike blvd improvements; only 4 “new pavement and curb cut improvements” citywide. If the list is not meant to be exclusive, than why focus on it? Also, the spot improvements should be in places that have high pedestrian numbers first or that address barriers to pedestrians. The map is impossible to read. None of the spot improvements appear to be in Downtown, at other business districts, or at Trax stations. Why put the bicycle boulevard spot improvements on the map? Aren’t they just pedestrian spot improvements? Do they need a special call out?
page 50	- Fig. 5-2: Explain why back in parking is the best approach for a neighborhood business node.
page 50	The description of neighborhood node needs some work. This section should focus on pedestrian improvements –like business districts should have wider sidewalks than residential areas to accommodate placemaking and gathering, but there are bike improvements mixed in. Street lighting, sidewalk lighting, public art, plantings, banners, etc all add to the public realm experience but are not discussed. Why be specific on measurements? Seems like it is not going to be universal to all neighborhood business nodes. No mention of smaller turn radii to slow vehicles at intersections with greater pedestrian activity.
page 50	- Discussion section would benefit from some punch. Livable streets and sidewalks are the living rooms of our neighborhoods –where neighbor meets neighbor. They are rallying points, social spaces, and business developers. They are the places where community is built.
page 51	- Fig 5-3: Add “more inviting” to the language. Buildings at the sidewalk can make pedestrians more visible thus more comfortable. Add discussion about turn radii balancing safety of pedestrian with function of the street. Excess roadway could also be converted to places for people, such as parklets, outdoor dining, etc. in the right context (ironically this was mentioned in the 1919 report to the City). This should mention creating safe walking routes from the sidewalk to the buildings.
page 52	- Fig 5-4: – Text Idea: Allow for surrounding areas to permeate the traditionally separated uses. Many of these typologies are contained by fencing or roadways that can’t be easily crossed. Many are adjacent to residential uses. Add walkways from building to bus stops.
page 52	- It is important to link these sites to trail systems (BST, Jordan River).
page 52	- Biking to work should be promoted through employers. Encourage construction of showers and bike storage into the office buildings.

page 52	- TOD does not really fit in the suburban business park. In SLC, this means Research Park and our industrial areas, where residential uses are not permitted. While TOD does not need to include residential, it is generally and widely accepted that they do to activate places throughout the day, not just during business hours. But a suburban office park in SLC is a different animal, not sure TOD paragraph belongs here.
page 53	- Fig 5-5: Move this figure and descriptions to the Bicycle chapter, unless the intent is to discuss how the pedestrian should be accommodated in protected bike lane streetscapes (micro-plazas, pedestrian refuges, seating, planting, yield to pedestrians at mid-block crossings, etc).
page 53	- It is also missing any discussion of linking the transportation elements to the adjacent land uses.
page 54	- Fig 5-6: under raised medians: consider restricting some left turns for a more continuous streetscape.
page 55	- Fig 5-7: This typology seems redundant to the neighborhood business node (Fig 5-2) and does not explain the difference between a neighborhood business node and a neighborhood commercial district. The Westside Master Plan defines these and they are being incorporated into other community plans. This page does not talk about what makes a neighborhood commercial district.
page 55	- Urban Design would like to see a variety of paving options to demarcate a pedestrian zone besides colored concrete and stamped asphalt.
addition	Missing Typology: Mid-block walkways are not mentioned anywhere and very applicable. A reference to the Draft Mid-block Walkway Design Guidelines would be useful.
page 65	- Fig 6-6: Why is there a gap on 1700 South between 1300 E and 1500 E?
page 67	- Fig 6-7b: Indicates that no facilities will be studied for 600 South and 500 South requires further study. This does not align with the Downtown Community Plan or the Grand Boulevards project.
page 70	- Fig. 6-8: An overlay of stations with bike facilities would illustrate true bicycle access.
page 70	- It would be great if the maps later in the document showed bike routes that are accessible to the TRAX stations. 200 E, 900 E don't have bike infrastructure on the maps, but are the access points to the stations. From 300 E it is relatively easy and pleasant to get to the station through Library Square, much harder on 400 South. Same with 900 S. Also bike paths to the SLine don't connect to the actual line at 700 E or 900 E. 800 E does not go all the way through the neighborhood to connect either. This is a big omission and makes it hard to complete that last mile.
page 70	- Might want to consider using multiple maps to provide more detail and make it easier to see where everything is. The citywide map is important, but I wonder how useful it really is?
page 71	- Fig 6-9: Spot recommendations should include all places where the network passes under or over an interstate or at railway crossings. I-15 and the railways are major barriers to all modes and places where there is a perception of being unsafe. If safety is the goal, those have to be addressed by more than just striping. Lighting, art, maintenance are all important. This is huge for the Westside neighborhoods.
page 94	- Pedestrian Wayfinding: Please include SLC Urban Design in Partners.
page 94	- Park(ing) Day: Please include SLC Urban Design in Partners.
page 94	- Mid-block Walkways: Please change "Walkable Salt Lake" to "SLC Urban Design" under City Role and include business and property owners under Likely Partners.
Chapter 7	- Add horizontal rule (line) to the recommendations that have text spanning left and right columns so it's clear where to read.
page 101	- Mid-block Walkways: include reference to Mid-block Walkways Design Guidelines. Add RDA to Target Audience.
page 107	- Urban Design would like to see a higher priority for Mid-block Walkways.
Chapter 8	- Cost Estimates could use an example or two pulled from a recent project. Are cost estimates important for a plan that goes out 20 years? They provide today numbers, but they probably are not going to be relevant in 2025.