

SALT LAKE CITY JOINT TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD  
& BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Minutes of the January 8, 2024 Meeting

TAB Members present for this meeting were Dave Alderman, Greg Sanchez, Isaac Astill, Jim Espeland, Johnnae Nardone, Jon Larsen, Josh Stewart, Julie Bjornstad, Matt Gray, Steve Wooldridge, and Suzanne Stensaas.

TAB Members electronically present for this meeting were Daniel Mendoza, John Close, and Justice Morath.

TAB Members absent for this meeting was Craig Buschmann.

BAC Members present for this meeting was Matthew Morriss.

BAC Members electronically present for this meeting were Alla Chernenko, Ashley Lodmell, Ben Trueman, Greta Sommerfeld, Joshua Poppel, Martin Cuma, Patrick Casey, and Sarah Johnson.

BAC Members absent for this meeting were Laura Lewis, Max McLeod, Rachel Manko, and Raymond Reynolds.

Also electronically present for this meeting were Heather McLaughlin-Kolb, Amy Lyons, Dave Iltis, Becka Roof, and Julianne Sabula.

The meeting was held electronically and was called to order at 4:37 p.m. by Greg Sanchez and all members introduced themselves.

**Public Comment** – Dave Iltis with Cycling Utah wanted to bring a few things to the joint Committees' attention. One is that over the last couple of years, the Streets Division still has unfinished bike lanes. They paint part of them and then don't finish the rest of them. He thinks it's a problem with Streets coordination and lack of attention to the bike lanes, he gave several examples of where this has happened. The second thing he wanted to bring up is 100 South. He's brought this to the Committee before, SLC absolutely failed to follow the Complete Streets Ordinance. He did say that SLC has been great in adding an outside lane marking so the lanes are now 10 feet. He said this has noticeably slowed traffic and they need to consider making this the default on other streets. It doesn't really make a bike lane, but it does slow traffic and at least gives bicyclists somewhere to ride, that's a little bit better. He has questions regarding City Creek as far as what progress SLC is making to open it to the top during holidays and weekends. He also said the barriers that are on Bonneville Blvd really squeeze bicyclists and pedestrians into a narrower section than it was before. This is because they've placed the barriers, not on the center line so they're encroaching on the walkway and bikeway, that really needs to be fixed. He's also wondering what SLC is going to do with the City Creek bike sprint in the fall so that the 20+ year event still gets to go on. He would like an update on speed limits as far as what SLC is planning to do with the

speed limits very soon. He knows they are planning to lower them, but it would be great to see the plan. Suzanne asked how the public would know that any issues addressed in the public comments would get resolved. Julianne said Dave has been really great at alerting Transportation to things which is really useful because he's eyes and ears for them. With respect to e-mails, typically someone in Transportation has been responding to these and they're going to soon be advancing the Citywide Transportation Plan which is an update to their master plan. It will be up for adoption and then the next step will be to operationalize that plan which will look at how to take all those policy principles and have those absorbed into the city processes. This will take some time, but they are looking at getting that implemented. Julianne said she does believe there is a communication loop although it's not always instantaneous. Johnnae asked if other people show up and have comments, how do they get an answer. Julianne said she thinks that's in the minutes. Suzanne asked if they could get things fixed right away if someone came to them. Craig said they are an advisory board, and don't direct Transportation to do things. Becka said they may think it's really simple but it's actually policy related and that has to do often with cars parked when the lines are being painted which comes back to a policy issue. There is no policy to have cars removed so Streets can paint lines. Johnnae said the question remains; how people get these questions answered. Jim said they have been in the minutes in the past and he would like to keep it that way, so they are also seeing the response. Steve told people about the city mobile app where they can request street painting. Greg said the meeting minutes are where the comments are answered.

### **Brief Update: City Creek Water Treatment Plant**

The Chair of both TAB and BAC had a meeting to discuss the agenda for this joint meeting. The Public Utility folks have asked to come back specifically with their public engagement people to talk more with everyone about what they're doing with City Creek during the years of construction. In discussing the agenda, it was decided that they would not have them on the agenda but instead ask them for a written update to see how they adjusted their traffic control plan in terms of access to the canyon for a variety of different hiking and biking activities. Answers were sent that didn't quite answer the questions so they're circling back with Public Utilities to see if they can get slightly better answers. If the group is then interested in having further discussion, they will be asked to be on the agenda. Becka said it wasn't clear if they were open to more input or just wanted to share what was on their website. She asked if they were interested in receiving additional feedback or if the decisions were already made and it's just a matter of getting the word out. They are still waiting on the answers on some of those things and if it seems appropriate and in consultation with the chairs, they will decide if Public Utilities are to come back and give further presentation or of, they will just distribute the information electronically. Transportation is continuing to work with them to get information appropriate to share with the TAB and BAC. Dave said at the last TAB meeting, they agreed to meet with Public Utilities and someone from the Mayor's office and there is a meeting scheduled for this month. Martin's goal for this meeting isn't to push them to open the canyon more but do a post-mortem of what has happened during this project and how to avoid this in the future. Let them know there was a problem, and they need to work on a process to fix it in the future, not to push for more concessions. Martin is happy to take some of Dave Iltis' questions and if the atmosphere is good to ask those questions, he will do so. Matthew said there is still a lot of interest in this closure from people he's talked to out in the public.

## **Capital Improvement Program – FY25 Funding Requests**

Becka thanked the members who already gave input through the survey she circulated with the agenda. The survey included two different categories, one was the internal funding requests that Transportation is asking for and the other was for Constituent CIP applications. She explained how projects go through the process of approval including getting letters of support from community groups. The constituent board ranks all city CIP applications, then the Mayor does rankings, then the City Council typically makes decisions on the applications the following August. In addition to what she sent the group, she is adding the Green Loop CIP which she would also like them to rank with the ones already sent. She said Transportation helps the constituents with their CIP applications as far as figuring out how they fit within city policies and plans as well as helping them establish a budget. When Becka closed the survey, there were only 7 responses, most of which were from TAB, and she put together a chart to show how those applications were ranked by those who responded. She showed those rankings to see if TAB or BAC would like to go with that or change the rankings before possibly providing a letter of support. Julie said there may need to be a better understanding and background of the constituent projects for people to rank them. Becka went over the survey results, how much in funds are available, and how much is being asked for by Transportation. The group went over details of specific projects and were then asked if they would like to keep the prioritization as it is or have a discussion on re-ranking the projects. They discussed the projects with potential matching funds from the State and how to best prioritize between the Transportation applications and the Constituent applications. Greg said they sent a combined letter last year which said they generally supported the projects with some specific priorities and BAC added support for the Complete Streets projects. Johnnae would like to discuss what they prioritize and for her it would be transit and neighborhood byways. A support letter was discussed again, and they would like to say they support all of these, and any ranking should be based on safety of pedestrians and cyclists, in that order like their letter last year. Greg said he would like to see 3 surveys with Transportation, Constituent, and both combined with ranking. After reviewing and discussing the different projects, they would like to rank these again through a survey and then write a letter of support. Greg said they will continue this discussion with the intent of finalizing their ranking and getting a letter written next month.

## **Project Initiation Process and Complete Streets Checklist**

Due to time constraints, this topic will be on a future agenda.

**Motion:** Johnnae Nardone motioned to adjourn the meeting; Suzanne Stensaas seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 6:12 p.m.

## **Meeting Chat**

**from Roolf, Becka to everyone: 4:32 PM**

**Hi Everyone. We have a request for a slightly new meeting protocol. If you are on the committee, you are requested to please keep your camera on. If you are not on the committee, please keep your camera off unless you are speaking or presenting.**

**from Sabula, Julianne to everyone: 4:44 PM**  
**Happy to jump in with a few thoughts if that would be helpful.**

**from Dave Iltis to everyone: 4:47 PM**  
**Yes, communication is getting better!**

**from Dave Iltis to everyone: 4:49 PM**  
**Yes, but the TAB can ask for response from the city.**

**from Dave Iltis to everyone: 4:50 PM**  
**The policy is not working since the bike lanes are often left undone for a year or two or three.**

**from Dave Iltis to everyone: 4:52 PM**  
**Unfortunately with the SLC Mobile app, responses are often not given, requests are closed, or it's buggy.**

**from Martin Cuma to everyone: 5:06 PM**  
**Ah, sorry, I missed the fact that we need to do a survey, though, it would be useful to know what are the constraints in the budget**

**from Dave Iltis to everyone: 5:06 PM**  
**How do members of the public see the list ahead of meetings like this?**

**from Dave Iltis to everyone: 5:07 PM**  
**And participate or give feedback?**

**from Dave Iltis to everyone: 5:16 PM**  
**What is the total budget?**

**from Martin Cuma to everyone: 5:24 PM**  
**Aren't the traffic signals "orphan assets".**

**from Dave Iltis to everyone: 5:26 PM**  
**Anyone, what is the total budget for the Transportation related CIP requests?**

**from Martin Cuma to everyone: 5:27 PM**  
**Dave, Becka said it depends but mentioned \$6.5M.**

**from Martin Cuma to everyone: 5:27 PM**  
**For transportation....**

**from Sabula, Julianne to everyone: 5:27 PM**  
**No, Martin. Orphan assets tend to be 'new-fangled' elements, such as bike lanes, esp protected bike lanes and other things that have become more common over the past few decades across the US.**

**from Dave Iltis to everyone: 5:31 PM**

**Correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe that the TAB and BAC are asked (by code) to \*each\* provide input rather than combined.**

**from Martin Cuma to everyone: 5:36 PM**

**Can we open the Google survey again to allow those who did not do it to participate?**

**from Alla Chernenko to everyone: 5:37 PM**

**This conversation was very helpful, I would be more likely to participate in another round of survey now that I have additional context**

**from Dave Iltis to everyone: 5:42 PM**

**I checked and the BAC provides input to TAB \*\*\*AND\*\*\* to the Transportation Division on CIP. So, separate recommendations from each entity are needed.**

**from Sabula, Julianne to everyone: 5:46 PM**

**I am seeing a theme here that prioritizes the safety of vulnerable street users.**

**from Martin Cuma to everyone: 5:50 PM**

**I would like to do the survey.**

**from greta to everyone: 5:50 PM**

**I'd love another poll! My apologies for missing the first one**

**from Martin Cuma to everyone: 5:50 PM**

**Just open the existing one again and add the new answers to the existing ones.**

**from Justice Morath to everyone: 5:50 PM**

**I took the first survey but would support a second survey know that I'm more informed about the context.**

**from Sabula, Julianne to everyone: 5:55 PM**

**Johnnae is saying is exactly what I'd suggest. What are thematic priorities?**

**from Dave Iltis to everyone: 5:57 PM**

**Interestingly, the 1973 SLC Bike Plan proposed bike lanes on 600 S. 51 years later, we might actually get those...**

**from Dave Iltis to everyone: 5:59 PM**

**And, didn't the street trees in the 700 E median all die after they were originally planted?**

**from Dave Iltis to everyone: 6:00 PM**

**They need water or they will die again.**

**from Dave Iltis to everyone: 6:01 PM**

[https://archive.sltrib.com/story.php?ref=/utah/ci\\_2424219](https://archive.sltrib.com/story.php?ref=/utah/ci_2424219)

**from Dave Iltis to everyone: 6:01 PM**  
yes

**from Daniel to everyone: 6:01 PM**  
**Are maintenance costs a separate budget item? For example, the watering costs for the trees?**

**from Sabula, Julianne to everyone: 6:02 PM**  
**Yes @Daniel**

**from Roof, Becka to everyone: 6:03 PM**  
**Yes, Maintenance costs are ongoing, and so they go into the application to be incorporated in the next general budget**

**from Sabula, Julianne to everyone: 6:11 PM**  
**I'd like to share how valuable this conversation is to our division, even if it's a bit messy. This is a level of engagement that we strive to solicit, so I hope you'll tell us what things best support your ability to provide that. Your time and thoughtful comments and questions are very much appreciated!**

Approved by Transportation Advisory Board 02-05-24.  
Approved by Bicycle Advisory Committee 02-12-24.