

Foothill Drive Corridor Study
February 26, 2008 Workshop
Meeting Summary

On February 26, 2008, the Foothill Drive Corridor Study Team held its third stakeholder workshop at the Anderson-Foothill Library in Salt Lake City from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. The meeting began with an opportunity for attendees to review maps and display boards depicting the study's four draft alternatives. Project team members roamed around the room and answered questions about the alternative.

Once all of the meeting attendees had a chance to review the alternatives, Jim Lightbody, the project manager, presented an overview of the project. He stated that the study team had incorporated public feedback from the workshops and open house into the development of draft alternatives. The alternatives provided a range of transportation options utilizing the existing right-of-way on Foothill Drive. Meeting attendees asked Mr. Lightbody questions about the alternatives and afterwards the attendees were divided into two groups for a facilitated discussion on the benefits and drawbacks of each alternative.

Below is a summary of the key themes that emerged in each group during the discussion period.

Alternative 1 — Bus Rapid Transit

Some residents felt that Alternative 1 maximized transit ridership. Other residents said they would like to see a hybrid solution from Alternative 1 that includes both a BRT lane and keeps the landscaped median. This would require a different bus configuration. Another resident said that we should remove an auto lane to keep both the landscaped median and BRT. This would also encourage people to use transit on Foothill Drive since transit will provide the fastest travel time in this scenario.

People liked BRT because it is a convenient form of transit and therefore more appealing. Some residents stated that for BRT to be successful it needs to work with the regional system and connect to transit service further south (Olympus Cove, 7200 South).

Alternative 2 — Reversible Auto Lane

There was some concern about limiting left-turns in Alternative 2. Residents stated that it would be difficult to get to their homes and neighborhoods. Others said that limiting the left turns would be doable, but it would require a change in their current travel patterns. Residents stated that having some left-turn access, perhaps at key intersections, would help. Structured U-turns or "Michigan Lefts" at intersections were also suggested to help with the problem.

Residents also stated that it may be difficult for drivers to understand and learn the reversible lane concept. Others stated that the reversible lane concept should be adjusted so that 4 lanes go in the peak direction with 2 lanes in the opposite direction. Another suggestion was to have 3 reversible lanes and add landscaping to the side of the road.

Alternative 3 — Bus/HOV Lane

Residents liked Alternative 3 because it encourages carpooling and use of BRT. One resident said the dedicated HOV/BRT lane should be used as a bike and pedestrian lane during off peak hours. They also said that Alternative 3 used landscaping nicely. There were some concerns about how the HOV/BRT lane would be enforced. Many in the group felt that the transit riders should be “rewarded” with the fastest travel time and should get priority in the HOV lane. One resident suggested adding a reversible center lane to this alternative during peak times.

Alternative 4 — Six Lanes

Residents stated that limiting left turns in Alternative 4 is not practical. Instead, they would like to see intermittent median islands with left turns. They would also like to add landscaping to the side of the road instead of landscaping the center of the road.

Traffic

Some attendees stated that traffic flow should be the top priority improvement, even if that comes at the expense of aesthetics and community amenities. Others disagreed, stating that the community should have access to the road and that bike and pedestrian issues must be addressed.

There were concerns about the speed on Foothill Drive and some suggested lowering the speed limit or timing the signals to encourage a 30 to 35 m.p.h. speed.

Corridor Beautification

Many of the residents were opposed to removing the landscaped median. There is strong community support for the landscaped median and a prominent member donated the median and landscaping. Residents also said that the median is useful during snow storms and encourages bicycles and pedestrians by making the corridor “friendlier.”

A few residents stated support for landscaping on each side of Foothill Drive to act as natural noise barriers for the residential areas near the roadway. . They also stated that people could enjoy the shade and beauty of the trees in the community.

Bicycles and Pedestrians

The majority of attendees stated that none of the alternatives adequately addressed the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians. Some residents suggested adding a bike lane through the golf course east of Foothill Drive. Another suggestion was to take the 12 foot sidewalks and turn them into a 4 foot bike lane and an 8 foot sidewalk.

One resident asked about the possibility of adding a pedestrian bridge over Foothill Drive. The group discussed that it was difficult to access Foothill Village and Lamplighter Square by walking from the surrounding neighborhoods. They also discussed the expense and difficulties of pedestrian bridges.

Residents would like to have more “walk time” at key intersections on Foothill Drive (2300 East and 1700 East). They also said that the rounded curbing poses a safety risk to pedestrians.

Transit

Overall, residents wanted to stress the importance of transit and “getting people out of cars.” They stated transit can improve the area’s quality of life and air quality. They said that by making transit a priority, they hope it will attract more ridership.

Some residents felt that businesses needed to encourage and provide employees with programs to encourage transit use. One stated that the University and Research Park should provide alternate schedules and encourage telecommuting to reduce traffic in the area. Residents stated that better eastside service was needed and that it should be coordinated with transit service in Summit County.

Meeting Attendees:

Rebecca Utz, Resident	Kerry Doane, Resident
Steve Altman, Resident	Ellen Reddick, Resident
Dave Perry, East Bench Comm. Council	John Doane, Resident
Suzy Dailey, Resident	Jan Brittain, Resident
Charlene Tims, Resident	Mary-Delle Gunn, Resident
Robin Carbaugh, Resident	Rob Kistler, University Hospital
Jerry Bergon, Resident	Lisa Wilson, UDOT
Dawn Kubota, Ballard Spahr	Alma Allred, U of U
Norm Chambers, U of U	Jory Johner, WFRC
Doug Hattery, WFRC	Sharon Briggs, UDOT
Michael Manowkian, UTA	Ray McCandless, Salt Lake City Planning
Kevin Young, Salt Lake City	James Lightbody, DMJM Harris
Kris McBride, WF&Co.	Jay Nelson, DMJM Harris
Bethany Matsumori, WF&Co.	Brian Wilkinson, WF&Co