Foothill Drive Corridor Study
September 13, 2007 Workshop
Meeting Summary

On September 13, 2007, the Foothill Drive Corridor Study Team held its second stakeholder workshop at the Sprague Library in Sugar House from 6 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. The meeting began with a summary of the first workshop by Jim Lightbody, project manager. He stated that the study team had incorporated and addressed comments from the first workshop into their work on the land use and transportation studies to this point. The objective of the second workshop would be to give the workshop group the opportunity to comment on the current findings, progress and direction of the study. Larry Gibson, land use lead, presented possible land development scenarios and Jay Nelson, traffic lead, presented his study of the transportation needs. Jim Lightbody finished the presentation by discussing visions and options for addressing the transportation needs in the corridor.

The group divided into three groups to discuss the three topics for the evening: vision for the corridor, changing the corridor to accommodate transportation needs, and specific strategies to achieve the vision for the corridor.

Below is a summary of the key themes that emerged in each group during the discussion period. Following the summary are the direct notes from each facilitation group.

Current Status – Future Vision
Although participants had many suggestions for the corridor, most agreed that the current problems aren't "too bad" and that there is still time before the problem becomes critical. In discussing the future vision, the group was receptive to looking at a wide variety of solutions and planning properly for the future. One group defined Foothill Drive as a "traffic corridor" with the purpose of moving people efficiently and as quickly as possible through the area and to their destination. Many attendees stated that transit would be vital to managing the traffic on the corridor. Second to improved transit, the participants hoped for a more beautiful corridor with landscaping, walls and a continuous look from beginning to end.

Transit
Overall, the meeting attendees were supportive of transit in the corridor and stated that improvements to the current transit system should be a high priority to the study. They stated that transit had to be competitive with driving in getting people to their destinations in a timely manner with minimal hassle. They also said that transit in the corridor should be viewed as part of a regional transit system, with park and rides available as far south as Sandy to bring people to the University. They felt that the system should be University-focused, with minimal stops within the corridor, to ensure that travel times are competitive with driving.

Specific transit strategies were brought up, including Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), TRAX and a dedicated bus lane. There was greater support for BRT as long as it is planned at a

regional level to bring commuters from south Salt Lake County and Park City into the city and to the University. Some attendees had questions and concerns regarding the possibility of TRAX operating within the current right-of-way in the corridor. Some were supportive of a dedicated bus lane to improve transit in the corridor and the convenience to individual users. Others where concerned about the safety issues of the dedicated bus lane, saying that it could be dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians.

Corridor Beautification
Many of the groups talked about the importance of landscaping and aesthetic treatments in the corridor. Improvements to sidewalks would also improve the appearance of the corridor as well as safety for bicycles and pedestrians. Several people mentioned the landscaped median at Sunnyside and Foothill Drive and would like to see those treatments, or something similar, continue throughout the corridor.

Incentives and Disincentives
Some attendees stated that individual car trips within the corridor could be eliminated if the University and large employers provide incentives for staff to use transit and carpools. They felt that if parking costs were increased and the convenience of driving was decreased, more people would begin carpooling or using transit. The University has initiated a strong transit program for students, faculty and staff and will be evaluating the program's effectiveness.

Reversible Lanes
Workshop participants were supportive of further studying the concept of reversible lanes for the Foothill Drive Corridor. Some stated that reversible lanes would be a good use of the current right-of-way and were supportive because it would not require widening the road. The attendees perceived reversible lanes as being effective because of the larger northbound traffic demand in the morning and a larger southbound traffic demand in the evening. A few of the meeting attendees stated that reversible lanes plus improved transit would address current and future traffic volumes.

Bicycles and Pedestrians
Each group talked about the need to improve the sidewalks on Foothill Drive to be more "friendly" and safe for pedestrians. Some felt that improved aesthetics through the area would also encourage bikes and pedestrians to use the corridor more. The idea of a bike lane was also discussed. A few participants differentiated the two types of cyclists: recreationists and commuters. They advised the committee to look carefully at the different needs of each type of cyclist.

Meeting Attendees:

Ryan Taylor, UTA	John Bezzant, AIMCO
Danielle Herrscher, UTA	Jon Nepsted, Fehr & Peers
Ellen Reddick, Resident	Tim Boschert, UDOT
Antonio Lima, Summit Group	Dan Fazzini Jr. , Bicyclist
Rob Kistler, University Hospital	Jan Brittain, Resident

Norman Chambers, U of U	Matthew Leonard, Resident
Alma Allred, U of U	Ana Valdermoros, SLC Planning
Kerry Doane, Resident	Jim Bach, Red Butte Garden
Cristina Coronado, Ballard Spahr	Steve Alder, Resident
Kevin Young, Salt Lake City	Bethany Matsumori, WF&Co.
Troy Herold, CLC Associates	Lindsey Ferrari, WF&Co.
Joe Perrin, Salt Lake City	Angela Linford, WF&Co.
John Doane, Resident	James Lightbody, DMJM Harris
Larry Gibson, DMJM Harris	Doug Hattery, WFRC
Jay Nelson, DMJM Harris	

The following are the direct comments written during the three group discussions:

Group 1: Future Vision

- Address travel I-80 to North
  - Specific streets for high travel
  - "Traffic Corridor"
- Foothill meant to carry traffic
  - Educate community
  - Not every street main thoroughfare
- 30 years: Mass Transit & Trax
  - Speed up mass transit
  - Incentivize mass transit – increase parking costs
- Widening not an option
  - Funding for mass transit
  - Get people out of cars -- parking
- Bike, Pedestrians, Environment
  - SLC Air quality
  - Bike lane on Wasatch
  - 2 types of cyclists – commuters and recreationalists
- Adding Mass Transit on Foothill
  - Negative impact on car traffic
  - Need intercept – shared lane BRT
  - Incentive/Disincentive
  - Don't take away road capacity
- Widening capability?
  - Combine with bus transit → move more people
  - Con: Bike and pedestrian
- Bus advantage + Reversible lanes
- Transit—Local vs. Regional
  - Not going to affect the locals
  - Regional system – cover larger distances
- Clean
- Restrict growth to need of roads
  - Development that overwhelms Foothill

    - University growth from students slow increase
- More Friendly – trees and bikes
    - Cap or ease current traffic levels
- Commercial
    - Neighborhood restaurants
    - Current commercial has high turn over
- Boulevard
    - Safe – crossing safely near commercial areas
    - Reduce amount of traffic
        - Incentivize mass transit
        - Priority transit lanes – increase convenience
    - Manage regional traffic
    - Provide access to transit regionally
    - Reversible lane
    - Sidewalk – continuous, aesthetic improvements
    - Bike lane – remove street parking on Foothill Drive
    - No parking on Foothill
    - Beautifying wall (Bryan Ave & 1700 South)
    - Consistent, continuous look
    - Lighting and ambience
    - Right of way varies along corridor from home to home
        - Realign; use to improve look
        - Make it look like Sunnyside through 1300 South
    - Reversible, transit, beautiful, traffic management
    - Do the lanes need to be at their current width?
- Smog free
- Pedestrian friendly
- Multi-modal – all transportation needs
- Transit – full to capacity
- Parkway
    - Trees
    - Center islands
    - Bus
    - Unified look
- Foothill runs through several communities
    - Continuous look
    - Clean up intersection; Improve safety
    - Unified look of the corridor should be second to improving transit issues
- Don't tear out homes → too expensive and damaging to the community morale
- Flexible transportation system that can be scaled to growth and need
- Regional transit strategy
- Light rail and trolley benefit – once built always there despite funding impacts, changes, etc.
- BRT must start further south
    - Intercept facility
        - 7200 South and few stops in between

- Parking to support transit
    - 1300 South
    - Underground garage (lessens visual impact to surrounding neighbors)
- Park and ride lots full, discourages transit use
- Improve Sunnyside intersection
- Reversible Lane
- Keep traffic flowing
    - Convert center lane and 1 through lane into a reversible lane
- Clean up sidewalk – move towards curb; bury telephone
- Bike and pedestrians on Foothill → Destination
    - Extra width to shoulder – unstripe shoulder
- Bike lane vs. Bus only lane
    - Safety issues for bikes around bus only lanes
- Find out what is safer: Striped or Unstriped?
    - Car doors danger to bikers
    - Dangerous bike lanes won't be used
    - Conflicts with motorists

Group 2: Changing the Corridor

- If lanes are removed, what will replace the lanes to manage traffic volumes
- Motivate carpool utilization to reduce travel
- Better understand use of lanes for all modes
- Re-use of median(s) for travel lanes
- Make improvements to edge of roadway (bikes, sidewalks)
- Widen within existing right of way – widening will require relocations
- "Choke Point" at Sunnyside – First priority project
    - (ROW restriction)
    - Why so much volume on Sunnyside?
    - Check signal timing (EB Sunnyside)
    - Peak period
    - What is source of travel from "U"/RPark/Med Center
- Reversible lanes a good improvement to consider
- Pedestrian crossings around Foothill/Sunnyside and north a problem.
- Major parking intercept in corridor – 5,000-10,000 cars – Park somewhere else and take transit to the University
- Participants were asked to rank the importance of transportation improvements to the area, 1 meaning not a top priority and 10 being urgent.
    - 3 responded that it was a '5', largely impart to how congestion impacts air quality
    - 1 person ranked it as a '6'
    - 1 person ranked its importance as an 8
- Decrease travel time through corridor
- Is it a "neighborhood road"
    - 1 person responded: No: Only a N/S arterial in East
    - 1 person responded: No: High speed extension of I-15 to University

    - 1 person responded: No: Need high speed corridor in area – additional lanes
    - Conflict of narrowing and resultant impact to traffic in residential areas
    - 1 person responded: Yes: slow traffic for peds/bikes
- Speed-up mass transit to make an attractive alternative to driving
    - "Better routes" to get places competitively time wise with driving
    - University-focused system
    - Park n' Ride further south to collect regional trips
- Short term impacts
    - Alternate route to campus
    - Reversible lane – awaiting transit or more lanes (long term)
    - Restrict left turns at key locations during peak times (impact to local streets)
    - 2 lane traffic on Sunnyside (impact to local streets)
    - Landscaped (Treed) median (full length)
    - Grade separate Sunnyside
- Participants were asked to rank the importance of transportation improvements to the area, 1 meaning not a top priority and 10 being urgent.
    - 1 person ranked it as a 9 or 10 because of the Kmart/Walmart issue
    - 2 people ranked it as a 5
    - 1 person ranked it as a 10, saying "move people, not cars"
- East leg at 2300 South – "T" intersection
- "Look/Feel"
    - Small shops (too seedy), walkable, landscaping, "character" stores = slower traffic
    - Move traffic through – look nice and move through
    - Make transit more convenient
    - Complicated intersections – impact to through movement
    - Right turn in a.m. peak at Sunnyside a problem
    - University responsibility (i.e. more beds, more students = traffic on Foothill)
        - More careful
        - Dialogue not there
        - Community impact strategy (enforcement)
    - Compromise
        - Shopping+ Capacity
        - Maintain Right of Way
        - Overall continuity
- Dedicated Transit Lane (NB in a.m./ SB in p.m.) to University
- Priority to "fix" (improve Foothill traffic flow)
- Participants were asked to rank the importance of transportation improvements to the area, 1 meaning not a top priority and 10 being urgent.
    - 1 person ranked it as a 7-10
    - 1 person ranked it as a 2 and said that other alternatives were needed (transit won't solve the problem)
    - 1 person ranked it as a 10, saying "make transit work"

    - 1 person ranked it as a 9, repeating the comment of "make transit work"
    - 1 people ranked the issue as a 5
        - Note: group stated that improving traffic flow on Foothill is not "a single fix"
- Manage traffic by time of day and function
- "Not an 'industrial street' in a residential area"
- Monorail

Group 3: Specific Strategies

Transit Concepts: Pros:

- Cleaner
- Mass movement
- Safer and quieter streets
- Avoid driving in storms or peak hours
- Use commute time, TRAX

Transit Concepts: Cons:

- Logistically inconvenient
- Slower
- Transfer delay
- Lack of connections

Comments re: Current Transit in the Corridor

- Current transit serves the current need
- Dedicated reversible transit lane (bus)
- Move some development to other parts of the valley
- Grade separated transit (i.e. monorail)
- Bike lanes on 2300 East serve demand – thus no need for bike lane on Foothill Dr.
- Concrete is noisier
- No localized bus

Specific strategies

Likes/Dislikes

- Transit potential for reducing vehicle trips
- Dislike TRAX – there is no connection south of I-80
- Street Car
    - Lose biking
    - Would like only if in separate lane – (general group dislike)
    - Not as flexible as bus
- BRT
    - Need 3 stops to be effective
- Express Bus
    - Must have separated lane
- Continuous Flow Intersection (CFI)

- Bike/Pedestrian
    - Limited visibility due to fences
    - Would not take a traffic lane for a bike lane
    - Safety improvements for pedestrians needed
    - Suggest improve bike routes elsewhere i.e. Wasatch Dr.
    - More direct route on the north end
    - If bike lane is available on Foothill more bikes would use it
    - Does not think a bike lane is a priority
    - Maintain and beautify existing sidewalk no need for wider sidewalk
    - Enhance sidewalk with development
- Transit
    - Combine transit with reversible lanes
    - Provide shuttles for university events
- Trax
    - Taking away traffic capacity
    - Not enough ridership
    - Bus preferred over TRAX, must move faster than traffic
- No benefit to adding lanes
- Like reversible lanes more than HOT lane
- Add medians