 Appendix B  Community Outreach

Public outreach is a key element in any master planning effort. The purpose of the Salt Lake City Transit Master Plan public outreach was to engage a broad and diverse section of the population in order to discuss and solicit ideas related to the development of the plan. To this effect, public outreach was conducted in all seven Council Districts of Salt Lake City and online. To ensure that a significant segment of the population had the opportunity to provide feedback, multiple opportunities for public involvement were offered, including: stakeholder interviews, mobile event outreach, public open houses, and on-line engagement.

This section includes an overview and summary of key findings from the following outreach events:

- Salt Lake City Transit Master Plan Meet-and-Greet
- Stakeholder Interview
- Mobile Outreach Events
- September 2015 Open House
- Website Surveys
- Design Your Transit System Survey

KEY THEMES

Much of the feedback received during all the public outreach activities for the Salt Lake City Transit Master Plan coalesced around a number of key themes. For example, many of the open-ended suggestions and comments received during the public outreach process focused on providing a complete and convenient transit system that allows for a car-free lifestyle, which was the top priority goal selected by Open House participants. In addition, many respondents expressed that public transit works relatively well for commuting to a few major employment centers, but that it is not a viable option for commuting at off-peak hours or for travel to areas outside the central business district. Other common themes included:

- Provide TRAX service later in the evening (past-midnight)
- Run neighborhood busses later in the evening
- Improve transit stops
- Develop frequent routes to areas other than downtown and the University of Utah
- Develop a citywide network
- Improve connections between routes and neighborhoods
- Service non-sporting cultural events (plays, symphony, opera)
- Service the west side and East Bench areas
- Improve the maps and transit route information provided online and in print
- Improve real-time information to better allow riders to know when the next bus is coming
- Make prepaid fares more visible and accessible
- Improve bicycle and pedestrian access to transit to increase usability of transit (bike share, bike paths, crosswalks)
- Make sure that operators/transit personal are informed and courteous
OVERVIEW OF OUTREACH EFFORTS AND INPUT

Salt Lake City Transit Master Plan Meet-and-Greet

The project commenced with a “Meet-and-Greet,” held on January 27, 2015 at the City Creek Harmons grocery store. This event gave the project team the opportunity to meet and have casual conversations about the intent of the Plan with members of the public early in the process. Key stakeholder groups that were invited to the Meet-and-Greet were: Salt Lake City Community Councils, Salt Lake City Council, Salt Lake City Transportation Advisory Board, Salt Lake City Planning Commission, Utah Transit Authority (UTA) Board of Trustees, Salt Lake County, Wasatch Front Regional Council, UDOT, Breathe Utah, Heal Utah, Salt Lake City School District, Envision Utah, Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce, Downtown Alliance, Crossroads Urban Center, University of Utah, Westminster College, Sugar House Chamber, and Salt Lake County Agency on Aging Adults.

Stakeholder Interviews

The project team met with several key stakeholder groups in the community during spring of 2015 to understand the needs of their organizations and constituencies. Interviews focused specifically on their goals for the Transit Master Plan, pros and cons of the current UTA network, level of understanding of the services provided, and any other issues such as accessibility, affordability, etc.

Interviews were conducted with the following groups:

- UTA – the project team was also in regular communication with UTA throughout the process
- Wasatch Front Regional Council – 1/27/15
- Utah Transit Riders Union – 1/28/15
- University of Utah – 1/28/15 and 4/7/15
- Salt Lake City Council – 4/7/15
- Salt Lake City Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) – 4/7/15
- Breathe Utah – 4/7/15
- Salt Lake City’s UTA Trustees – 4/7/15
- South Salt Lake City – 4/7/15
- UDOT – 4/8/15
- Salt Lake City Chamber of Commerce – 4/8/15
- Salt Lake City Downtown Alliance – 4/8/15
- Salt Lake City Planning Commission – 4/8/15
- Salt Lake County Aging and Adult Services – 6/18/15
- Crossroads Urban Center – 6/18/15
- Salt Lake City School District – 6/19/15

In addition to the stakeholder interviews, there were a number of presentations and question and answer sessions for interested parties. Participants at these presentations included: Community Councils, the Business Advisory Board, Friends of the S Line, the Bicycle Advisory Board, the Transportation Advisory Board, FTA Region 8, and the Sugar House Chamber of Commerce.

Common themes from the interviews are summarized here.
• **Goals/Vision**
  - Competitiveness with auto: To attract riders, public transit must be competitive with private automobile (in time and convenience). In addition to quality of transit service provided, the ease and low cost of driving impacts decision-making (cost and availability of parking, peak rush hour is only ~20 minutes)
  - Support current and future growth areas
  - Desire to be regional destination for culture/commerce
  - Need to meet local needs, not just commuter needs, e.g. intra-neighborhood and neighborhood to neighborhood travel

• **Service gaps**
  - Better east-west service connectivity and more user-friendly west side service
  - Access to and between neighborhood business nodes/commercial districts
  - Employment centers
    - Better connections between service sector jobs and trunk routes
    - Better connections to final destination in downtown
    - Better service to Research park/University, which is a major employment hub

• **Other transit improvements stakeholders would like to see**
  - Improved reliability/speed
  - Increased frequency
  - Improved bus stops (most stops have only a sign, no bench, no shelter)
  - Better, safer access to stops
  - Ease of use – simplicity of system and “legibility”/ease of understanding; especially utilize technology to improve access to information and system
  - Affordability of fares
  - Span of service, esp. late night service

• **Build transit “culture”**
  - Individualized travel education program
  - Raise awareness/marketing – get opinion leaders riding transit and embracing it vocally/publically
  - Promote, promote, promote
  - Utilize pass programs and improved service to build transit culture
  - Overcome UTA public perception problem

• **Coordination between modes**
  - Coordinate the Transit Master Plan with other transportation modal plans: Bike/Ped Master Plan, signal plan, parking plan, etc.
  - Integration with bike share is particularly important (esp. last mile connections)
  - Parking: Plentiful inexpensive parking undermines transit competitiveness
  - Focus on complete streets
  - TNCs, Car-to-go, other innovative modes
Mobile Outreach Events

To develop a presence in the community and engage members of the public that do not traditionally attend open houses, the team launched a mobile outreach effort during the summer of 2015. This effort took advantage of existing city-wide and neighborhood events. A number of these events included the use of a “trolley” that was modified to allow members of the public to board, interact with members of the project team, and engage in the outreach activities.

At all events, the project team used presentation boards to convey key findings about the existing transit system and its users from the State of the System Fact Book. Attendees were invited to provide feedback via comment boards and a map where they could indicate key service needs. Over 400 individual comments were collected during the Mobile Outreach events. The mapping exercise allowed event attendees the opportunity to geographically highlight routes that need improvement in one of the following areas: improved service, longer service, or new service.

The team attended a total of 17 mobile outreach events, shown in the map on the following page:

- Living Traditions – 5/15/15
- Rose Park Fest – 5/16/15
- World Refugee Fest – 6/6/15
- Parley’s Way Corridor Study – 6/17/15
- 9th West Farmers Market – 6/21/15
- Food Truck Thursday – 6/25/15
- Partners in the Park – 7/7/15
• Granary Row – 7/31/15
• Groove in the Grove – 8/4/15
• DIY Fest – 8/8/15
• 9th West Farmers Market – 8/16/15
• Sugarmont Farmers Market – 8/21/15
• Downtown Farmers Market – 8/22/15
• University of Utah Plazafest – 8/26/15
• Avenues Street Fair – 9/12/15
• Foothill Village Outreach – 9/17/15
• 9th & 9th Street Fair – 9/19/15

Mobile outreach at Groove in the Grove, summer 2015.
Source: Fehr & Peers
Transit Master Plan Mobile Outreach Map
Summer 2015

MAY EVENTS
May 15 - Living Traditions
May 16 - Rose Park Community Festival

JUNE EVENTS
June 6 - World Refugee Day
June 17 - Parley's Way Corridor Study
June 21 - 9th West Farmer's Market
June 22 - Food Truck Monday @ Sugarmont
June 25 - Food Truck Thursday @ Gallivan

JULY EVENTS
July 7 - Partners in the Park
July 31 - Granary Row

AUGUST EVENTS
August 4 - Groove in the Grove
August 8 - Craft Lake City
August 16 - 9th West Farmer's Market
August 21 - Sugar House Farmer's Market
August 22 - Downtown Farmer's Market
August 26 - U of U Plaza Fest

SEPTEMBER EVENTS
September 12 - Avenues Street Fair
September 17 - Foothill Village Outreach
September 19 - 9th & 9th Street Festival

End of season open house!
CITY CREEK HARMONS GROCERY
September 23, 2015
5:00pm - 7:00pm
135 East 100 South
Comment Boards

At the Mobile Outreach events, participants wrote their comments on sticky notes and placed them on the comment board. These comments were then classified into one of the following typologies: Frequency, Span of Service, Connectivity, Speed and Reliability, Stop access, Stop Amenities, Fares, System Legibility, Transit Culture, Other Transit Related Comments, and Not Relevant. The following list and graph (Figure B-1) shows the portion of total comments that fell into each typology and a sample representative comment that was received at a Mobile Outreach event attributed to this typology.

- Connectivity (18%)
  “Better East-West connections!!”
- Fares (13%)
  “Sell Farepay cards at more places and be in every neighborhood”
- Other Transit Related Comments (13%)
  “No tracks on 1100 East. Run electric bus instead”
- Frequency (12%)
  “More frequent and longer services. Services not only geared toward 9-5 crowd”
- Span of Service (9%)
  “Run TRAX 1 hr. later on weekends”
- Speed and Reliability (8%)
  “Faster/more direct service between Salt Lake and Airport”
- Transit Culture (6%)
  “Provide drivers with adequate pay to be genial to riders”
- Stop Amenities (6%)
  “More benches and station amenities like covered stops and garbage cans”
- Stop access (5%)
  “I love the paved path by the Sugar House Trolley!”
- System Legibility (5%)
  “Not being accurate on the GPS is a problem”
- Not Relevant (5%)
  “The newer 300 South bike lanes are dangerous due to inattentive drivers attempting to enter/leave driveways”
Mapping Exercise

At the Mobile Outreach events and September Open House, attendees were invited to identify areas on a map that they believed needed transit improvements. Options for transit service improvements included improved service, longer service, or new service. The most frequent location for improved service quality was District 1, with travel to District 4 most sought after. District 4, with travel to District 6, was the location most frequently identified in need of longer hours of service. Travel from District 1 to Districts 4 and 6 were the most frequently identified areas for new transit routes.
The culmination of the Salt Lake City Transit Master Plan’s summer outreach efforts was an Open House held at the City Creek Harmons grocery store on September 23, 2015. The team presented the educational boards from the mobile outreach effort as well as boards that showed key gaps where land use density or demographics indicate a propensity to ride transit, but where there is little transit use. The Open House also had an opportunity for participants to provide input on three “conversation boards.” One allowed them to prioritize goals for the Transit Master Plan, one asked for input on service design principles, and one invited conversation on maps & information, fares, and access & station improvements.

Key participations statistics were:

- Open house attendees – 60
- Board exercise participants – 40
- Comments – 64

Goals Board

At the Open House participants were invited to identify which of the Salt Lake City Transit Master Plan goals most resonated with their vision for an ideal transit network. Over 50% of respondents identified “Provide a complete and convenient transit system that supports a car-free lifestyle” as their top goal (Figure B-3).
At the Open House, participants were invited to identify which of the Salt Lake City Transit Master Plan’s service design principles was the most important to the success of the project. Almost 50% of respondents identified “Connected: provide simple citywide connections on a high-frequency network” as the most important service design principle (Figure B-4).

**Service Design Principle Board**

- **Provide complete, convenient system; support car-free lifestyle**: 52%
- **Improve air quality**: 9%
- **Increase the number of people riding transit**: 11%
- **Create economically vibrant, livable places**: 11%
- **Provide access to opportunity for vulnerable populations**: 9%
- **Provide safe, comfortable transit access & waiting experience**: 4%

**Connected**

- **Provide complete, convenient system; support car-free lifestyle**: 47%
- **Convenient**: 27%
- **Permanent**: 8%
- **Legible**: 8%
- **Easy to Use**: 5%
- **Demand Driven**: 5%
Website Surveys

The project team also developed a project website: SLCRides.org. This website ensured that Salt Lake City residents who were unable to attend one of the in-person public outreach events could learn about the Salt Lake City Transit Master Plan. SLCRides.org included detailed information about the project, outreach events planned and completed, project reports and documentation, and any survey tools open to the public.

The project team created a short online survey during the summer (open July 30 to October 1, 2015) through Open City Hall that was linked from the project website. UTA also developed a survey that was open to the public during summer 2015 (closed October 1, 2015) that was accessible from the UTA website.

Key participation statistics were:

- Open City Hall – 535 responses
- Open UTA – 461 total respondents with 74 respondents of these residing in Salt Lake City
- Direct Comments on SLCRides – In addition to the available online surveys, 7 participants wrote direct emails through the SLCRides website

Open City Hall Survey

The Salt Lake City Transit Master Plan website (SLCRides.org) allowed residents to take an Open City Hall survey. This survey asked respondents to identify their top choices regarding key outcomes from the Plan, desired improvements, and “big ideas” they have related to transit.

Each of the questions and breakdown of responses are shown in the following graphics. The most salient findings are:

- Air quality (49%) and transit system convenience and reliability (41%) are the most important outcomes (Figure B-5) of the plan for the large majority of respondents (90% combined)
- Pedestrian and bicycle access to stops (28%) was the highest ranking improvement (Figure B-6)
- A citywide network is the most important big idea (Figure B-7) for a majority of respondents (51%)
Figure B-5  Outcomes

- Air Quality: 49%
- Convenience and Reliability: 41%
- Better Design: 4%
- Equitable Access: 3%
- Land Use: 2%
- Improved Economy: 1%

Figure B-6  Improvements

- Pedestrian and bicycle access to stops: 28%
- More neighborhood service: 19%
- Frequent transit service: 12%
- Shorter travel time: 17%
- Later weekday service: 8%
- More weekend service: 3%
- Better maps and information: 2%
- Stop amenities: 1%
Open UTA Survey

UTA’s survey asked responders to identify their top choices regarding service improvements, bus improvements, light rail (TRAX) improvements, and FrontRunner improvements. The following graphs represent responses from Salt Lake City residents. The most salient findings are:

- Bus is the most important mode for improvement (45%), followed by TRAX and Streetcar (35%) – (Figure B-8)
- Improving service span is the most important bus improvement (50%), followed by service later at night (31%) – (Figure B-9)
- Late night service is the most important TRAX improvement (47%), followed by direct service between the Airport to the University (19%) – (Figure B-10)
- Sunday service is the overwhelming top priority for FrontRunner enhancement (59%) – (Figure B-11)
Figure B-8  Service Improvements

- 45% Bus service
- 35% TRAX & streetcar service
- 16% FrontRunner service
- 3% Active transportation
- 3% Rail station and bus stop improvements
- 1% Vanpool, carpool and other Rideshare services

Figure B-9  Bus Improvements

- 50% Bus service running more often
- 31% Bus service running later at night
- 11% Bus service to more places
- 7% More weekend bus service
- 1% Bus service running earlier in the morning
Figure B-10  Light Rail (TRAX) Improvements

- Additional late night service until after midnight (47%)
- Provide direct TRAX service between airport and U of U (11%)
- Additional streetcar lines (15%)
- 15-minute Saturday service (19%)
- Additional Sunday service earlier and later in the day (8%)

Figure B-11  FrontRunner Improvements

- Sunday FrontRunner service (59%)
- Reduced travel time (12%)
- Increased frequency during middle of weekdays (4%)
- More frequent Saturday service (22%)
- Improved wi-fi (3%)
Design Your Transit System Survey

The Design Your Own Transit System survey tool was launched by the Salt Lake City in February 2016. The survey tool was comprised of three tasks:

- Task 1 allowed users to create their own transit system by allocating hypothetical money to different system needs. Spending was calculated based on how much area the participants system covers (system coverage), how often service runs (service frequency), and the days of the week it operates. If participants ran over budget, they were forced to go back and revise their selections.
- Task 2 allowed participants to determine their long term investment strategy by selecting the mode or modes they wanted to build.
- Task 3 allowed participants to select additional improvements to accompany the transit service they created.
- After completion of the Design Your Own Transit System tool, participants were asked to take a short demographic survey (1,269 of 1,412 participants completed the demographic survey).

Summary of Key Findings

Survey Participants

- 1,412 people participated in the Design Your Transit System survey tool, of which 65% live in Salt Lake City.
- The survey reached a wide audience. Seniors (over 65), low income populations (less than $35,000 per year), and residents of western Salt Lake City were somewhat under-represented as compared to their share of the general population.

Transit Use

- 40% of respondents ride transit multiple times per week and 60% ride at least once a month.
- The top reason cited for riding transit was environmental reasons (25% of respondents).
- The top reasons for not riding transit more often were related to convenience, with more than 50% of respondents indicating transit takes too long or doesn’t go where they need it to go.

Service Coverage

- The highest priority destinations to serve were Utah’s top job centers (52%) and mixed use and major growth areas (49%). These two destinations were priorities for all groups regardless of frequency of transit use, age, or income.
- Service to LIMITED neighborhoods was a particular priority for adults 65 or older (2nd most common response) and low income respondents (3rd most common response).

Service Periods

- Respondents most desired new service in the evening (70%), followed by Saturday service (58%) and finally Sunday service (39%). The order of new service priorities were identical, regardless of frequency of transit use, age, or income.

Capital Improvements

- The top investment priority was to increase investments in a rail based system (46%). This was the top priority regardless of frequency of use, age, or income.
- Adults over 45-64, 65 and older, and low income respondents were somewhat more likely than other groups to indicate a preference for a bus based system or incremental improvements to the current system.
Other Improvements (to support coverage, service period, and capital investment selections)

- Increased investment in access to transit on foot or by bike was the most preferred improvement overall (43%) and for all groups except those age 65 or older.
- Respondents age 65 and older indicated a preference for investments in benches, shelters, and amenities at transit stops.
Survey Participants

Participants Location

The Design Your Own Transit System tool reached 1,412 participants, with 1,269 completing the subsequent demographic survey, which were mapped in Figure B-12.

- More than 65% of survey participants lived within Salt Lake City (Figure B-13). For responses within Salt Lake City, Figure B-14 illustrates responses by City Council boundaries.
- More than 30% of respondents live in District 4 and 22% live in District 5.
- District 6 and western Salt Lake City had limited respondents.

Figure B-12 Location of Participants
Figure B-13  Salt Lake City Residency

Are you a resident of SLC? (N=1,239)

Proportion of Respondents

Yes  64.6%

No   35.4%

Figure B-14  City Council District

Responses by Council District (N=717)

Proportion of Respondents

Council District 7  11.2%
Council District 6  0.6%
Council District 5  22.2%
Council District 4  33.1%
Council District 3  16.9%
Council District 2  7.4%
Council District 1  8.8%
**Age and Gender**

The age of respondents was categorized to highlight groups including college students (18-24), adults (25-44), older adults (45 to 64), and seniors (65 or older). The majority of participants were between 25-64 years old as shown in Figure B-15. Respondents older than 65 were somewhat under represented, as this group makes up 10% of the city population.¹

---

**Figure B-15   Age**

Survey participants were more likely to be male, at 56% of respondents (Figure B-16).

---

**Figure B-16   Gender**

---

¹ 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S0101
Income and Vehicle Access

Approximately 18% of respondents either did not have a car available or only had one available sometimes (Figure B-17).

Figure B-17  Car Availability

Survey participants tended to have higher incomes, with nearly half (45%) earning more than $75,000 per year (Figure B-18). Low income populations were underrepresented in this survey, as 22% of participants earn less than $35,000 per year, while 40% of the population of Salt Lake City earns below that threshold.²

Figure B-18  Income

² 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table: DP03
Existing Transit Use

Nearly 90% of survey participants have used some form of public transit in Salt Lake City (Figure B-19). Approximately 40% ride public transit multiple times per week. Over a quarter ride less than once a month, while 10% do not ride transit.

Figure B-19 Frequency of Transit Use

![Bar chart showing the frequency of transit use.](image)

Reasons for Using Transit

Respondents cited both “choice” and “transit dependent” factors in their decision to use transit (Figure B-20). The largest share of respondents indicated that environmental reasons and convenience as very or somewhat important to their decision to use transit. A substantial share of riders also cited reducing stress and cost savings as important factors.

Figure B-20 Reason for Transit Use

![Bar chart showing the reasons for transit use.](image)
What Are the Main Reasons You Don’t Use Transit More Often?

Survey respondents were asked to identify reasons why they do not use transit more often. Participants identified convenience as a key barrier to transit use in Salt Lake City (Figure B-21).

- The top three responses, each chosen by approximately half of respondents, indicated transit is not a convenient option because it takes too long, doesn’t go where they need to go, or doesn’t run at the right time. Respondents identified other convenience-related factors, including finding driving and parking more efficient and needing a car for work or errands.
- Notably, fewer than 20% of respondents indicated they would not ride even if it were convenient, indicating that most would be receptive to using transit if it were more convenient.

Fewer than 10% of respondents don’t feel safe riding the bus and approximately 8% are unclear about how to use the system.

Trends for respondents living in and outside of Salt Lake City were similar (Figure B-22), though Salt Lake residents were more likely to not use transit because they walk and bike most places.

Nearly 17% of participants identified “other” reasons for not using transit more often, including transit concerns of efficiency, cost, and limited service (Figure B-23).

Figure B-21  Reason for Not Using Transit More Often – All Respondents
Figure B-22  Reason for Not Using Transit More Often - SLC Residents Only

What is the reason you don’t use transit? (N=784)

- Takes too long: 56.8%
- Can’t get where I need to go: 22.8%
- Doesn’t run at the right times: 15.7%
- Need car for work or errands: 9.2%
- Driving and parking is more economical and efficient: 8.6%
- Other: 7.1%
- I bike or walk most places: 5.0%
- Hard to understand how to get where I need to go: 4.3%
- Makes me feel uncomfortable or unsafe: 0.5%

Proportion of Respondents

Figure B-23  “Other” Reasons for Not Using Transit More Often

Other reasons for not using transit (N=208)

- Other: 23%
- Not efficient: 24.5%
- Costs too much: 16.6%
- Limited service options: 10.6%
- Limited evening service: 7.3%
- Limited weekend service: 4.8%
- Do not feel safe: 4.8%
- Unreliable: 3.8%
- Do not understand the system: 0.5%

Proportion of Respondents
Service Coverage

Respondents were given the opportunity to designate specific service areas in which their transit system could operate.

Responses were further analyzed to identify any trends for particular demographic groups:

- **Overall** – The highest share of respondents indicated that Utah’s top job centers and mixed use and major growth areas were priority destinations (Figure B-24). Service to industrial areas in western Salt Lake City was the least selected coverage improvement. Responses from residents of Salt Lake City mirrored the overall trends (Figure B-25).

- **Frequency of Use** - Participants were grouped based on how frequently they use transit; the top choice for all groups was to serve Utah’s top job centers followed by mixed use and major growth areas (Figure B-26).

- **Age** – Utah’s top job centers was the top response for all age groups, except the 18-24 age group for which showed a slight preference for service to mixed use and major growth areas. For older adults, service to LIMITED\(^3\) neighborhoods was the second most common response (Figure B-27).

- **Income** - All income groups selected service to Utah’s top job centers as the most preferred destination. High income participants were more likely to select service to mixed use and major growth areas or the airport, while preferred destinations for low income participants were spread across multiple responses. (Figure B-28).

---

Figure B-24 Desired Service Coverage (Select all that apply, within your budget) – All Respondents

---

\(^3\) Neighborhoods that are more likely to use transit such as higher concentrations of car free or low-income households, youth, seniors, or people with disabilities
Figure B-25  Desired Service Coverage (Select all that apply, within your budget) - SLC Residents Only

Figure B-26  Desired Service Coverage by Frequency of Transit Use
Figure B-27  Desired Service Coverage by Age

Figure B-28  Desired Service Coverage by Income
Figure B-29  Desired Service Coverage by City Council District
Service Periods

Respondents were asked to designate additional service periods within which their transit system would operate.

- **Overall** – The highest share of respondents indicated a preference for evening service and Saturday service (Figure B-30). Sunday service was the least selected period for service improvement. Responses for Salt Lake City residents only mirrored this trend (Figure B-31).

- **Frequency of Use** - All groups cited increased evening service as their top service period investment priority, followed by Saturday, and then Sunday service (Figure B-32).

- **Age** – All groups cited increased evening service as their top service period investment priority, followed by Saturday, and then Sunday service (Figure B-33).

- **Income** – All groups cited increased evening service as their top service period investment priority, followed by Saturday, and then Sunday service (Figure B-34).

Figure B-30 Desired Service Periods (Select all that apply, within your budget) – All Respondents
Figure B-31  Desired Service Periods (Select all that apply, within your budget) - SLC Residents Only

Desired Service Period for SLC Residents (N=727)

- Evening service: 77.2%
- Saturday service: 43.4%
- Sunday service: 44.4%

Location: Salt Lake City

Figure B-32  Desired Service Periods by Transit Use

Frequency of Transit Use vs. Desired Service Period (N=1,146)

- Evening service
- Saturday service
- Sunday service

Proportion of Respondents per frequency

Rarely: Less than once a month, Occasionally: 1-3 times a month - Once a week, Frequently: A few times a week or more
Figure B-33  Desired Service Periods by Age

Age Group vs. Desired Service Period (N=1,128)

- Evening service
- Saturday service
- Sunday service

Proportion of Respondents per age group

Age
18 to 24
25 to 44
45 to 64
65 or older

Figure B-34  Desired Service Periods by Income

Household Income vs. Desired Service Period (N=1,128)

- Evening service
- Saturday service
- Sunday service

Proportion of Respondents per Income group

Income
Low income
Middle income
High income

Low Income: Less than $35,000, Middle Income: $35,001 - $75,000, High Income: greater than $75,001
Figure B-35  Desired service Periods by City Council District

Council District vs. Desired Service Period (N=657)

Proportion of Respondents per location

Evening service

Saturday service

Sunday service

Council District
- Council District 1
- Council District 2
- Council District 3
- Council District 4
- Council District 5
- Council District 6
- Council District 7
Capital Improvements

Respondents were given the opportunity to designate specific capital improvements in which their transit system could invest.

- **Overall** - The highest share of respondents (46%) indicated a preference for a rail based system (Figure B-36). Responses from Salt Lake City residents were similar to those of the entire survey sample (Figure B-37), though Salt Lake City residents were somewhat more likely to want to increase investment in a bus only system.

- **Frequency of Use** - All frequency of use groups were most likely to choose to increase investment in a rail based system, followed by a bus AND rail based system (Figure B-38).

- **Age** – All age groups selected increased investment in a rail based system as the preferred capital investment. The second most common response varied by age, with 18-24 and 25-44 year olds choosing bus and rail improvements, older adults (45-64) selecting incremental improvements to the current system, and seniors (65 or older) selecting increased investments in a bus based system (Figure B-39).

- **Income** - High income participants indicated a preference for investing in a rail based system (their two top responses included rail investment). Investments in a rail based system was also the top response for low income participants, but many also prioritize investments bus and rail, bus, and improvements to the current system (Figure B-40).

Figure B-36 Desired Capital Improvements (Select all that apply, within your budget) – All Respondents

![Bar chart showing desired capital improvements](image)
Figure B-37  Desired Capital Improvements (Select all that apply, within your budget) - SLC Residents Only

Figure B-38  Desired Capital Improvements by Transit Use
Figure B-39  Desired Capital Improvements by Age

Figure B-40  Desired Capital Improvements by Income
Figure B-41  Desired capital Improvements by City Council District
Other Improvements

Respondents were asked to select other improvements that would support their coverage, service period, and capital investment selections.

- **Overall** - The highest share of respondents (43%) indicated improved access by foot and bike as their preferred improvement (Figure B-42). Real time arrival information and transit stop amenities were each selected by over a quarter of respondents. Salt Lake City residents exhibited similar preferences as the overall survey sample (Figure B-43).

- **Frequency of Use** - All frequencies of transit use groups selected access to transit on foot and by bike as the most important other improvement. While occasional and rare transit riders selected real time arrival information as the second most preferred improvement, frequent users indicated a preference for transit stop amenities (Figure B-44).

- **Age** - Improved access to transit on foot and by bike was the most preferred option by all age groups with the exception of those age 65 and older, who were most likely to prefer benches, shelters, and amenities at transit stops (Figure B-45).

- **Income** - All income groups cited improved access to transit on foot and by bike as the most preferred other improvement. Real time arrival information was the second most preferred improvement for both low and high income respondents, while the second most common response for middle income respondents was transit stop amenities (Figure B-46).

![Figure B-42 Other Desired Improvements (Select all that apply, within your budget) – All Respondents](image-url)
Figure B-43  Other Desired Improvements (Select all that apply, within your budget) - SLC Residents Only

Desired Other Improvements for SLC Residents (N=759)

- Improved access to transit on foot and by bike: 48%
- Benches, shelters, and amenities at transit stops: 27.2%
- Real time arrival information: 24.5%

Figure B-44  Other Desired Improvements by Transit Use

Frequency of Transit Use vs. Other Improvements (N=1,209)

- Improved access to transit on foot and by bike
- Benches, shelters, and amenities at transit stops
- Real time arrival information

Transit Use: Rarely, Occasionally, Frequently

Proportion of Respondents per frequency:

- Rarely: Less than once a month
- Occasionally: 1-3 times a month
- Once a week
- Frequently: A few times a week or more
Figure B-45  Other Desired Improvements by Age

Figure B-46  Other Desired Improvements by Income
Figure B-47  Other Desired Improvements by City Council District
Appendix C  Gaps Analysis

While portions of Salt Lake City are well served by transit, some portions of the city experience a mismatch in the existing transit supply and current demand, resulting in a “gap.” To determine where gaps exist, an analysis was conducted to identify underserved corridors or markets, areas with too much service, and areas ineffectively served by transit.

Key transit service opportunities identified in this analysis include:

- Increased frequency and span of service to support a “transit lifestyle”
- Increased midday and evening service to frame Salt Lake City as a regional destination
- Better connections between neighborhood nodes
- Improved reliability and speed to be more competitive with automobiles
- Improved stability of service
- Higher quality bus stops with more amenities
- Better and safer access to stops
- More affordable service
- Better maps and information

State of the System Report

The State of the System provided an analysis on the existing transit, land use, demographic, and travel behavior data provided by Salt Lake City, UTA, and the Wasatch Front Regional Council. It summarized the state of transit service and the myriad factors that impact the use and performance of transit in Salt Lake City today. Some of the key findings included:

- **Land Use and Growth:** Salt Lake City is the region’s employment hub and is continuing to grow.
- **Travel Patterns:** The majority of trips are non-commute trips.
- **Transit Use:** Currently, 6% of Salt Lake City residents take transit to work. Transit use is lower for non-commute trips.
- **Transit Service and Connections:** More bus service is provided than service on any other modes, but evening and weekend transit service is limited. Capacity constraints and limited layover space are limiting to transit service.
- **Transit Performance:** Transit boardings in Salt Lake City increased since 2011, but at a slower rate than the system as a whole and at a slower rate than service hours.
- **Access and Amenities:** Large block size and other barriers makes first/last mile access to transit difficult. Eighty-three percent of bus stops do not have a bench or a shelter for people to wait for the bus to arrive.

CURRENT TRANSIT DEMAND

Population & Employment Density

Figure C-1 shows the average weekday boardings overlaid on the population and employment density for Salt Lake City. The highest number of boardings are concentrated around areas with high population and employment density, particularly in downtown and the University of Utah. On the contrary, some dense areas do not have high transit boardings, such as the Sugar House Business District. Park-and-ride stations south of downtown—Ballpark Station, Central Pointe Station, and Millcreek Station, also have a high number of boardings.

Taking a closer look at the boardings in the dense area of downtown, Figure C-2 shows that transit boardings are concentrated on the western side of downtown. Central Station, State Street, and Main Street are some of the primary transit transfer points in downtown. Low transit boardings east of these transfer points indicates a first/last mile connectivity barrier to eastern downtown.
Figure C-1  Population/Employment Density and Weekday Transit Boardings: Salt Lake City
Figure C-2  Population/Employment Density and Weekday Transit Boardings: Downtown
Transit Propensity

The Transit Propensity Index (TPI) helps to determine the likelihood of transit use within a given geography. Some populations have a higher propensity to ride transit. This TPI is based on the combined densities of four populations: low-income households, zero vehicle households, seniors (ages 65+), and person with disabilities.

As illustrated in Figure C-4 and Figure C-5, some neighborhoods show high propensity for transit but lower transit boardings. This includes the area between the Central Business District and the University of Utah, the southern portion of the Capitol Hill neighborhood, portions of Liberty Wells, and neighborhoods west of I-15 (Rose Park, Glendale, and Poplar Grove neighborhoods). These high density areas have high concentrations of low-income, zero-vehicle households, seniors, and persons with disabilities but show less transit activity than other areas.

Transit Mode Share

Transit mode share—the percentage of trips made on transit—varies by district in Salt Lake City (Figure C-3). For the city overall, approximately 6% of Salt Lake City residents travel to work via transit.¹ According to the 2012 Utah Household Travel Survey, the University of Utah and the Airport Districts had the most transit use. Areas in the southern portion of the city (Sugar House/East Bench and Glendale/Poplar Grove) had the lowest transit mode share. When traveling to downtown Salt Lake City, these neighborhoods have a particularly high transit time disadvantage compared to auto travel.

Figure C-3 Transit Mode Share by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Percent of total trips made on transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport district</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas surrounding University of Utah</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Hill/Avenues</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar House/East Bench</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale/Poplar Grove</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2012 Utah Household Travel Survey

Figure C-4  Transit Propensity Index and Weekday Transit Boardings: Salt Lake City
Figure C-5  Transit Propensity Index and Weekday Transit Boardings: Downtown

This index is based on combined densities of:
- Low-income households
- Zero vehicle households
- Seniors (aged 65+)
- Disabled population
EXISTING TRANSIT SERVICE

Hours & Frequency

Frequent service is very limited outside of standard commute times, such as midday, evenings, and weekends. Service with a frequency every 15 minutes or less is considered the minimum that allows people to use transit without consulting a schedule. Of Salt Lake City’s 44 bus routes, only six routes operate service that is available every 15 minutes or less.

Service frequency on several routes varies over the course of the day.

- **Weekday Service Frequency and Span (Figure C-8):** Only about half of the 44 bus routes operate outside commute periods and provide midday service during the week.

- **Weekend Service Frequency and Span (Figure C-9):** Only 16 of the 44 bus routes operate on Saturdays and nine operate on Sundays. Among corridors that retain service on weekends, the highest-frequency service is generally every 30 minutes on Saturdays and every 60 minutes on Sundays.

Service gaps that do not meet the FTN Minimum Service Level Definition (Figure C-7) are circled in red in Figure C-8 and Figure C-9. Evening bus service is limited all days of the week after 8:00 p.m. TRAX, FrontRunner, and the S-Line streetcar line run on a somewhat later schedule. Limited service hours and low service frequency presents challenges for visitors, service sector workers, and those who want to live a “transit lifestyle.”

Transit service frequency for Weekday AM Peak, Weekday Midday, Saturday, and Sunday is also illustrated in Figure C-10 through Figure C-13. Service coverage decreases over different time periods and there is distinctly less service in west than east Salt Lake City.

**Figure C-6  FTN Minimum Service Level Definition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Span</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday – Saturday</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>5am – 6am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>6 am – 7pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>7pm – 11pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>7am – 7pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“I would love to be able to take the bus to and from work, however I start at 4 AM and there are no services available at that time.”

- “Design Your Own Transit System” Survey Respondent

“If there were more frequent buses and more frequency getting me across town, I would use transit more.”

- “Design Your Own Transit System” Survey Respondent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROUTE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EARLY AM</th>
<th>AM PEAK</th>
<th>MIDDAY</th>
<th>PM PEAK</th>
<th>EVENING / NIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>701</td>
<td>TRAX Blue Line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703</td>
<td>TRAX Red Line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704</td>
<td>TRAX Green Line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720</td>
<td>S-Line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>FrontRunner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>200 South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2X</td>
<td>200 South Express</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3rd Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6th Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>900 South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11th Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1700 South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2100 South / 2100 East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>State Street North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>500 East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>900 East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>1300 East / 1100 East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Redwood Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Highland Drive / 1300 East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>2300 East / Holladay Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>Foothill Blvd / 2700 East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Cottonwood Heights Fast Bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>South Valley / U of U Fast Bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>Highland Drive Fast Bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>Sandy / U of U Fast Bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>Tooele Express</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>Tooele - Salt Lake Via Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454</td>
<td>Grantsville/Salt Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455</td>
<td>U of U/Davis County/WSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456</td>
<td>Orem/Unisys/ Rocky Mtn. Express</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>Woods Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461</td>
<td>Bountiful Via State Capitol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462</td>
<td>North Salt Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463</td>
<td>West Bountiful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470</td>
<td>Orem - Salt Lake Intercity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471</td>
<td>Centerville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>Orem - Salt Lake Express</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
<td>SLC - Orem Hwy 89 Express</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>State Capitol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509</td>
<td>900 W Shuttle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513</td>
<td>Industrial Business Park Shuttle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>Poplar Grove / Glendale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519</td>
<td>Fairpark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>Rose Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551</td>
<td>International Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>902</td>
<td>Park Ctr-SLC Connect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>919</td>
<td>Fairpark (West HS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920</td>
<td>Rose Park (West HS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS22</td>
<td>2200 West Flex Shuttle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Frequency of service:* 15 min | 16-30 min | 31-60 min | 60+ min | 1-4 trips | No Service
### Figure C-8  Service Frequency and Span – Weekend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROUTE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>SATURDAY</th>
<th>SUNDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>701</td>
<td>TRAX Blue Line</td>
<td>16-30 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703</td>
<td>TRAX Red Line</td>
<td>16-30 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704</td>
<td>TRAX Green Line</td>
<td>16-30 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720</td>
<td>S-Line</td>
<td>16-30 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>Frontrunner</td>
<td>16-30 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>200 South</td>
<td>16-30 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3rd Avenue</td>
<td>16-30 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6th Avenue</td>
<td>16-30 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2100 South / 2100 East</td>
<td>16-30 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>State Street North</td>
<td>16-30 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>500 East</td>
<td>16-30 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>900 East</td>
<td>16-30 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>1300 East / 1100 East</td>
<td>16-30 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Redwood Road</td>
<td>16-30 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Highland Drive / 1300 East</td>
<td>16-30 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470</td>
<td>Ogden - Salt Lake Intercity</td>
<td>60+ min</td>
<td>60+ min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509</td>
<td>900 W Shuttle</td>
<td>16-30 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>Poplar Grove / Glendale</td>
<td>16-30 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519</td>
<td>Fairpark</td>
<td>16-30 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>902</td>
<td>Park City-SLC Connect</td>
<td>16-30 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Frequency of Service:**
- 15 min
- 16-30 min
- 31-60 min
- 60+ min
- 1-4 trips
- No Service
Note: Refer to the State of the System Factbook for full size maps (Figures 4-7 to 4-11).
Transit Travel Time vs. Drive Time

Figure C-6 below illustrates a theoretical comparison of travel times by car and transit between several Salt Lake City neighborhoods and downtown and between key regional destinations and downtown. This comparison serves not as a specific illustration of travel time, but rather to highlight the neighborhoods where transit carries a particularly high time disadvantage compared to auto travel:

- Sugar House neighborhood
- Glendale neighborhood
- East Bench neighborhood

Figure C-13 Drive Time vs. Transit Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Drive Time</th>
<th>Transit Time</th>
<th>How many times slower is transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sugar House neighborhood</td>
<td>Downtown SLC</td>
<td>0:11</td>
<td>0:26</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>Downtown SLC</td>
<td>0:12</td>
<td>0:18</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Park neighborhood</td>
<td>Downtown SLC</td>
<td>0:08</td>
<td>0:13</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplar Grove neighborhood</td>
<td>Downtown SLC</td>
<td>0:08</td>
<td>0:14</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale neighborhood</td>
<td>Downtown SLC</td>
<td>0:11</td>
<td>0:23</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Avenues neighborhood</td>
<td>Downtown SLC</td>
<td>0:11</td>
<td>0:18</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bench neighborhood</td>
<td>Downtown SLC</td>
<td>0:16</td>
<td>0:36</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The times were calculated using the trip planning tool on Google Maps. Drive times were taken at 5 p.m. Transit times were calculated by selecting 5 p.m. as the beginning travel time for weekday trips. For the purposes of this analysis, Salt Palace Convention Center was selected as the default “downtown SLC destination.” Walk times are not included for drive time or transit time.

ADDITIONAL NEEDS

Bus Stop Amenities

There are limited amenities for passengers at bus stops. Eighty-three percent (83%) of bus stops do not have a bench or a shelter for people to wait for the bus to arrive. Figure C-14 illustrates which bus stops have a shelter and a bench, a shelter only, a bench only, a sign only, and no amenities. Improving bus stops with well-marked signage and amenities could make waiting for the bus safer and more comfortable for the user.

Service Stability

UTA has the option of making changes to their system three times per year, which creates uncertainty about system stability and undermines the City’s ability to organize growth around
transit. Changes can include re-numbering of routes, re-routing of lines, and schedule adjustments. This can make historical route-by-route ridership and performance data difficult to compile and historical changes and trends more difficult to understand; it may also impact legibility of the system for riders, an issue that will be further explored as part of public outreach.

UTA has made some major structural changes in their service in the last 10 years that changed boarding patterns. Notable changes include construction of Salt Lake Central Intermodal Hub and a redesign of the whole system that occurred in 2006-2007, and the opening of the TRAX Red and Green lines, which changed the main downtown transfer location from Gallivan to Courthouse in 2011.

Opportunities may exist to build more stable, long-term ridership and encourage transit-oriented development through limiting service changes

**Affordability**

The cost of transit can be particularly burdensome on large families, youth, and transit dependent populations—low-income, older adults, persons with disabilities, and zero car households. Affordability is particularly relevant for the west side population of Salt Lake City, of which 50% are youth. Solutions to the affordability issue might include a low-income transit pass, a family transit pass, or discounts for major trip patterns, e.g. University-Downtown.

**Access**

Access to transit can be challenging in Salt Lake City due to the wide streets and large blocks. Solutions for this issue might include mid-block connections as development occurs and enhanced pedestrian environments. Other travel modes available in Salt Lake City—GREENbike Share, UTA Rideshare, demand-responsive rideshare, and Transportation Network Companies (e.g. Uber and Lyft)—can also feed into the transit system to provide a multimodal connection.

“"I rode the bus consistently for about six months but quit after the closest stop to my house moved from one block away to six. Arrival times were so inconsistent, it was frustrating. I would rather see fewer routes with ACCURATE and RELIABLE stop times. I could plan accordingly then."”

- “Design Your Own Transit System” Survey Respondent
**Information**

UTA provides a series of online and electronic information resources including an online trip planner, real-time information, and a mobile app center to connect passengers to services.

Opportunities to improve the understanding of the system include:

- Awareness and education of the services offered (e.g. fare free zone, guaranteed ride home, next bus info available via text message);
- Ease of use through simplified and legible information; and
- Improved access through technology.

**Facilities**

To provide additional service in the future, UTA will need new facilities to accommodate expansion. Additional bus layover space would be useful near areas of high transit use, such as the University of Utah and downtown Salt Lake City. 4th S/Main Street also has an issue with capacity as no additional trains are able to move through the intersection.

**KEY FINDINGS**

- Higher density areas tend to have higher use of transit, however **some high density areas in Salt Lake do not show high transit boardings**, such as eastern downtown, portions of Liberty Wells, Sugar House, and neighborhoods west of I-15
- Some areas with high propensity to use transit have **low transit boardings and low transit mode share**, therefore not as well-served by existing transit system.
- Service enhancements including **increased frequency and span of service** could support a transit lifestyle and help transit be more competitive with driving alone.
- To improve and enhance the transit user experience, future transit investments should consider **affordability, access, and information**.
- **Additional transit facilities** will be needed to accommodate future growth and system expansion.
Appendix D  Transit Corridor Evaluation

The Transit Master Plan included an extensive technical evaluation that informed draft transit service and capital recommendations. These recommendations evolved into the service and capital elements of the plan (Chapters 2 and 3). The recommendations were the outcome of a technical evaluation process that started with an existing conditions analysis (see Appendix A), was complemented by a multi-faceted public outreach process during the spring, summer, and fall of 2015 (see Appendix B), and a gaps analysis based on both the existing conditions analysis and public outreach findings (see Appendix C).

The service element of the Transit Master Plan includes a vision for an expanded high-frequency transit network for Salt Lake City, a core component of the plan. The long-term frequent transit network (FTN) is a 20-year vision for where frequent service should be provided in Salt Lake City. Defining an FTN allows Salt Lake City to work closely with Utah Transit Authority (UTA) to set priorities for service provision now and in the future. The service element contains three principal components:

- FTN Map – The expanded vision for where frequent service should be provided throughout the city
- FTN Service Level Definition – The definition of the standardized service level that will be provided on all FTN routes, e.g., frequency, span, and days of service
- Service Design Principles – Principles that are used to design the network of corridors recommended for capital investment and service investment

A network map including an initial phasing recommendation for FTN implementation is provided here. During the next stage of analysis, the phased FTN vision will be finalized based on the online “Design Your Own Transit System” survey and input from key stakeholders.

The capital element provides direction for where capital investment in the transit system will provide the greatest community benefits. The corridor evaluation was used, in conjunction with existing plans, to identify corridors for infrastructure improvements. The subsequent, final stage of the evaluation process will be a modal analysis that will define which improvements are appropriate in each of these recommended corridors, e.g. investments to improve transit performance, modal upgrades to Bus Plus, Bus Rapid Transit, or rail.

The Transit Master Plan also includes a set of recommendations for programs, policies, and other supportive investments.
PROJECT BACKGROUND AND GOALS

The Transit Master Plan responds to community and policy mandates to improve public transportation for the benefit of all members of the community in Salt Lake City. The Plan will help Salt Lake City and UTA set priorities for the next 20 years, guide decisions about the timing and location of capital investments, and increase the use of transit citywide.

Salt Lake City is leading the Plan, focused on identifying transit needs, desires and investments citywide. However, the Plan builds on other local and regional planning efforts and is being developed in close coordination with UTA, City departments, and regional agencies. The Plan has been developed with an inclusive public process to ensure community needs and desires are captured. The goals and objectives of the Plan are shown in Figure D-1.

**Figure D-1  Transit Master Plan Goals and Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Improve air quality.</td>
<td>Reduce per capita vehicle miles traveled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve competitiveness of transit with auto travel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Increase the number of people riding transit.</td>
<td>Increase transit ridership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Make transit useful for more types of trips.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve the competitiveness of transit with auto travel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provide a complete transit system that supports a transit lifestyle.</td>
<td>Provide reliable, efficient, frequent transit service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide service on a citywide network that serves a broad range of important community destinations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain stable service on the core transit network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide service on the core transit network during the evening and on weekends to support all types of trips, including work and non-work trips.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide information and maps that make the transit system easy to understand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provide a safe and comfortable transit access and waiting experience.</td>
<td>Improve bicycle and pedestrian access to transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve the transit waiting experience and universal accessibility of stops and stations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provide access to opportunity for vulnerable populations.</td>
<td>Design a transit network that supports access to jobs, education, daily needs, and services for transit-dependent populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide affordable transit options, particularly for low-income households.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Create economically vibrant, livable places that support use of transit.</td>
<td>Align transit investments with transit-supportive land use policies and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Catalyze economic development and jobs in Salt Lake City by providing effective transit service that employers, businesses, and the development community can depend upon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
METHODOLOGY

The screening and evaluation process assessed a range of existing transit and potential transit corridors to determine where current and future demographics, land use patterns, and population and employment concentrations are most likely to support high-quality transit service, and support the broader community goals established for the Plan (see Figure D-1). As fully described in the Goals & Evaluation Framework memo, the investments that were evaluated were drawn from stakeholder and public outreach, input from Salt Lake City and UTA, and technical analysis completed for the State of the System Fact Book and the gaps analysis (Appendices A and C). ²

The evaluation process was iterative, gradually narrowing from a broad list of potential corridors to identify a final set of recommended corridors. Figure D-2 illustrates the evaluation process and Figure D-3 illustrates the phase I and phase II evaluation criteria.

The first phase was a fine-grained analysis of primarily land use and demographic data at the corridor segment level. This eliminated from consideration those corridors that are least likely to deliver significant return on transit investments within the plan time frame and helped the team assemble a set of corridors for the second phase of analysis. During phase II, the team analyzed 15 corridors against a broader range of evaluation criteria.

At this stage, there were several factors held constant, including the operating plan, mode, and capital cost per mile (assumptions for the operating plan were taken from the FTN service level definition). In addition, two potential new transit hubs were included based on discussions with UTA and Salt Lake City staff during the September site visit, one in East Downtown near 700 E and 200S and the second at the University. Several of the corridors that were evaluated terminate at one of these new hubs.

This yielded the draft FTN and capital investment corridor recommendations, presented in Figure D-5 and Figure D-6 below, respectively. A range of mode options are identified for capital investment corridors.

The attachments to this memo show full results from the phase I (Appendix A) and phase II (Appendix B) corridor evaluation.

² See http://slcrides.org/documents/ for documents developed previously for this Plan.
Figure D-2  Evaluation Process

I: Land Use Evaluation
- Evaluate full arterial network at fine-grained level

II: Corridor Evaluation
- Evaluate fifteen corridors to identify draft FTN and corridors for capital investment

III: Corridor Refinement
- Further analysis of top four to six corridors

Transit Master Plan
- Long-range vision
- Short-range investments
- Investment priorities
- Land use coordination
- Supporting policies
## Figure D-3 Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to Transit Master Plan Goals</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria (Segment screening criteria shaded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit ridership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete transit system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe/comfortable experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to opportunity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic vibrancy/livability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phase I & II

- **●** Transit ridership
- **●** Complete transit system
- **●** Safe/comfortable experience
- **●** Access to opportunity
- **●** Economic vibrancy/livability

- **●** Existing ridership*
- **●** Transit Propensity Index (TPI)
- **●** Land use density current (population and employment)
- **●** Land use density future (population and employment)
- **●** Lack of access to a vehicle

### Phase II only

- **●** Anchor/generator strength and accessibility
- **●** Potential for travel time savings and/or improved reliability
- **●** Ridership potential (current and future year)
- **●** Redevelopment Potential
- **●** Cost effectiveness

*The analysis accounts for the fact that corridors without any nearby transit service would be disadvantaged.
SERVICE ELEMENT

Overview of a Frequent Transit Network

What is a Frequent Transit Network?

A frequent transit network (FTN) is a set of designated transit corridors that offers frequent, reliable service connecting major destinations and neighborhood centers throughout the day including evening hours, every day including weekends. A frequent transit network can be comprised of both bus and rail technologies. Regardless of mode, the network should be developed to provide a consistently high standard of capacity, reliability, frequency, and customer service amenities. The FTN should be clearly communicated so that it is easily understood and marketed to riders to ensure ease of use (Chapter 5 provides further recommendations related to branding the FTN).

To create a complete transit system, other local transit routes and alternative service models provide feeder service to FTN corridors (see Chapter 2). In addition, the value of a FTN can only be fully realized by fostering supportive land use development and high-quality pedestrian and bicycle access to stops/stations. Therefore, a truly effective FTN must be developed as a partnership between a city, its multiple departments, and a transit agency.

Once a desired FTN is defined, a City and its transit partner can work together to obtain funding and make the improvements necessary to achieve the level of service that is envisioned.

Key Performance Characteristics of a Frequent Transit Network

To meet City goals to increase transit mode share and truly support residents’ ability to live a car-free lifestyle, a frequent transit network should ideally have the following characteristics:

- **Fast and Reliable**: Operate transit on arterial streets/transit priority streets where it will be most rapid and reliable; make improvements that reduce transit travel time and make it more competitive with automobile travel.
- **Frequent**: Connect major destinations and neighborhood centers with 15 minute or better, all day service. Service that operates every 15 minutes or less is considered the minimum service level that allows people to use transit without consulting a schedule.
- **All Day**: 15 minute or better service frequency between at least 6 a.m. – 7 p.m. on weekdays and Saturdays, with 30-minute service in the evening and on Sundays.
- **Every Day**: 7 day per week service that maintains a basic level of frequent service on weekends.

What investments are typically made on a Frequent Transit Network?

Once the network is defined, coordinated transit service, transit capital, access, and land use investments should be made on these corridors. Investments include:

- **Intersection and Signal Management**: It is critical how signals and rights-of-way are managed in FTN corridors. Since these corridors carry the highest volume of transit riders and have the greatest potential to capture more non-auto users, signal management at intersections should favor transit vehicles; on-street parking uses should be sacrificed in the interest of moving full, high-capacity buses through congested commercial districts; and integrated solutions should be sought to allow transit and bicycles to safely coexist.
- **Stops/Stations**: The quality of stop and station amenities on FTN corridors is critical. Stops/stations also represent an opportunity to brand the FTN network differently so that
it is clear to riders where high frequency service operates (see Chapter 6 for more information).

- **Multimodal Investment**: Coordinated multimodal investments along the FTN allow easy, safe access to frequent service (see Chapter 4 for further discussion).

- **Land Use**: Zoning and other land use policies must support high frequency service along the FTN (see Chapter 6 for further discussion).

### Service Design Principles for Salt Lake City

In conjunction with the corridor evaluation process, these principles were used to design the network of corridors recommended for service investment and capital investment. These principles respond to the goals of the Plan, the gaps analysis, and input from stakeholders and the public.

- **Convenient**: Provide frequent, reliable daytime and evening transit service
- **Connected**: Provide simple, citywide connections on a high-frequency network
- **Legible**: Brand the core frequent transit network differently and design for ease of understanding
- **Easy to Use**: Make the transit network easy to access and comfortable
- **Demand Driven**: Invest in transit where overall travel market demand is high
- **Permanent**: Provide stable service that riders and investors can rely on now and in the future

These service design principles inform the service and capital recommendations, as well as the recommendations for programs, policies, and other supportive investments which are presented in a separate memo.

### Frequent Transit Network in Salt Lake City

#### A High-Frequency Grid System for Salt Lake City

UTA altered its route structure to a largely hub-and-spoke system several years ago with the construction of the Intermodal Hub, which is located in an area west of downtown that does not have considerable current activity or density. Currently, many of UTA’s routes terminate at the Hub to take advantage of the centralized layover space that is available there. The gaps analysis and public outreach has revealed that this creates challenges for people who need to travel to other destinations throughout the city, necessitating multiple transfers and/or indirect trips. Further, in some cases, route productivity is undermined as routes must go to the Hub despite a lack of demand.

Salt Lake City’s strong linear street grid is well-suited for a grid-based system if new layover locations can be identified. This change could allow for more frequency on heavily used routes and/or offering better service in currently under-served areas where there is demand.

The corridor evaluation process was designed to support Salt Lake City’s evolution towards a more grid-based system. The phase II analysis used continuous and direct citywide corridors and explored two new locations for transit hubs – one in East Downtown near 700 E and 200 S and one at the University of Utah (indicated on the maps in this memo). Creating more layover space for UTA buses is a major factor in whether changes can be made to the transit system, including implementation of the envisioned FTN network.
Frequent Transit Network Service Level Definition

High frequency is critical to the functioning of a grid-based transit system as riders depend more on transfers. Based on the general principles described above, the level of service shown in Figure D-4 is recommended for the FTN. All designated FTN routes should operate according to these parameters, which were designed not only to be frequent, but also to operate relatively consistently all day, every day. The service design is simple and easy to understand so that riders can use an FTN route without referencing a schedule. In conjunction with clear branding, this provides a level of certainty and reliability on which riders can depend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Span</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday – Saturday</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>5 am – 6 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>6 am – 7 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>7 pm – 11 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>7 am – 7 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Frequent Transit Network Recommendation

Figure D-5 illustrates the draft recommendation for a grid-based FTN for Salt Lake City. The FTN is a long-range vision that is intended to be phased in over time. There are two basic FTN phases:

1. **Tier 1**
   - **Existing**: Corridors that are already served by frequent service.*
   - **Future**: Corridors that have conditions now or in the near-term that merit FTN status. These were the top performing corridors in both phases of analysis.

2. **Tier 2**
   - **Future**: Corridors that are projected to have conditions that merit FTN status in the future. These are corridors that performed well in one of the phases of evaluation or are high priorities from a community outreach standpoint.

*Note: those corridors designated as “Existing” do not meet the FTN service level definition shown in Figure D-4, with the exception of State Street (Route 200). For the most part, they provide frequent service (at least every 15 minutes) during weekdays during the day (peak periods and midday). As of completion August 2015, there were no routes that operate at 15 minute frequency every day of the week, there was one route (200-State Street) that operated at this frequency 6 days per week, and only the TRAX network operated at this frequency during weekday evenings. With implementation of Tier 1, service on these corridors should be upgraded to meet the FTN definition.

Relationship to UTA Service Categories

Based on outreach findings, the current UTA frequent transit network branding is not readily visible to the average rider. UTA’s current service types are not defined primarily based on frequency, but on a combination of service qualities including purpose, stop spacing, and frequency, e.g., types include local, shuttle, flex, commuter, express, and fast bus. UTA is rolling out Bus Rapid Transit lines and a Bus Plus network that will be branded high-frequency services with improved reliability and higher level of stops/stations. These recommendations should be coordinated with UTA’s roll out of more branded service categories based on service level and reliability, e.g., local/neighborhood access/feeder routes, high frequency trunk lines (straight lines city wide). (See Programs and Supportive Investments memo for further discussion.)

Route Stability

One adopted, it is critical that the FTN become a stable, relatively unchanging part of the transit system so that riders can rely on it much as they do the TRAX system.

---

Figure D-5  Draft Frequent Transit Network Vision Recommendation

Note: The Final FTN Vision maps are provided in Chapter 2.
Local Service Network

The FTN is designed to serve long, direct citywide corridors. For a complete and easy-to-use transit system, it is critical that the transit system also includes complementary local routes that provide feeder service to the FTN and neighborhood circulation. Coverage rather than speed is the goal for the local network. Stop spacing as close as 600 feet can be acceptable in some cases. As with the FTN, transit access improvements are critical to maximizing usefulness of the local services and providing equitable access to transit service for all populations.

The local network that feeds the FTN is not a key focus of this plan, since the City’s limited transit resources will be focused on the development of the FTN. However, the City should support UTA actions to:

- Maintain a basic or “lifeline” level local service to within ½ mile of most residents. This level of service is defined by a minimum of 60 minute frequencies for 12 hours per day. If a route cannot support this level of service, then provision of alternative service models should be considered (see below).
- As the FTN is implemented, the local route network should be adjusted to ensure it complements and supports new frequent services.

Community Shuttles

Public outreach findings indicated a desire for services that provide better neighborhood connectivity. Community shuttles, sometimes described as neighborhood circulators, are a model that is used in some cities to serve short trips within communities, feed major transit routes (rail, BRT, or other frequent transit network service), shopping, employment, and other activities. Community shuttles often use smaller capacity vehicles, such as 20 to 25 passenger mini-buses, to provide local transit service in lower density residential neighborhoods or areas of challenging topography that are more difficult to serve with conventional fixed-route transit service. The cost-effectiveness of this model may be maximized through a special contracted rate for community shuttle operators. (See Chapter 2 for examples and further discussion).

Alternative Service Models

Several neighborhoods in Salt Lake City have transit needs, but lack sufficient density or demand to justify providing FTN or even local service, as defined above. These neighborhoods are candidates for alternative service models which can provide critical first mile/last mile connections in low-demand areas, such as demand-responsive public transportation services, private and institutionally-operated shuttles targeted at specific populations, and on-demand shared ride services (see Chapter 2 for examples and further discussion).
CAPITAL INVESTMENTS

Overview of Capital Investment

The Plan includes recommendations for where capital investment in the transit system will provide the greatest community benefits. Capital improvements can include investments in right-of-way management and intersections to benefit transit performance, as well as modal upgrades to Enhanced Bus, Bus Rapid Transit, and/or rail. At this stage, the corridors recommended for infrastructure improvements are highlighted. Capital corridors were analyzed to identify potential modes that are appropriate in each of these recommended corridors.

Capital Investment Initial Recommendations

The top performing corridors in the phase II evaluation are recommended for capital improvements (see Figure D-6). A first step in developing capital improvements on these corridors would be to conduct more detailed corridors studies to refine the mode, specific alignment, and design.

East-West Corridors:

Analysis of capital improvements is recommended along three east-west corridors that serve the University of Utah, spaced about one quarter- to one half-mile apart:

- #1: 200 S (Salt Lake Central - University of Utah)
- #2: North and South Temple (North Temple station - University of Utah)
- #3: 400 S (Redwood Road- University of Utah)

In addition, the following corridor is recommended for inclusion, as this corridor has been studied by UTA as an upgrade to the TRAX system to enable a direct connection between the Airport and the University of Utah:

- #6: North Temple/400 S (Airport – University of Utah)

North-South Corridors

Analysis of capital improvements is recommended along four north-south corridors:

- State Street is the highest performing north-south corridor in the evaluation:
  - #8: State Street (SLC Southern border - State Capitol)
- Analysis of improvements is recommended along two high-performing corridors that could potentially serve a recommended new transit center located along 200 S between 500 E and 900 E and/or provide north-south connections into the Avenues neighborhood and to LDS Hospital. Significant changes would likely not be proposed to the right-of-way in the Avenues, so capital improvements to these corridors are not indicated north of South Temple Street.
  - #9 a/b: 500 E (SLC southern border - 200 S or S. Temple)
  - #11 a/b/c: 900 E (SLC southern border - 200 S or S. Temple)
- Although the Redwood Road corridor does not score as highly on density metrics as other corridors, it is an important continuous transit corridor for connectivity on the west side of the city and thus is recommended for further capital investment analysis:
  - #14 a/b: Redwood Road (SLC southern border - 1700 N)
Figure D-6  Draft Capital Corridors Recommendation

Corridors for Capital Investment

Note: The final Capital Investment Corridors map is provided in Chapter 3.
ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Phase I Evaluation Results
Attachment B: Phase II Evaluation Results
Attachment A - PHASE I EVALUATION

For Phase I of the evaluation, the corridors did not represent a network of transit routes, but a series of arterial roadway segments. Segments were created using logical breakpoints (e.g., key intersections) to provide more granular representation of current and/or potential transit-carrying arterials. The following pages show the corridor segment map for Salt Lake City that was used for the first phase of the evaluation and maps of the results.
Employment Density (2040)

Jobs per corridor mile:
- Less than 2,000
- 2,001 - 4,000
- 4,001 - 6,000
- 6,001 - 8,000
- 8,001 or more

UTA Transit Service:
- FrontRunner/Streetcar/TRAX
- Park & Ride (UTA)
- Park & Ride (Other)

System data current as of March 2015

Walking Sheds:
- 1/4 mile

Data Sources:
UTA, Utah AGRC, ESRI

Other:
- Hospital
- Middle School/High School
- College
- Shopping Center
- Other
- University of Utah
- City Limits
Attachment B - Phase II Evaluation Results
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Attachment B  PHASE II EVALUATION

This section provides additional detail on the phase II corridor evaluation.

**Corridors**

Figure B-1 identifies the corridors that were considered in the phase II evaluation, as identified through the phase I screening process. The corridors are categorized as primarily east-west and north-south and are illustrated in Figure B-2. For the purposes of this phase of evaluation, all corridors are assumed to use a bus mode, with exception of Corridor 6 (the previously planned TRAX Black Line project), and operating characteristics and capital costs are also held constant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ph2 ID</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Corridor Name</th>
<th>Corridor Distance</th>
<th>Assumed Mode</th>
<th>Anchor 1</th>
<th>Anchor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>East-West</td>
<td>200 S</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>Central Station</td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>East-West</td>
<td>North Temple + South Temple</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>North Temple TRAX</td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>East-West</td>
<td>400 S</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>Power TRAX station</td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>East-West</td>
<td>900 S</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>Redwood and Indiana</td>
<td>University via 2100 E/Foothill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>East-West</td>
<td>900 S (via 1300 S)</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>Redwood and Indiana</td>
<td>University southern alignment (#6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>East-West</td>
<td>2100 S - 2100 E</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>Central Pointe TRAX</td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>East-West</td>
<td>North Temple - 400 S (TRAX Black Line)</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>TRAX</td>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>East-West</td>
<td>1300 S</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>Redwood and Indiana</td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>North-South</td>
<td>State Street</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>State Capital</td>
<td>SLC Southern border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a</td>
<td>North-South</td>
<td>500 E (to LDS Hospital)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>LDS Hospital</td>
<td>SLC Southern border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b</td>
<td>North-South</td>
<td>500 E (to New Hub)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>New Hub (700 E/200 S)</td>
<td>SLC Southern border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>North-South</td>
<td>1300 E</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>SLC Southern border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a</td>
<td>North-South</td>
<td>900 E (to LDS Hospital)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>LDS Hospital</td>
<td>SLC Southern border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b</td>
<td>North-South</td>
<td>900 E (to New Hub)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>New Hub (700 E/200 S)</td>
<td>SLC Southern border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11c</td>
<td>North-South</td>
<td>900 E-1100 E (Sugarhouse-New Hub)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>New Hub (700 E/200 S)</td>
<td>Sugarhouse Streetcar terminus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>North-South</td>
<td>Foothill Dr</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>SLC Southern border</td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>North-South</td>
<td>900 W</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>Ballpark TRAX</td>
<td>Central Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14a</td>
<td>North-South</td>
<td>Redwood Road</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>SLC Northern border</td>
<td>SLC Southern border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b</td>
<td>North-South</td>
<td>Redwood Road (to Central Station)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>Central Station</td>
<td>SLC Southern border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>North-South</td>
<td>700 N/600 N</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>Redwood and 700 N</td>
<td>Central Station</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure B-2  Phase II Corridors Map
## Evaluation Measures

Figure B-3 summarizes the methodology used to calculate each measure.

**Figure B-3 Evaluation Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase I and II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Existing ridership</td>
<td>Boardings in corridor</td>
<td>Daily weekday boardings, 2014, within ¼ mile of corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Transit Propensity Index (TPI)</td>
<td>Transit dependent residents within ¼ mile (low-income, seniors, disabled)</td>
<td>Density of older adults (65+), low-income households, and persons with disability (excludes households without access to a vehicle, considered separately) within ¼ mile of corridor. Data from American Community Survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Land use density current (population and employment)</td>
<td>Current jobs and residents within ¼ mile of corridor (per corridor mile)</td>
<td>Density of current (2015) population and employment within ¼ mile of corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Land use density future (population and employment)</td>
<td>Future jobs and residents within ¼ mile of corridor (per corridor mile)</td>
<td>Density of future (2040) population and employment within ¼ mile of corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Lack of access to a vehicle</td>
<td>Residents without access to a vehicle within ¼ mile of corridor (per corridor mile)</td>
<td>Density of households without access to a vehicle within ¼ mile of corridor. Data from American Community Survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase II Only</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Anchor/generator strength and accessibility</td>
<td>Presence of and accessibility to major institutions, high visitation cultural/recreational sites, large employers</td>
<td>Average Walk Score (<a href="https://www.walkscore.com/">https://www.walkscore.com/</a>) at points along each corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Potential for travel time savings and/or improved reliability</td>
<td>Potential for travel time improvement based on existing travel times</td>
<td>Corridor travel time sampled from Google Maps for different time periods in each direction: morning peak (8 am), midday (noon), afternoon peak (5 pm), evening (8 pm), late night (1 am). A ratio of the maximum to minimum travel time was calculated, representing the additional time a traveler would need to allocate to ensure arriving at a destination at the desired time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Ridership potential (current and future year)</td>
<td>Ridership potential based on current and future land use, current ridership, travel demand patterns, and type of investment</td>
<td>Boardings from routes serving bus stops along each corridor, adjusted based on population/employment growth, accessibility, and service changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Redevelopment Potential</td>
<td>Data source TBD based on available data</td>
<td>Ratio of improvements to land value. Percent of area redevelopable within ¼ mile of corridors. Average of measure within designated redevelopment areas and overall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Cost effectiveness</td>
<td>Cost per rider</td>
<td>Ratio of corridor capital cost (Bus Plus corridor cost per mile, held constant for all corridors) to future ridership potential.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Key Assumptions**

The following sections describe key assumptions used in the analysis.

**Operating Plan**

Figure B-4 provides a conceptual operating plan assumed for each corridor, with “frequent” service provided for a minimum of 13 hours on weekdays, 12 hours on Saturdays, and 12 hours on Sundays. This conceptual operating plan aligns with the Frequent Transit Network Service Level Definition described in the memo. To allow for comparison between corridors, the operating plan was assumed to be constant for each corridor.

![Figure B-4 Conceptual Operating Plan (FTN Service Level Definition)]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th># of Hours</th>
<th>Peak Headway (by period)</th>
<th># of Round Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Early Morning</td>
<td>5:00 AM</td>
<td>6:00 AM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday AM Peak</td>
<td>6:00 AM</td>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Day</td>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday PM Peak</td>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td>7:00 PM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Eve</td>
<td>7:00 PM</td>
<td>11:00 PM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Weekday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat AM</td>
<td>5:00 AM</td>
<td>7:00 AM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat Day</td>
<td>7:00 AM</td>
<td>7:00 PM</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat Eve</td>
<td>7:00 PM</td>
<td>11:00 PM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Saturday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun AM</td>
<td>7:00 AM</td>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Day</td>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td>7:00 PM</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sunday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capital Costs**

The bullets below summarize capital cost assumption used in the phase II evaluation. To provide a comparison between corridors, base costs were assumed to be constant for each corridor, but major capital costs such as railroad crossings were added (see Figure B-5).

- Constant capital cost of $15 million per mile based on Bus Plus assumption in UTA network study
- TRAX line (Corridor 6): Capital cost of $5.5 million assumed based on preliminary information from UTA.
  - Major capital elements: At grade railroad crossing for Corridor 4A

![Figure B-5 Capital Cost Assumptions]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Additional Costs</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>Grade separation, high-level estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$5,500,000</td>
<td>Per UTA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation Results

The corridors were rated for each evaluation measure and scored from 0 to 3 based on natural breaks in each data element, with a score of “0” indicating the lowest performance and “3” indicating the best performance relative to the corridors evaluated.

A brief description of each evaluation criterion is below. The remaining figures in this appendix illustrate results from the phase II evaluation.

Criterion A: Existing Ridership

- See Criterion H.

Criterion B: Transit Propensity Index

- Maps and explanation of the transit propensity index (TPI) are provided in the State of the System Fact Book and Appendix A. TPI was illustrated for corridor segments as part of the phase I analysis.

Criterion C1, C2, D1, and D2: Existing and Projected Population and Employment Density

- Maps of existing and future population and employment density are provided in the State of the System Fact Book and Appendix A. Population and employment density was illustrated for corridor segments as part of the phase I analysis.

Criterion E: Lack of Access to a Vehicle (Household Density)

- A map showing the density of households without access to a vehicle is provided in the State of the System Fact Book and Appendix A. Density of households without access to a vehicle was illustrated for corridor segments as part of the phase I analysis.

Criterion F: Anchor/Generator Strength and Accessibility (Walk Score)

- The average Walk Score was calculated for points along each corridor (data from www.walkscore.com). Figure B-8 illustrates scores, sampled at 0.10 mile intervals for all of Salt Lake City.

Criterion G. Travel Time Savings Potential

The opportunity for improvements to improve transit speed and reliability of transit was based on a measure of travel time reliability. Existing auto travel times were sampled from Google Maps for different weekday time periods. A ratio of congested to free-flow travel times was calculated (this is sometimes referred to as a travel time planning index, representing the maximum additional time a traveler or bus rider would need to allow to ensure arriving at their destination at the desired time). The maximum travel time was used to represent congested conditions and the minimum travel time was used to represent free-flow conditions. Each corridor was given a score ranging from:

- 0 – Low ratio: lack of congestion and relatively little need for speed and reliability improvement based on current traffic conditions, to
- 3 – High ratio: congestion and potential for capital improvements to improve transit travel time
Other factors compiled for qualitative assessment include street classification and cross section (e.g., number of lanes and lane designations) and current or funded investments in speed and reliability improvements.

Figure B-9 summarizes travel time information for each corridor, general right-of-way conditions, and whether the corridor is recommended for modal analysis.

**Criterion H: Future Ridership Potential**

A sketch-level analysis of future ridership potential used the followed steps:

- **For corridors with existing service:**
  - Base Ridership: Boardings from routes serving similar travel patterns to the proposed corridor were tabulated at each stop along the corridor.
  - Population/Employment Adjustment: population and employment growth was calculated for a quarter-mile buffer around each stop, and existing ridership was assumed to increase in proportion to projected growth.

- **For corridors without existing service:**
  - Ridership was based on corridors with similar land use (e.g., population/employment densities) and/or anchors.

- **Response to Proposed Service Levels**
  - Future ridership calculation included industry-standard elasticities for rider response to changes in transit service levels (# of weekday trips) and travel times.
  - Ridership growth at stops with substantial projected increases in density, higher transit propensity (based on Measure B: TPI), and/or greater accessibility (based on Measure F: Walk Score) was assumed to be more responsive to service changes.

Note: Analysis for this criterion differs from phase I analysis in this it is limited to existing ridership on routes that serve similar travel patterns.

**Criterion I. Redevelopment Potential**

Figure B-10 illustrates redevelopment potential for parcels close to the analysis corridors and designated redevelopment areas. This measure is based on the ratio of the value of improvements, e.g., buildings, to land value (I/L). Parcels where improvements are valued at 100% or less of the land value are considered to be underutilized. The area of such parcels within a quarter-mile of the analysis corridors was calculated in two ways: 1) for the entire corridor (reflects simple I/L measure) and 2) limited to redevelopment areas (reflects I/L measure as well as city adopted policy for where redevelopment should occur). The rating was based on the average of the two calculations.

Corridors 13 (900W) and 14b (Redwood Road) had the highest share of redevelopable parcels within redevelopment areas, and Corridors 6 (TRAX Black Line), 12 (900w), and 14a (Redwood Road) had the highest share corridor-wide.
| ID | Length (Miles) | Category | Description | A: Existing ridership (per mile) | B: Transit Proximity Index (Fri) | C: Land use density current - population | D: Land use density current - Employment | E: Lack of access to a vehicle | F: Anchor/generator strength and accessibility | G: Travel Time Savings | H: Future ridership potential | I: Development Potential: Average of 11 & 12 | J: Development Potential: % of developable area in ROAs | K: Development Potential: % of developable area overall | L: Cost Effectiveness | Average | TOTAL | RANK |
|----|----------------|----------|-------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------|------|
| 1  | 4.0            | East-West| 200 S       | 3                               | 2                               | 2                                     | 3                                    | 3                          | 3                         | 2                | 0                  | 3.0              | 0.5              | 0                        | 1.0                  | 1             | 1    | 2.3   | 27.5 | 1    |
| 9a | 4.6            | North-South| 500 E (to LDS Hospital) | 2                               | 3                               | 3                                     | 2                                    | 3                          | 0                         | 3                | 0.0                | 1.0              | 1                | 0.0          | 1.0           | 1             | 3    | 2.3   | 27.0 | 2    |
| 8  | 3.9            | North-South| State Street | 1                               | 2                               | 2                                     | 3                                    | 3                          | 3                         | 3                | 1.5                | 1                | 0.0              | 2.0          | 1.0           | 2             | 0    | 2.1   | 25.5 | 3    |
| 9b | 3.9            | North-South| 500 E (to New Hub) | 2                               | 3                               | 3                                     | 2                                    | 3                          | 3                         | 0                | 0.5                | 1                | 1                | 0.5          | 0.0           | 1             | 2    | 2.1   | 25.5 | 3    |
| 2  | 3.7            | East-West | North Temple + South Temple | 1                               | 2                               | 2                                     | 3                                    | 3                          | 0                         | 1                | 0.5                | 1                | 0                | 1.0          | 0.0           | 1             | 2    | 2.0   | 23.5 | 5    |
| 11c| 3.7            | North-South| 900 E-1100 E (Sugarhouse-New Hub) | 2                               | 3                               | 3                                     | 1                                    | 3                          | 2                         | 0                | 2.0                | 0                | 0                | 0.0          | 2.0           | 2             | 3    | 1.8   | 22.0 | 6    |
| 6  | 10.9           | East-West | North Temple - 400 S (TRAX Black Line) | 3                               | 0                               | 1                                     | 2                                    | 1                          | 2                         | 1                | 2.0                | 1                | 0.0              | 3            | 0.0           | 3             | 1    | 1.6   | 19.5 | 7    |
| 11a| 5.7            | North-South| 900 E (to LDS Hospital) | 2                               | 3                               | 3                                     | 0                                    | 2                          | 0                         | 2                | 0.0                | 2                | 0                | 0.0          | 2.0           | 2             | 3    | 1.6   | 19.0 | 8    |
| 3  | 7.2            | East-West | 400 S       | 0                               | 2                               | 2                                     | 2                                    | 2                          | 2                         | 0                | 1.0                | 1                | 1                | 0.0          | 1.0           | 1             | 1    | 1.5   | 18.0 | 9    |
| 11b| 4.4            | North-South| 900 E (to New Hub) | 1                               | 3                               | 3                                     | 0                                    | 3                          | 0                         | 2                | 0.0                | 0                | 0                | 1.0          | 0.0           | 1             | 1    | 1.4   | 17.0 | 10   |
| 15 | 4.4            | North-South| 700 N/600 N | 0                               | 1                               | 2                                     | 2                                    | 2                          | 1                         | 0                | 0.5                | 2                | 1                | 0.0          | 0.5           | 1             | 0    | 1.2   | 14.5 | 11   |
| 13 | 3.1            | North-South| 900 W       | 0                               | 2                               | 1                                     | 1                                    | 1                          | 2                         | 0                | 2.0                | 3                | 1                | 0.0          | 1.0           | 1             | 0    | 1.0   | 12.0 | 12   |
| 7  | 8.9            | East-West | 1300 S      | 1                               | 1                               | 1                                     | 0                                    | 1                          | 0                         | 0                | 1.5                | 2                | 1                | 0.0          | 1.5           | 1             | 3    | 1.0   | 11.5 | 13   |
| 10 | 5.3            | North-South| 1300 E      | 1                               | 2                               | 2                                     | 1                                    | 1                          | 1                         | 0                | 0.0                | 0                | 0                | 1.0          | 0.0           | 1             | 0    | 0.9   | 11.0 | 14   |
| 12 | 4.4            | North-South| Foothill Dr | 0                               | 0                               | 0                                     | 1                                    | 0                          | 0                         | 0                | 0.5                | 1                | 1.5               | 0            | 0.0           | 3             | 1    | 0.8   | 9.5  | 15   |
| 4a | 7.5            | East-West | 900 S       | 0                               | 1                               | 1                                     | 1                                    | 1                          | 1                         | 1                | 0.0                | 0                | 2.0                | 2            | 2.0           | 2             | 0    | 0.8   | 9.0  | 16   |
| 5  | 6.8            | East-West | 2100 S - 2100 E | 0                               | 1                               | 1                                     | 1                                    | 1                          | 1                         | 0                | 1.0                | 1                | 0.0              | 0.0          | 1.0           | 0             | 2    | 0.8   | 9.0  | 16   |
| 14b| 4.4            | North-South| Redwood Road (to Central Station) | 1                               | 0                               | 0                                     | 1                                    | 0                          | 1                         | 0                | 0.5                | 2                | 3                | 0            | 0.0           | 2             | 1    | 0.8   | 9.0  | 16   |
| 4b | 8.3            | East-West | 900 S (via 1300 S) | 0                               | 1                               | 1                                     | 1                                    | 1                          | 1                         | 1                | 0.0                | 0.5               | 1.5               | 1            | 0.7           | 1             | 0    | 0.7   | 8.5  | 19   |
| 14a| 6.8            | North-South| Redwood Road | 1                               | 0                               | 0                                     | 0                                    | 0                          | 0                         | 0                | 2.5                | 0                | 3                | 1.0          | 0.5           | 1             | 2.5  | 0.6   | 7.5  | 20   |
### Figure B-7 Phase 2 Corridor Analysis Data

| ID | Length (Miles) | Category       | Description                                      | A. Existing ridership per mile | B. Transit Propensity Index (TPI) | C1. Land use density - current - Population | C2. Land use density - current - Employment | D1. Land use density - future - Population | D2. Land use density - future - Employment | E. Lack of access to a vehicle (HH density) | F. Anchorgenerator strength accessibility (walk score) | G. Travel Time Savings (congested to free-flow travel time) | H. Future Ridership Potential (per mile) | I. Redevelopment Potential: Average of I1 and I2 | J. Cost Effectiveness (capital cost per annual rider) |
|----|----------------|----------------|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| 1  | 4.0            | East-West      | 200 S                                             | 1,500                           | 9.5                               | 11.0                                       | 27.0                                       | 14.6                                       | 27.5                                       | 0.96                                           | 64                                            | 1.3                                           | 1,900                                          | 16%                                            | 1%                                             | 31%                                           | $30                                           |
| 2  | 3.7            | East-West      | North Temple + South Temple                       | 400                             | 9.5                               | 11.1                                       | 26.9                                       | 14.6                                       | 27.2                                       | 0.91                                           | 63                                            | 1.5                                           | 600                                            | 19%                                            | 3%                                             | 35%                                           | $90                                           |
| 3  | 7.2            | East-West      | 400 S                                             | 200                             | 9.5                               | 11.1                                       | 26.9                                       | 14.6                                       | 27.2                                       | 0.91                                           | 63                                            | 1.5                                           | 300                                            | 19%                                            | 3%                                             | 35%                                           | $190                                          |
| 4a | 7.5            | East-West      | 900 S                                             | 100                             | 8.9                               | 8.5                                        | 9.6                                        | 9.7                                        | 9.7                                        | 0.47                                           | 58                                            | 1.2                                           | 200                                            | 32%                                            | 15%                                            | 50%                                           | $280                                          |
| 4b | 8.3            | East-West      | 900 S (via 1300 S)                                | 100                             | 8.7                               | 8.0                                        | 10.6                                       | 9.1                                        | 10.7                                       | 0.49                                           | 58                                            | 1.3                                           | 100                                            | 29%                                            | 22%                                            | 36%                                           | $380                                          |
| 5  | 6.8            | East-West      | 2100 S - 2100 E                                  | 200                             | 8.1                               | 8.8                                        | 11.4                                       | 9.5                                        | 11.8                                       | 0.30                                           | 54                                            | 1.5                                           | 300                                            | 22%                                            | 0%                                             | 44%                                           | $190                                          |
| 6  | 10.9           | East-West      | North Temple - 400 S (TRAX Black Line)           | 1,100                           | 7.4                               | 7.4                                        | 16.9                                       | 9.4                                        | 17.5                                       | 0.66                                           | 57                                            | 1.3                                           | 1,100                                          | 31%                                            | 2%                                             | 60%                                           | $50                                           |
| 7  | 8.9            | East-West      | 1300 S                                           | 400                             | 8.5                               | 7.8                                        | 7.7                                        | 8.1                                        | 7.8                                        | 0.33                                           | 54                                            | 1.4                                           | 700                                            | 25%                                            | 15%                                            | 35%                                           | $80                                           |
| 8  | 3.9            | North-South    | State Street                                     | 500                             | 9.9                               | 12.0                                       | 26.1                                       | 15.5                                       | 26.5                                       | 1.04                                           | 76                                            | 1.4                                           | 600                                            | 27%                                            | 19%                                            | 34%                                           | $90                                           |
| 9a | 4.6            | North-South    | 500 E (to LDS Hospital)                          | 700                             | 11.4                              | 13.5                                       | 18.2                                       | 15.1                                       | 18.3                                       | 0.94                                           | 74                                            | 1.1                                           | 900                                            | 20%                                            | 6%                                             | 34%                                           | $60                                           |
| 9b | 3.9            | North-South    | 500 E (to LDS Hospital)                          | 600                             | 11.5                              | 14.2                                       | 16.3                                       | 15.9                                       | 16.4                                       | 0.99                                           | 74                                            | 1.1                                           | 800                                            | 20%                                            | 11%                                            | 28%                                           | $70                                           |
| 10 | 5.3            | North-South    | 1300 E                                           | 300                             | 9.4                               | 10.0                                       | 8.8                                        | 10.4                                       | 9.0                                        | 0.36                                           | 60                                            | 1.4                                           | 300                                            | 15%                                            | 0%                                             | 29%                                           | $160                                          |
| 11a| 5.7            | North-South    | 900 E (to LDS Hospital)                          | 600                             | 9.4                               | 10.0                                       | 8.8                                        | 10.4                                       | 9.0                                        | 0.36                                           | 60                                            | 1.4                                           | 800                                            | 15%                                            | 0%                                             | 29%                                           | $70                                           |
| 11b| 4.4            | North-South    | 900 E (to New Hub)                               | 300                             | 11.5                              | 13.8                                       | 8.1                                        | 14.8                                       | 8.3                                        | 0.68                                           | 71                                            | 1.6                                           | 400                                            | 13%                                            | 2%                                             | 23%                                           | $130                                          |
| 11c| 3.7            | North-South    | 900 E-1100 E (Sugarhouse-New Hub)                | 800                             | 11.3                              | 14.5                                       | 9.1                                        | 15.7                                       | 9.3                                        | 0.73                                           | 73                                            | 1.2                                           | 900                                            | 12%                                            | 2%                                             | 21%                                           | $60                                           |
| 12 | 4.4            | North-South    | Foothill Dr                                      | 100                             | 6.3                               | 5.4                                        | 9.2                                        | 5.4                                        | 9.4                                        | 0.11                                           | 47                                            | 1.9                                           | 500                                            | 27%                                            | 0%                                             | 54%                                           | $120                                          |
| 13 | 3.1            | North-South    | 900 W                                            | 100                             | 9.2                               | 7.5                                        | 10.5                                       | 10.1                                       | 11.1                                       | 0.42                                           | 62                                            | 1.4                                           | 200                                            | 39%                                            | 46%                                            | 33%                                           | $340                                          |
| 14a| 6.8            | North-South    | Redwood Road                                     | 500                             | 7.3                               | 5.5                                        | 4.3                                        | 5.8                                        | 5.0                                        | 0.19                                           | 48                                            | 1.2                                           | 600                                            | 35%                                            | 14%                                            | 56%                                           | $100                                          |
| 14b| 4.4            | North-South    | Redwood Road (to Central Station)                | 500                             | 7.4                               | 5.6                                        | 8.5                                        | 7.6                                        | 9.6                                        | 0.24                                           | 59                                            | 1.2                                           | 700                                            | 37%                                            | 36%                                            | 38%                                           | $80                                           |
| 15 | 4.4            | North-South    | 700 N/600 N                                      | 100                             | 8.9                               | 10.2                                       | 17.2                                       | 13.1                                       | 18.1                                       | 0.46                                           | 70                                            | 1.3                                           | 100                                            | 25%                                            | 17%                                            | 33%                                           | $530                                          |
Figure B-8  Measure F: Accessibility (Walk Score)
## Figure B-9  Corridor Travel Time and Right-of-Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor ID</th>
<th>Corridor Name</th>
<th>Travel Time (Minutes, Round Trip)</th>
<th>Right-of-Way Notes</th>
<th>Recommended for Capital Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>200 S</td>
<td>29-38 (9, 1.31)</td>
<td>1-2 GP lanes per direction, center turn lane, parking, bike lanes</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>North Temple + South Temple</td>
<td>24-35 (11, 1.46)</td>
<td>N. Temple: 2 GP lanes per direction, center turn lane, parking or bike lanes. S. Temple: 2 GP lanes per direction, center-turn lane or parking</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>400 S</td>
<td>36-58 (22, 1.61)</td>
<td>3 GP lanes per direction, parking, TRAX</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>900 S</td>
<td>44-54 (10, 1.23)</td>
<td>2 GP lanes per direction, center turn lane/median, bike lanes, parking or parking/curb extensions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>900 S (via 1300 S)</td>
<td>48-63 (15, 1.31)</td>
<td>see 4a and 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2100 S - 2100 E</td>
<td>36-54 (18, 1.50)</td>
<td>2 GP lanes per direction, center turn lane (varies), curb extensions/parking (varies)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>North Temple - 400 S (TRAX Black Line)</td>
<td>63-85 (22, 1.35)</td>
<td>see 2 and 3</td>
<td>Improvements; planned by UTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1300 S</td>
<td>48-67 (19, 1.40)</td>
<td>2 GP lanes per direction, center turn lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>State Street</td>
<td>24-33 (9, 1.38)</td>
<td>3 GP lanes per direction, center turn/median, parking</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a</td>
<td>500 E (to LDS Hospital)</td>
<td>32-34 (2, 1.06)</td>
<td>2 GP lanes per direction, center turn lane (varies), street parking (varies)</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b</td>
<td>500 E (to New Hub)</td>
<td>28-31 (3, 1.11)</td>
<td>see 9a</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1300 E</td>
<td>28-39 (11, 1.39)</td>
<td>1 or 2 GP lanes, center turn lanes/median (varies), street parking (varies), bike lane (varies)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a</td>
<td>900 E (to LDS Hospital)</td>
<td>38-42 (4, 1.11)</td>
<td>2 GP lanes per direction, center turn lane, parking</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b</td>
<td>900 E (to New Hub)</td>
<td>20-31 (11, 1.55)</td>
<td>see 11a</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11c</td>
<td>900 E-1100 E (Sugarhouse-New Hub)</td>
<td>24-28 (4, 1.17)</td>
<td>see 11a; 1100E: 2 GP lanes, bike lanes, parking</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Foothill Dr</td>
<td>17-32 (15, 1.88)</td>
<td>2-3 GP lanes, center turn lane, parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>900 W</td>
<td>19-27 (8, 1.42)</td>
<td>2 GP lanes, center turn lane, parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14a</td>
<td>Redwood Road</td>
<td>28-34 (6, 1.21)</td>
<td>2-3 GP lanes, center turn lane, bike lanes (varies)</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b</td>
<td>Redwood Road (to Central Station)</td>
<td>24-28 (4, 1.17)</td>
<td>See 14a</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>700 N/600 N</td>
<td>24-32 (8, 1.33)</td>
<td>700/600N: 2 GP lanes per direction, center-turn lane; 300W: 3 GP lanes per direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 2 Corridor Evaluation Results
Salt Lake City Transit Master Plan

Figure B-10  Measure I: Redevelopment Potential

*Parcels where value of improvements (e.g., buildings) is less than or equal to value of land. A lower I/L ratio represents greater redevelopment potential.
FREQUENT TRANSIT NETWORK ANALYSIS

Population and employment density along the analysis corridors was calculated to help recommend FTN corridors. Figure B-11 provides general rules-of-thumb relating transit service frequency to the minimum intensity of land use (e.g., household size, population, and employment) required to support that level of service. These relationships provide useful guidance, however other factors also help determine the level of service justified on a corridor, including serving major activity centers such as the University of Utah, downtown Salt Lake City, or other major anchors or activity centers at one or both ends of a line, as well as the spacing between parallel corridors and providing access to opportunity for vulnerable and transit-dependent populations.

Figure B-11 Density – Frequency Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=5 min</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from TCRP Report 100: Transit Capacity and Quality of Service manual and other sources

Figure B-12 evaluates potential level-of-service warranted on the analysis corridors based on population and employment density alone as well combined population and employment density.
### Figure B-12  Corridor Analysis of Density-Service Level Thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor Number</th>
<th>Corridor Description</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>2040 Population Density</th>
<th>2040 Employment Density</th>
<th>2040 Population + Employment Density</th>
<th>Meets Minimum Threshold For:</th>
<th>Highest Level Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>200 S</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>10 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>North Temple + South Temple</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>10 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>400 S</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>900 S</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>900 S (via 1300 S)</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2100 S - 2100 E</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>North Temple - 400 S (TRAX Black Line)</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1300 S</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>60 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>State Street</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>10 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a</td>
<td>500 E (to LDS Hospital)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b</td>
<td>500 E (to New Hub)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1300 E</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a</td>
<td>900 E (to LDS Hospital)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>60 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b</td>
<td>900 E (to New Hub)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11c</td>
<td>900 E-1100 E (Sugarhouse-New Hub)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Foothill Dr</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>No service</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>900 W</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14a</td>
<td>Redwood Road</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>No service</td>
<td>60 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b</td>
<td>Redwood Road (to Central Station)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>No service</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>700 N/600 N</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: [1] PopDens+0.75*2.5*EmpDens 2040
BRT should not be considered on State St, 500 E or 900 E. An enhanced bus may make more sense. It would stop more often but still have the light frequency neighborhood bus service expansion at the same time to gain the ridership.

The plan recommends both targeted marketing and expansion and refinement of free and pay programs. Specifics will be determined in the implementation phase no change.

We do have this in Fig 3-9, Additional Projects

The plan recommends both targeted marketing and expansion and refinement of free and pay programs. Specifics will be determined in the implementation phase no change.

The plan recommends both targeted marketing and expansion and refinement of free and pay programs. Specifics will be determined in the implementation phase no change.

The plan includes a walking/biking trail with priority travel on high-capacity corridors supports investments in frequent service. Where sufficient right-of-way is available in these corridors, dedicating part of the right-of-way to mass transit is justified based on travel times.

The plan includes a walking/biking trail with priority travel on high-capacity corridors supports investments in frequent service. Where sufficient right-of-way is available in these corridors, dedicating part of the right-of-way to mass transit is justified based on travel times.

The plan does not reference a TRAX outer loop.

This plan analyzed local needs and goals; these corridors may warrant more frequent service on key corridors regardless of mode. No change.

The plan recommends both targeted marketing and expansion and refinement of free and pay programs. Specifics will be determined in the implementation phase no change.

The plan recommends both targeted marketing and expansion and refinement of free and pay programs. Specifics will be determined in the implementation phase no change.

The plan recommends both targeted marketing and expansion and refinement of free and pay programs. Specifics will be determined in the implementation phase no change.

The plan includes a walking/biking trail with priority travel on high-capacity corridors supports investments in frequent service. Where sufficient right-of-way is available in these corridors, dedicating part of the right-of-way to mass transit is justified based on travel times.

None of these assumptions are not supported by current research. A state EIR or typical HMR document would evaluate environmental impacts of any fixed guideway project. No change.

The plan recommends both targeted marketing and expansion and refinement of free and pay programs. Specifics will be determined in the implementation phase no change.

The plan recommends both targeted marketing and expansion and refinement of free and pay programs. Specifics will be determined in the implementation phase no change.

The plan recommends both targeted marketing and expansion and refinement of free and pay programs. Specifics will be determined in the implementation phase no change.

The plan recommends both targeted marketing and expansion and refinement of free and pay programs. Specifics will be determined in the implementation phase no change.

The plan recommends both targeted marketing and expansion and refinement of free and pay programs. Specifics will be determined in the implementation phase no change.

The plan recommends both targeted marketing and expansion and refinement of free and pay programs. Specifics will be determined in the implementation phase no change.
Please stop ignoring ADA. Putting bus stops more than one block away from the next ferry/fix-it bus and ADA stops.

The SLC Accessibility Council has made recommendations that will be incorporated, and they will be considered during implementation. Changes await responses.

Concur with the comments of the ADA. No change.

Review of Fig 3-8 shows ADA deficiencies, including the width of bus stops, which increases congestion and pollution.

This is acknowledged with the comments of the ADA. No change.

The Plan should require that UTA have real-time signs on all bus stops to note when the next bus is coming. Do not pay the patent troll that says that they have the patent for this.

The plan recommends the use of time passenger information. It is unclear what patent is being referenced. No change.

There are no minimum parking requirements in Transit Station Area districts. Define the "core" of Transit Station Area (TSA) districts, no minimum number of parking spaces is required for any use. Studies show that the walk distance to transit stops (Bike-Generator Master study suggests that is standard due to a lack of targeted legislation and parking lots, full if you're reduced).

The plan does not make specific parking requirement recommendations but does recommend transportation demand management, which includes parking policies supported by current research and local conditions. No change.

Come against the suggestion from the Sugar House study that "require that all shared parking be priced." It is a GDS, TIA, and L四个 districts on existing and direct access.

The comment relates to another study. No change.

Instead of using the 'sticker' TIAA to exchange services (TIAA) or the only thing that is being built are apartments, not mixed use TODs. Simple "Encourage development of transit-oriented development (TOD) through form-based codes and shaded/covered areas within a 10-minute walk of TOD, pedestrian and high-

It is unclear what change to the Transit Master Plan is desired. No change.

Do not recommend that bus stops in residential areas have signs which encourage soliciting and will attract homeless.

It is unclear what change to the Transit Master Plan is desired. No change.

Additional discussion on future transit stops and the Sugar House Light Rail. It needs to be implemented.

This is an illustrative example of how bus service could be reconfigured rather than a network perspective. The plan also examined how it would connect with the rest of the network; a future corridor study would determine whether this connection would be on a route or another mode. References to the project were removed. No change.

Allow the "bicyclist network" fit? This is a sentiment expressed in the Executive Summary, what is going on with that? Is the connectivity going to get the level of attention it needs? It sure doesn't look like it from this plan.

Agree that language could be incorporated, perhaps into Chapter 6.

The Sugar House S-Line needs to be extended (route to be determined).

Concur with Council Direction. No change.

The downtown circulator needs to be built (including brick and pedestrian safety is expensive on streets that will necessarily have both).

Concur with Council Direction. No change.

Additionally, a streetcar needs to be implemented on 400 W in the Granary District on some tracks.

Concur with Council Direction. No change.

The downtown circulator needs to be built (although brick and pedestrian safety is expensive on streets that will necessarily have both).

Concur with Council Direction. No change.

What is the assumed timeline for this? Is this a sentiment expressed in the Executive Summary, what is going on with that? Is the connectivity going to get the level of attention it needs? It sure doesn't look like it from this plan.

Agree that language could be incorporated, perhaps into Chapter 6.

In order to reevaluate and reaffirmed that the alignment is supported from both a local mobility perspective. The plan also examined how it would connect with the rest of the network; a future corridor study would determine whether this connection would be on a route or another mode. References to the project were removed. No change.

Concur with Council Direction. No change.

The downtown circulator needs to be built (including brick and pedestrian safety is expensive on streets that will necessarily have both).

Concur with Council Direction. No change.

Additionally, a streetcar needs to be implemented on 400 W in the Granary District on some tracks.

Concur with Council Direction. No change.

This is a sentiment expressed in the Executive Summary, what is going on with that? Is the connectivity going to get the level of attention it needs? It sure doesn't look like it from this plan.

Agree that language could be incorporated, perhaps into Chapter 6.

The downtown circulator needs to be built (although brick and pedestrian safety is expensive on streets that will necessarily have both).

Concur with Council Direction. No change.

Additionally, a streetcar needs to be implemented on 400 W in the Granary District on some tracks.

Concur with Council Direction. No change.

This is a sentiment expressed in the Executive Summary, what is going on with that? Is the connectivity going to get the level of attention it needs? It sure doesn't look like it from this plan.

Agree that language could be incorporated, perhaps into Chapter 6.

The downtown circulator needs to be built (although brick and pedestrian safety is expensive on streets that will necessarily have both).

Concur with Council Direction. No change.

Additionally, a streetcar needs to be implemented on 400 W in the Granary District on some tracks.

Concur with Council Direction. No change.

This is a sentiment expressed in the Executive Summary, what is going on with that? Is the connectivity going to get the level of attention it needs? It sure doesn't look like it from this plan.

Agree that language could be incorporated, perhaps into Chapter 6.

The downtown circulator needs to be built (although brick and pedestrian safety is expensive on streets that will necessarily have both).

Concur with Council Direction. No change.

Additionally, a streetcar needs to be implemented on 400 W in the Granary District on some tracks.

Concur with Council Direction. No change.

This is a sentiment expressed in the Executive Summary, what is going on with that? Is the connectivity going to get the level of attention it needs? It sure doesn't look like it from this plan.

Agree that language could be incorporated, perhaps into Chapter 6.
Transit Service Delivery: a. City-Transit Agency Partnership i. While UTA should take into consideration the needs of SLC, it is clear that SLC should see transit as a tool to reduce vehicle use in the downtown area especially. This should be a short term goal, with a transit system being a long term goal. This is a concern with a fundable recommendation of the plan to strengthen the partnership of City and UTA. While a City system was a reasonable concept evaluated, it did not rise to the top. Private contracts would only be considered for alternate service delivery models, e.g., employer shuttle and ride-sharing programs and would still involve some level of cooperation with UTA and its system. No change.

b. Reliably on the goal of the transit system mentioned? While there are other public transit systems in the State of Utah, the idea of creating smaller communities around the state, including Logan and Park City have free bus service. This goal needs to be mentioned if SLC is serious about transit success. This is something that is backed up by past discussions and past which UTA has indicated they will not be able to do. Therefore, the City would need to pursue alternative fare and pass program in lieu of free fare zone expansion. No change.

c. The plan includes a number of ideas, such as the implementation of train through downtown. This introduces the need for alternative service delivery models, e.g., employer shuttle and ride-sharing programs and would still involve some level of cooperation with UTA and its system. No change.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Access to the Transit System: a. The emphasis in the plan for this component of the plan is not as high as expected. This will ultimately be a way to avoid fully serving some neighborhoods. Also, I'm not convinced that a number of ideas, such as the implementation of train through downtown. This introduces the need for alternative service delivery models, e.g., employer shuttle and ride-sharing programs and would still involve some level of cooperation with UTA and its system. No change.

Affordability: a. We see the previously submitted proposal submitted to SLC Transportation multiple times. See attached document. (3) 10,000 Wheels for Affordable Transportation that builds a sustainable program for affordable transit, cycling, walking, and an coordinated way. Recommendation 4.2 supports prioritizing expansion of Greenbike in the near future. No change.

Greenbike: a. Greenbike is an incredibly important part of the Transit system, yet it is barely mentioned in the document. With UTA plans for redesigning the system over the next 20 years, Greenbike needs to be expanded to be truly viable, not just in the downtown area. Greenbike is a key component that allows for riders to move from one transit mode to another. It needs to be expanded to Sugarhouse, the west side, State Street corridor, Liberty Park, U of U area, and south the entire city. Greenbike needs to be a tool for people in all areas of the County and not just downtown. Greenbike is a component of the expansion of the Greenline. Greenline and full-funding bicycling infrastructure is also needed to make it safe and easy to use. See below - if SLC is serious about getting people out of cars in transit, they must fund bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure as well as the expansion of Greenline. Greenbike must become a system that can be used by all, regardless of income level. Currently, it is not.

2. No Change

3. Concur with response

4. Concur with response

5. Concur with response

6. No Change

7. No Change

8. No Change

9. Concur with response

10. Concur with response

11. Concur with response

12. Concur with response

13. Concur with response

14. No Change

15. Concur with response

16. No Change

17. Concur with response

18. Concur with response

19. Concur with response

20. Concur with response

21. Concur with response

22. Concur with response

23. Concur with response

24. Concur with response

25. Concur with response

26. No Change

27. Concur with response

28. Concur with response

29. Concur with response

30. Concur with response

31. Concur with response

32. Concur with response

33. Concur with response

34. Concur with response

35. Concur with response

36. Concur with response

37. Concur with response

38. Concur with response

39. Concur with response

40. Concur with response

41. Concur with response

42. Concur with response

43. Concur with response

44. Concur with response

45. Concur with response

46. Concur with response

47. Concur with response

48. Concur with response

49. Concur with response

50. Concur with response

51. Concur with response

52. Concur with response

53. Concur with response

54. Concur with response

55. Concur with response

56. Concur with response

57. Concur with response

58. Concur with response

59. Concur with response

60. Concur with response

61. Concur with response

62. Concur with response

63. Concur with response

64. Concur with response

65. Concur with response
I also liked someone’s idea of having reduced or free fare on public transit on days with low rider volumes. This could be a great way to encourage more people to use transit, especially those who may otherwise be hesitant due to cost. potatoes

44. What would be the main goal to set near transit nodes north and south of public transit service areas? Increase ridership and encourage economic development in those areas. potatoes

45. I would agree with several people that transit needs to be more efficient to get people to use, and zoning transit lines to avoid red lights could be a great way to do this. Great to see changes being made! potatoes

46. Why is 900 South preferable to 1300 South (on the east side of SLC), as part of the Tier 1 plan? Seems like 1000 South would be better spacing between routes until additional service is added. No change.

47. More detail about possible ways to consolidate service to pay for additions to the network is needed. No change.

48. The Transit Master Plan would place frequent transit on 400 South. This duplicates current transit service on 200 South. No change.

49. I suggest building a Trax line on 400 South to replace the 220 bus. The 300 South corridor is a lot more complicated than 400 South, but it could still be a good option. Some options are spelled out, but without a clear plan forward, it’s a drawn-out crawl.

50. The plan should do a good job of outlining how to increase transit – by improving service, frequency, and time of day for service. However, there are too many issues. potatoes

51. This isn’t identified as an ITND corridor, however, even with projected growth, it doesn’t generate ridership comparable to other corridors that would require grade separation, such as 900 S. No change.

52. The plan is focused more on developing a rail system rather than evaluating existing service. potatoes

53. The strategic plan needs to ensure that the network is well-balanced and that the frequencies are appropriate for the needs of the different areas. potatoes

54. If the plan isn’t successful, UTA would have to meet with potential funding sources, along with magnitude and yet of access, as identified in Chapter 7. A detailed funding package will be developed in later phases and will be assembled incrementally. No change.

55. The plan identifies UTA as a partner in this city with the city will work to implement conditions and agreements/changes in the city limits. No change.

56. The plan does not recommend new TRAX lines. TRAX is in exclusive lanes and has signal priority in most locations in the City. Some signals are controlled by the State. No change.

57. It’s a great plan for future use, but if we are to think about what we can do now, there is no clear plan forward. It is a drawn-out crawl.

58. The plan does not contemplate that the time to move through the entire downtown (trip in time still to do this) is that, in the interval, I needed to add some general thoughts: for a single mode: and has then to be more comfortable. This corridor could be great on many more than one day. It may be possible to co-locate all three limited service on 2400 S. The corridor could be more useful, etc. For example, we have close to the 2400 South corridor to Central Front and front to front for these corridors if they are available on those days. And that would work even if you only offered every second every two every three within the city all day, a day of a Saturday or Sunday.

59. The plan should have a plan for peak periods, especially, having ‘green line’ days in which time of frequency and GCU line in time. potatoes

60. The plan doesn’t prioritize planning in the near-term, it is too long-term and has a focus on the long-term. The plan should be more future-oriented and prioritize near-term planning. potatoes

61. The plan doesn’t address specific routes, it does include all the corridors and one-two and three corridors in the frequent service network, which calls for at least one\. A few more service encounters, on the other hand, will be needed. Also, it’s important that Trax takes advantage of the trains on regular service.

62. The plan should do a better job of outlining how to increase transit – by improving service, frequency, and time of day for service. However, there are too many issues. potatoes

63. The plan does not take into account how easy it is to get to the center of the city. By having multiple transit lines, people need to get from the train to where they want to go. potatoes

64. The plan doesn’t have a clear plan for peak periods, especially, having ‘green line’ days in which time of frequency and GCU line in time. potatoes

65. The plan doesn’t address specific routes, it does include all the corridors and one-two and three corridors in the frequent service network, which calls for at least one\. A few more service encounters, on the other hand, will be needed. Also, it’s important that Trax takes advantage of the trains on regular service.

66. The plan should do a better job of outlining how to increase transit – by improving service, frequency, and time of day for service. However, there are too many issues. potatoes
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68. The plan doesn’t prioritize planning in the near-term, it is too long-term and has a focus on the long-term. The plan should be more future-oriented and prioritize near-term planning. potatoes

69. The plan doesn’t have an implementation plan, it is too long-term and has a focus on the long-term. The plan should be more future-oriented and prioritize near-term planning. potatoes

70. The plan doesn’t have a clear plan for peak periods, especially, having ‘green line’ days in which time of frequency and GCU line in time. potatoes
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72. The plan doesn’t have a clear plan for peak periods, especially, having ‘green line’ days in which time of frequency and GCU line in time. potatoes

73. The plan doesn’t prioritize planning in the near-term, it is too long-term and has a focus on the long-term. The plan should be more future-oriented and prioritize near-term planning. potatoes

74. The plan doesn’t have a clear plan for peak periods, especially, having ‘green line’ days in which time of frequency and GCU line in time. potatoes

75. The plan doesn’t prioritize planning in the near-term, it is too long-term and has a focus on the long-term. The plan should be more future-oriented and prioritize near-term planning. potatoes

76. The plan doesn’t have a clear plan for peak periods, especially, having ‘green line’ days in which time of frequency and GCU line in time. potatoes

77. The plan doesn’t prioritize planning in the near-term, it is too long-term and has a focus on the long-term. The plan should be more future-oriented and prioritize near-term planning. potatoes

78. The plan doesn’t prioritize planning in the near-term, it is too long-term and has a focus on the long-term. The plan should be more future-oriented and prioritize near-term planning. potatoes

79. The plan doesn’t prioritize planning in the near-term, it is too long-term and has a focus on the long-term. The plan should be more future-oriented and prioritize near-term planning. potatoes

80. The plan doesn’t prioritize planning in the near-term, it is too long-term and has a focus on the long-term. The plan should be more future-oriented and prioritize near-term planning. potatoes

81. The plan doesn’t prioritize planning in the near-term, it is too long-term and has a focus on the long-term. The plan should be more future-oriented and prioritize near-term planning. potatoes

82. The plan doesn’t prioritize planning in the near-term, it is too long-term and has a focus on the long-term. The plan should be more future-oriented and prioritize near-term planning. potatoes

83. The plan doesn’t prioritize planning in the near-term, it is too long-term and has a focus on the long-term. The plan should be more future-oriented and prioritize near-term planning. potatoes

84. The plan doesn’t prioritize planning in the near-term, it is too long-term and has a focus on the long-term. The plan should be more future-oriented and prioritize near-term planning. potatoes

85. The plan doesn’t prioritize planning in the near-term, it is too long-term and has a focus on the long-term. The plan should be more future-oriented and prioritize near-term planning. potatoes

86. The plan doesn’t prioritize planning in the near-term, it is too long-term and has a focus on the long-term. The plan should be more future-oriented and prioritize near-term planning. potatoes

87. The plan doesn’t prioritize planning in the near-term, it is too long-term and has a focus on the long-term. The plan should be more future-oriented and prioritize near-term planning. potatoes

88. The plan doesn’t prioritize planning in the near-term, it is too long-term and has a focus on the long-term. The plan should be more future-oriented and prioritize near-term planning. potatoes

89. The plan doesn’t prioritize planning in the near-term, it is too long-term and has a focus on the long-term. The plan should be more future-oriented and prioritize near-term planning. potatoes

90. The plan doesn’t prioritize planning in the near-term, it is too long-term and has a focus on the long-term. The plan should be more future-oriented and prioritize near-term planning. potatoes
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94. The plan doesn’t prioritize planning in the near-term, it is too long-term and has a focus on the long-term. The plan should be more future-oriented and prioritize near-term planning. potatoes
The draft plan uses the word "Portland" 19 times on 10 different pages. That's not a bad
response. Positive. No change.

I recently moved from the U of U area where I regularly rode the 220, 209, 2, etc. All of
response. Positive. No change.

I think something this plan doesn't address is increasing the ability to transport bikes on
response. Positive. No change.

Travelling from the west side to the east side now takes far longer than it should
response. Positive. No change.

I am not a resident of Salt Lake City, however, I work in Salt Lake City Monday through
response. Positive. No change.

I'd also like to see the continued improvement of sidewalks, and more hawk lights in
response. Positive. No change.

...that there is a great transit network (and Salt Lake City is close), the City can afford to be
response. Positive. No change.

new transit riders as long as private vehicles are the most convenient mode. As long as
response. Positive. No change.

usage. A state-of-the-art transit network alone may not attract a significant number of
response. Positive. No change.

...roadways going East and West. With West being the first
response. Positive. No change.

other words all outbound roadways leading South and or North, especially main
response. Positive. No change.

6:00 pm should be given secondary considerations when it comes to synchronization. In
response. Positive. No change.

less stops would also make things better if it was clearly marked which buses were
response. Positive. No change.

make a huge difference.
response. Positive. No change.

any transit plan in a metro area as spread out as ours.
response. Positive. No change.

considerations would be roadways going East and West. With West being the first
response. Positive. No change.

without an emphasis on how East and West side
response. Positive. No change.

improve speed. Thanks for the time everyone is putting into this!
response. Positive. No change.

can't take my bike, transit isn't an option any longer. This will probably become more
response. Positive. No change.

need to take my bike with me because of my commute at the end of the line. Thus, if I
response. Positive. No change.

transit and SAFE storage (i.e. lockers). It is quite frustrating when you show up on to a
response. Positive. No change.

transit plan recommendations. No change.
response. Positive. No change.

...that the west side and our needs will be
response. Positive. No change.

indepth study of this important issue. I was glad to see the west side, particularly Rose
response. Positive. No change.

...suggest sentiments that there is low ridership on the west side - I believe as an effect of
response. Positive. No change.

...but I would address it differently. The major roadways should be a high priority for leaving
response. Positive. No change.

...as well. The plan identifies midnight as a minimum standard for frequent service, if resources
response. Positive. No change.

...of those where increase FTN frequency and hours
response. Positive. No change.

...the needs of private vehicles are addressed in
response. Positive. No change.

...for the east side. By example, I lived in Rose Park in
response. Positive. No change.

...to the west side, where residents have statistically lower income, even in a win-win
response. Positive. No change.

...to the west side, particularly Rose Park, as a result of the study outcomes
response. Positive. No change.

...that plans to provide better services to this area will be put off or
response. Positive. No change.

...compromises which that will inevitably entail, that the west side and our needs will be
response. Positive. No change.

...and with significant concentrations of people most likely to ride transit. Alternative service models
response. Positive. No change.

...potentially more riders - including those with lower incomes. - FTN corridors are proposed in locations
response. Positive. No change.

...in sections of the West Side where frequent all-day service would not be the most efficient way to serve
response. Positive. No change.

...will be put off or forgotten and/or that plans to provide better services to this area will be put off or
response. Positive. No change.

...an effect of low ridership on the west side. In fact, I am in a
response. Positive. No change.

...and it's not because ridership is low - it's because the
response. Positive. No change.

...as part of the response to 2015, UTILITY is installing bike racks on buses that have a higher capacity, in
response. Positive. No change.

...on UTA everyday and have been for 9 years to commute to the University of Utah from the
response. Positive. No change.

...the neighborhood. It also has excellent ridership. The hours of the 6 should be extended
response. Positive. No change.

...and worked at the University of Utah. Public transit to the U involved 2
response. Positive. No change.

...of people who live more than a few blocks from major routes. And even better if we all
response. Positive. No change.

...all outbound roadways leading South and or North, especially main
response. Positive. No change.

...the west side at the same rate as it has for the east side. By example, I lived in Rose Park in
response. Positive. No change.

...to partner with UTA on reconfiguration and increased frequencies that will minimize
response. Positive. No change.

...and because most of the city's
response. Positive. No change.

...the various study outcomes
response. Positive. No change.

...that FTN corridors are proposed in locations
response. Positive. No change.

...a neighborhood that can connect with the UTA system to provide more frequent transit to these
response. Positive. No change.

...might consider a neighborhood that can connect with the UTA system to provide more frequent transit
response. Positive. No change.

...of people who live more than a few blocks from major routes. And even better if we all
response. Positive. No change.

...and did not happen to a
response. Positive. No change.
Thank you again for all of your work on this. I am encouraged that Utah is investing in its Transit Signal Priority, segments of dedicated lane, and improving stops into level.

The new transit centers near the hospitals and at 2nd & 7th are welcome. I might suggest that they will abolish that route totally! So even though I live in the city, pay taxes etc., I look into my neighborhood of 88th and hickory boxes of 10th will get nothing.

I get on at the south end of the red line and get off around 3900 S most times that I ride. It looks as though my neighborhood just south of I 80 and many blocks east of 13th will be of no change.

I am not a Millennial, but I walk and take public transportation because it is a part of my life. However, we also have to get them to destinations beyond the center of town once

Positive. No change.

No change.

I get nothing. Great!
I applaud avoiding Research Park along the Foothill BRT/Bus plus (line 12). The lack of a 1,250 BRT would mean that some combination of rail and light rail will have to handle the traffic demand at a major freeway. Given the difficulty and cost of widening other thoroughfares, using higher capacity alternative to make more efficient use of limited ROW is an excellent idea.

Identical with the plan’s intention. However, the plan does not make specific mode recommendations, and these suggestions from prior plans are being considered against various alternatives to determine which would maximize ridership.

Zero. No change.

0 - No Change

1 - Concur with response.

1 - Change

There is also possibility for a branded bus route to connect hotels in the southern part of downtown with the Salt Palace and TRAX.

Resulting in consistent with the plan’s recommendations. The FTN would serve connections between the hotels/southern downtown area and central business district. No change.

Original route in travel lane and it has signal priority in mixed traffic in the City. Signals at 700 S and 600 S are controlled by the State, however, the City advocates for transit priority. No change.

0 - No Change

1 - Concur with response.

1 - Change

We need bike lanes or parking areas in congested areas to allow bikes to move past congested traffic.

Consistent with plan recommendations. No change.

0 - No Change

1 - Concur with response.

I would love to see more evening service to the Westside, I have to be home by 7 or I

Would add language stating that the City will continue to work with UTA to consider the

1 - Change

0 - No Change

1 - Concur with response.

I ride Front Runner a lot. I have been to the Ogden Station and they have a café. I go all

Would be consistent in a response plan on individual projects is implemented. No change.

1 - Concur with response.

0 - No Change

1 - Change
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1 - Concur with

This plan is neither a bicycle plan nor a plan for private vehicles, but rather focuses

Largely consistent with the plan’s recommendations, however, the plan does not

0 - No Change

1 - Concur with response.

1 - Change

I like that you have a simple phased approach to improving the system.

Can’t be compared to improvements of the system.

1 - Concur with

1 - Change

1 - Concur with

The lack of pedestrian signals at intersections increases the risk of accident for

1 - Change

0 - No Change

1 - Concur with response.

I would start researching ways to improve the 400 South and Main intersection to find

1 - Change

0 - No Change

1 - Concur with response.

This project is addressed in a separate and more detailed study. This plan supports

1 - Change

0 - No Change

1 - Concur with response.

Why is there not more talk about expanding trax? I hate the bus, everyone hates taking

1 - Concur with

1 - Change

0 - No Change

1 - Change

If I could park at a station it would be a lot smaller but you guys are now building some

1 - Concur with response.

1 - Change

0 - No Change

1 - Concur with response.

You guys are bike and walking bananas. I hope someday you guys don’t get some

1 - Concur with response.

0 - No Change

1 - Change

1 - Concur with

0 - No Change

1 - Concur with response.

1 - Concur with

0 - No Change

1 - Concur with response.

This master plan feels like it’s taking a million ideas without giving any clear direction. I get the importance of connecting what we have to much bigger ideas, but are we not capable of being innovative and coming up with our own solutions?

No suggested changes. No change.

1 - Change

0 - No Change

1 - Concur with response.

I would love to see some kind of idea of where the light rail will go in the future. I don’t get why there is so much talk about new ideas and making changes to current ideas, and makes me wonder if we will ever get to a stage that it will actually happen.

1 - Concur with response.

1 - Change

0 - No Change

1 - Concur with response.

If I could park at a station it would be a lot smaller but you guys are now building some

1 - Concur with response.

1 - Change

0 - No Change

1 - Concur with response.

This plan is mode neutral. Mode has been/will be explored in more detailed corridor

1 - Change

0 - No Change

1 - Concur with response.

Your guys are bike and walking bananas. I hope someday you guys don’t get some

1 - Concur with response.

0 - No Change

1 - Change

1 - Concur with

0 - No Change

1 - Concur with response.

This plan supports what study’s recommendations, with the exception of parking. This plan recommends a connection to the university via a temporary extension of the Downtown Connector.

1 - Concur with response.

1 - Change

0 - No Change

1 - Concur with response.

Increased access to both Salt Lake City and Provo during winter and summer.

These are outside the scope of this plan. However, it is worth incorporating significant changes to only bus service that will add increased service to these areas. No change.

1 - Change

0 - No Change

1 - Concur with response.

1 - Concur with

1 - Change

0 - No Change

1 - Change

1 - Concur with

0 - No Change

1 - Concur with response.

As noted above, with the exception of Fig 3-4.
The plan is difficult to access with a reader for the visually impaired.

The purpose of the FTN is to give equal importance to all frequent transit corridors in the network regardless of whether the service is delivered by bus or rail.

The City must provide safe and accessible routes to all stops, including potential stops available within 10 miles of vehicle location; generally operates between 6 AM-8 PM.

If the network is not fully accessible for people with disabilities, the city agency should work with other providers to prevent any negative impact for paratransit riders.

The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.

The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.

Can we provide a Word version of the doc? Also, can we revise any graphics with text rather than revising graphics? Yes, we have some examples we could add.

The Master Transit Plan draft does not mention the needs of people with access to the city. Changes are addressed in response to similar comments.

The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.

Language will be added based on input from the disabled community. Changes are captured in the responses to those comments.

Where pedestrian access is described in the plan, it refers to pedestrians - including those using mobility devices - of all abilities. No change.

One approach is to build requirements regarding accessible transportation into the City's main plan.

Language will be added based on input from the disabled community. Changes are captured in the responses to those comments.

Where pedestrian access is described in the plan, it refers to pedestrians - including those using mobility devices - of all abilities. No change.

The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.

Where pedestrian access is described in the plan, it refers to pedestrians - including those using mobility devices - of all abilities. No change.

The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.

Language will be added based on input from the disabled community. Changes are captured in the responses to those comments.

The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.

Language will be added based on input from the disabled community. Changes are captured in the responses to those comments.

The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.

Language will be added based on input from the disabled community. Changes are captured in the responses to those comments.

The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.

Language will be added based on input from the disabled community. Changes are captured in the responses to those comments.

The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.

Language will be added based on input from the disabled community. Changes are captured in the responses to those comments.

The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.

Language will be added based on input from the disabled community. Changes are captured in the responses to those comments.

The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.
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The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.

Language will be added based on input from the disabled community. Changes are captured in the responses to those comments.

The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.

Language will be added based on input from the disabled community. Changes are captured in the responses to those comments.

The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.
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The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.

Language will be added based on input from the disabled community. Changes are captured in the responses to those comments.

The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.

Language will be added based on input from the disabled community. Changes are captured in the responses to those comments.

The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.

Language will be added based on input from the disabled community. Changes are captured in the responses to those comments.

The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.

Language will be added based on input from the disabled community. Changes are captured in the responses to those comments.

The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.

Language will be added based on input from the disabled community. Changes are captured in the responses to those comments.

The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.
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The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.
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The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.
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The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.
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The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.

Language will be added based on input from the disabled community. Changes are captured in the responses to those comments.

The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.

Language will be added based on input from the disabled community. Changes are captured in the responses to those comments.

The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.

Language will be added based on input from the disabled community. Changes are captured in the responses to those comments.

The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.

Language will be added based on input from the disabled community. Changes are captured in the responses to those comments.

The City staff will research best practices to ensure equal access for shared rides, regardless of ability. Others specifically add paratransit vehicles, either in a distance-based system or a fixed route system.
We appreciate that the City will provide real-time information at bus stops. However, the City must ensure that the information is provided in an accessible manner to all individuals, including those with visual and hearing impairments.

This will be further explored in bus stop design guidelines and, with consultation from the City's Accessibility Council. No change, except as may be included in response to related comments.

1 - No Change
1 - Concur with response

1. This is a complex report with much detail provided. I believe simplification and a back to basics approach should be taken. The Tier 1/tier 2 approach with all the niceties mentioned is too complex and delays a usable bus system. Why not forget Tier 1 and simply implement Tier 2? Add the routes step by step and implement Tier 3 later. Let's work to get the public on the buses. We all know the main issue is lack of routes and frequency of service. Other items mentioned in this study are good but should be secondary. IMPLEMENT THE GRID NOW.

The first part of this comment refers to the full plan rather than the executive summary. The primary purpose of the former is to guide staff and inform others who want to delve into technical details, while the primary purpose of the latter is to distill the full report into something digestible for the general public. Tiers are provided to identify corridors where near-term investments are most needed rather than to limit what is implemented, but if funding allows, the full network can be implemented sooner. Consider renaming the Executive Summary as the plan and the full report as the technical report.

1 - Change Required
1 - Concur with response

Suggest to rename Executive Summary as “Summary Report”. In addition, in order for a grid to be effective, the Tier 1 corridors must have frequent service. Let's discuss; by 'investments' I mean service and capital (as appropriate) so I think we are on the same page.

1 - No Change
1 - Change Required
1 - Concur with response

2. Security and Crime Mitigation measures are not mentioned. This concern is addressed in response to similar comments.

No change.

3 - No Change
3 - Change Required
3 - Concur with response

3. Energy efficient/non polluting transit system not in goals. This is consistent with the plan's recommendations. No change.

No change.

3 - No Change
3 - Change Required
3 - Concur with response

4. Favor grid model in SLC and radial model outside City to nodes (PARKING AT OUTER NODES SHOULD BE PROVIDED)

Outside City limits and, therefore, the purview of this plan. No change.

3 - No Change
3 - Change Required
3 - Concur with response

5. 1/2 mile between parallel grid routes is ok provided transfer points are provided at grid route crossings. This should be the starting point for minimum FTNs. From the midpoint, this is about a quarter mile. No change.

Corridor spacing assumes that riders would not need to walk from one corridor to another parallel corridor, but rather to walk to the corridor that is closest. From the midpoint, this is about a quarter mile. No change.

3 - No Change
3 - Change Required
3 - Concur with response

6. Public education program on how to use the “system”. This is consistent with the plan's recommendations. No change.

No change.

3 - No Change
3 - Change Required
3 - Concur with response

7. Page 2-11 states others are working on Foothill Drive. Effort should be made to coordinate this document with Foothill Drive goal and solutions. No coordination is provided in this document.

This plan is intended to be a ‘living document’ that can respond to new information and/or conditions. When the Foothill Drive Implementation Strategy is complete, this plan will accommodate its recommendations. No change.

3 - No Change
3 - Change Required
3 - Concur with response

8. More transit hubs (with parking) should be provided. I.e. At exterior of SLC at NE, SE, SW and NW proximity to boundaries.

New transit hubs are recommended in this plan within the City, and without reference to parking. Points outside of City limits are not within the purview of this plan. No change.

3 - No Change
3 - Change Required
3 - Concur with response

4. Consider a program that provides free passes for seniors. This could be considered as a strategy with fare and pass programs during the implementation phase.

This was not a UTA park and ride; people were parking illegally on private property and the owner began to enforce its prohibition of public parking. There is no available land to build public parking in this area, however, the FTN provides stronger connections to the station. No change.

3 - No Change
3 - Change Required
3 - Concur with response

5. Reopen the park and ride lot at the North Temple TRAX/FrontRunner station. This was not a UTA park and ride; people were parking illegally on private property and the owner began to enforce its prohibition of public parking. There is no available land to build public parking in this area, however, the FTN provides stronger connections to the station. No change.

No change.

3 - No Change
3 - Change Required
3 - Concur with response
Notice of Public Hearing

On Wednesday, November 30, 2016, the Salt Lake City Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to consider making recommendations to the City Council regarding the following petitions:

1. 7th Street Cottages Zoning Map Amendment, Subdivision and Planned Development at approximately 868 E. 2700 South and 2716 S. 900 East — Adam Noah, representing Growth Aid LLC, is requesting approval from the City to develop five (5) residential lots on two properties located at the above listed address. The existing homes on the 2700 South property will be demolished and the home on the 900 East property will remain. The project requires a zoning map amendment, a subdivision, and planned development approval. The two properties are currently zoned R-1/7,000 (Single Family Residential District), and are located in City Council District 7, represented by Liz Adams. (Staff contact: Lex Troughton, (801) 535-6184, or lex.troughton@slcgov.com.)

   a. Zoning Map Amendment — A request to amend the zoning map for the subject properties from R-1/7,000 (Single Family Residential) to R-1/5,000 (Single Family Residential), Case Number PINSL2016-00057.

   b. Preliminary Subdivision Plan — A request to subdivide and reconfigure two existing parcels into five new parcels. One parcel will contain an existing home and four new vacant residential lots will be created. Case Number PINSL2016-00055.

   c. Planned Development — A request for planned development approval to address the creation of a lot without street frontage and the creation of a development with average lot sizes to meet or exceed the 5,000 square foot minimum in the R-1/5,000 Zone. Case Number PINSL2016-00059.

2. Cottage Court Development — Zoning Map Amendment, Subdivision and Planned Development at approximately 3101 S. 900 East — Adam Noah, representing Growth Aid LLC, is requesting approval from the City to develop sixteen (16) residential lots on four properties located at the above listed address. The existing homes on the properties would be demolished to facilitate this project. The project requires a zoning map amendment, a subdivision, and planned development approvals. The two properties are currently zoned R-1/7,000 (Single Family Residential District), and are located in City Council District 7, represented by Liz Adams. (Staff contact: Anthony Riederer, (801) 535-7625, or anthony.riederer@slcgov.com.)

   a. Zoning Map Amendment — A request to amend the zoning map for the subject properties from R-1/7,000 (Single Family Residential) to R-1/5,000 (Single Family Residential), Case Number PINSL2016-00054.

   b. Preliminary Subdivision Plan — A request to subdivide and reconfigure four existing parcels into sixteen new parcels. Case Number PINSL2016-00041.

   c. Planned Development — A request for planned development approval to address the creation of a lot without street frontage, for relief from required yards, and for the creation of a development with average lot sizes to meet or exceed the 5,000 square foot minimum in the R-1/5,000 Zone. Case Number PINSL2016-00042.

The public hearing will begin at 5:30 p.m. in room 326 of the City County Building, 451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, UT.

The City & County Building is an accessible facility. People with disabilities may make requests for reasonable accommodation, which may include alternate formats, interpreters, and other auxiliary aids and services. Please make requests at least two business days in advance. To make a request, please contact the Planning Office at 801-535-7797, or relay service 1122507.
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The purpose of this staff report is to present the draft Transit Master Plan to the Planning Commission. This report is in preparation for a briefing on the Plan at Commission’s November 9 meeting as part of the adoption process.

REQUEST:

Mayor Jackie Biskupski requests that the Planning Commission review the draft Transit Master Plan, in preparation for adoption.

BACKGROUND & KEY ELEMENTS OF THE PLAN:

The Transit Master Plan is the first plan of its kind for Salt Lake City. The plan evaluates travel patterns and transit needs citywide in order to develop high-level recommendations for transit service, infrastructure, and supportive investments, programs and policies over the next twenty years. It also identifies strategies for implementation, including potential funding sources, key moves for early success and momentum, and a governance model. A key focus of the plan is to respond to and prepare for growth in population and jobs, the desire to improve air quality, changing demographics and transportation preferences, and the impact of transportation choices on health and household budgets.

The Transit Master Plan’s primary recommendations include a grid-based network of high frequency transit corridors, development of alternate service models for lower-density residential neighborhoods and employment centers, and safe and convenient access to transit. It also recommends better information and system legibility, fare programs, and supportive land use and parking policies. The Plan’s Executive Summary provides a high-level overview of the key recommendations. The full plan, including all appendices, can be found on the project website’s Project Documents page.

The plan will be used by several of the City’s agencies to provide guidance in implementing service and infrastructure improvements, as well as to strengthen our relationship and clearly communicate priorities with UTA. The new proposed plan will be used in coordination with the recently adopted Pedestrian & Bicycle Master plan, the City’s overall Transportation Master Plan, Plan Salt Lake and area master plans throughout the City.

PROCESS:

The Planning Commission was briefed early in the process, and the project team utilized input received there to develop the plan, particularly project goals and stakeholder coordination. Council have been briefed four
times prior during the plan process, with accompanying transmittals and presentations. These have included summaries of public engagement at each step.

The Salt Lake City Transportation Division now presents the draft master plan, along with a summary of the public and staff comments.

Revisions to the master plan based on the public and internal comment summarized below will be incorporated prior to transmitting to City Council for their consideration.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS:

The Transit Master Plan builds on past plans, especially those developed and adopted in recent years, such as Plan Salt Lake, Sustainable Salt Lake, the Downtown Plan, the Westside Master Plan, the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan, and Utah's Unified Transportation Plan 2011-2040.

Some of the transit and transportation demand management focused recommendations of this plan will be furthered in the upcoming Transportation Master Plan Update.

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT THROUGHOUT THE PLAN:

A summary of the public process can be found on pages 8-9 of the Executive Summary and is described in detail in Appendix B, “Community Outreach”.

Throughout the planning process, the public has opportunity to shape the direction of the plan. Public engagement included stakeholder interviews with sixteen organizations, two public open houses, eighteen mobile workshops, and online questionnaire, and a unique online game in which over 1,400 participants developed and communicated their priorities for transit. In total we received about 2,500 comments, survey responses, map mark-ups and “sticky notes”.

The plan also received input from an internal Steering Committee including representatives from Engineering, Planning, Economic Development, Sustainability, HAND, CAN leadership and communications team, the RDA, the Mayor’s Office – including the Mayor’s Accessibility Council – and the City Council Office.

The Transportation Advisory Board, Bicycle Advisory Committee (a standing committee of TAB), and Business Advisory Board have each received briefings to give input throughout the process, and the Transportation Advisory Board will provide a recommendation on the plan at their meeting of November 7, 2016.

Further summary of the public input at each of these stages was included in the four prior transmittals related to this plan, as sent to the City Council in March 2015, July 2015, October 2015, and July 2016.

The draft plan itself was publicized and available for public comment from October 18 through November 7, 2016.

In addition to those who viewed the plan directly through the project’s website www.slcrides.org, the topic on Open City Hall received over 394 (as of November 4) unique views.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:

Each comment received is being considered independently in a comment resolution matrix. This matrix will show how the City will accept, accept with modifications, or decline each comment. This work is still in progress but will be completed prior to the Planning Commission briefing on January 14, and a tabular format will be available prior to the hearing.
The summary below highlights the significant and common themes from the public comment and internal comments on the draft plan.

- **Several people wrote with simple support for the plan** – citing improved transportation for themselves and their kids. There were some requests that the plan be implemented faster, and/or concern that area not served by the high-frequency network would not be served at all. Several people asked that facilities near their own residences, places of employment, and other specific destinations be prioritized, including those outside of Salt Lake City.

  o Incorporation of comments – We appreciate the support for the plan. The plan suggests phasing that we believe is attainable in terms of overall resources and community support for change. We will clarify in the plan that it does not seek to reduce nor eliminate service, but rather to provide frequent, all-day service where it is most likely to succeed and to support city goals, and to provide new service models and improved access for neighborhoods that are beyond the reach of the frequent network. We encourage those who live in other cities and counties to express their desire for local transit planning to their elected officials, and we are happy to be a resource.

- **Several people expressed a desire for robust transit and transit-supportive infrastructure, including new and improved transit centers, rail connections, dedicated bus lanes, and signal priority.**

  o Incorporation of comments – We have included high-level references to these in the master plan, and will delve into specifics through the corridor and site planning processes.

- **A few people wrote to express general opposition to the plan.**

  Opposition was a minority opinion, and largely fell within two categories: a desire for a far more aggressive plan and general opposition to UTA.

  o Incorporation of comments – we believe the plan is aspirational but attainable given existing and potential new resources. Should new and/or expanded funding sources become available, the plan could be implemented on a more aggressive schedule. The plan is intended to enhance local control over where our investments can best serve our community and to be used to communicate our priorities clearly to UTA.

- **A few people had comments related to private auto travel.** Some prefer investments in signal timing and other improvements for vehicles, while others prefer more explicit policies to discourage auto travel.

  o Incorporation of comments – since this is a modal plan focused on transit, it does not delve specifically into the needs of motorists. However, increased transit ridership slows the growth in traffic and congestion, and signal improvements for transit can also benefit traffic flow for cars, especially those travelling in the peak period and peak direction. The plan does recommend Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies, which are explored in more detail in the Parking Study (in progress) and TDM and auto travel will be further explored in the forthcoming Transportation Master Plan Update.

- **Integration of bicycles was a common theme** with several members of the public. The majority applauded the integration of bicycles, however some expressed the need to expand
and improve transit riders’ ability to bring their bikes on transit, especially those who use a bicycle at both ends of their daily commute.

- No change to the plan recommendations. Active transportation is a strong component of the plan, and the plan emphasizes improvements over which the City has full control. That said, UTA has been exploring and implementing improvements to on-vehicle bike accommodations, including the installation of bus racks that hold three bikes instead of two and the testing of a variety of in-vehicle hooks and racks, especially on the rail system. The Plan’s recommendations fully support these efforts.

- Several suggestions were made to integrate the needs of the disabled community, and comments on specific language that would raise awareness, reinforce the need to make transit better for those who experience the greatest transportation challenges, and shift the culture toward greater inclusivity.

  - Incorporation of comments – we will make numerous additions to the plan to include more explicit consideration of the wide variety of disabilities affecting people’s access to transit, including the achievement of true accessibility with alternate service models, specific references to disabilities in Chapter 4 “Access”, inclusion of disabled populations in Goal 5 “Provide Access to Opportunity for Vulnerable Populations”, and consideration of needs such as the challenges of travel mobility devices, and better audio and visual cues.

  - The plan will also recommend that, outside this master plan process, the City should consider the finer details of accessibility as an integral part of implementation planning.
SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA
In Room 326 of the City & County Building
451 South State Street
Wednesday, November 9, 2016, at 5:30 p.m.
(The order of the items may change at the Commission’s discretion.)

The field trip is scheduled to leave at 4:00 p.m.
Dinner will be served to the Planning Commissioners and Staff at 5:00 p.m. in Room 118 of the City and County Building. During the dinner break, the Planning Commission may receive training on city planning related topics, including the role and function of the Planning Commission.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING WILL BEGIN AT 5:30 PM IN ROOM 326
APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR OCTOBER 26, 2016
REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR
REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR

PUBLIC HEARINGS
Legislative Matters
1. Trolley Square Ventures Zoning Map Amendment - A request by Douglas White, representing the property owner, Trolley Square Ventures, LLC, to amend the zoning map for seven properties as follows: 644 E 600 S (Parcel #16-06-481-019) 603 S 600 E (Parcel #16-06-481-001) 652 E 600 S (Parcel #16-05-353-001) 658 E 600 S (Parcel #16-05-353-002) 664 E 600 S (Parcel #16-05-353-003) 628 S 700 E (Parcel #16-05-353-016) 665 E. Ely Place (Parcel #16-05-353-014) The subject parcels are currently zoned RMF-45 (Moderate/High Density Multi-Family Residential District), RMF-30 (Low Density Multi-Family Residential District) and SR-3 (Special Development Pattern Residential District). The applicant is requesting that the properties be rezoned to FB-UN2 (Form Based Urban Neighborhood District) with the intent to redevelop the site in the future as a mixed-use (residential & commercial) development. The properties are located within City Council District 4 represented by Derek Kitchen. (Staff Contact: Lex Traughber, (801)535-6184 or lex.traughber@slcgov.com) Case Number PLNPCM2016-00031

2. Master Plan and Zoning Map Amendment at approximately 350 East 800 South - A request by Suzette Eaton, the property owner, to amend the Zoning Map and the Central Community Future Land Use Map for one property listed at the above address. The subject parcel is currently zoned RMF-30 (Low Density Multi-Family Residential Zoning). The applicant is requesting that the property be rezoned to CN (Neighborhood Commercial) to accommodate an existing nonconforming commercial structure. The property is located within City Council District 4, represented by Derek Kitchen. (Staff Contact: Kelsey Lindquist (801)535-7930 or kelsey.lindquist@slcgov.com)
   a. Master Plan Amendment - A request to amend the Future Land Use Map of the Central Community Master Plan from Low Density Residential (1-15 dwelling units per acre) to CN (Neighborhood Commercial). Case Number PLNPCM2016-00660
   b. Zoning Map Amendment - A request to amend the Salt Lake City Zoning Map from RMF-30 (Low Density Multi-Family Residential District) to CN (Neighborhood Commercial District). Case Number PLNPCM2016-00659.

3. Station Area and Depot District Rezone at approximately around the intersection of 300 South and 600 West - Mayor Jackie Biskupski has initiated a petition to rezone a number of properties in this area to facilitate their redevelopment as part of the Station Center project being
pursued by Salt Lake City’s redevelopment agency. The project intends to redevelop the area with a mix of uses including retail, office, and residential. Currently, the land is home to a mix of commercial and light industrial uses and is zoned both D-3 (Downtown Warehouse) and CG (General Commercial). The proposed redevelopment project requires a rezone to GMU (Gateway Mixed Use). The subject properties are within Council District 4, represented by Derek Kitchen. Staff contact: Anthony Riederer at (801)535-7625 or anthony.riederer@slcgov.com

Case Number PLNPCM2016-00583

4. **TSA Zoning District Text Changes** - A request by the Salt Lake City Council to review and modify the zoning regulations for the TSA Zoning District. The TSA Zoning District is located along North Temple between 400 West and 2200 West and along 400 South between 200 East and 900 East. The proposed changes to the regulations include: -Clarifying what land uses are allowed in the zone; -Changing how far buildings can be setback from the street; -Clarifying what types of uses are allowed on the ground floor of buildings; -Modifying design standards related to overall building size, street level design, building materials, parking garage design, mid-block walkways and other design standards; -Modifying the approval process and development guidelines to further incentivize affordable housing, higher quality development and other related issues; and -Minor changes to other sections of the TSA zoning district or other related provisions in the zoning ordinance. This zoning text amendment will primarily affect Section 21A.26.078 "TSA Transit Station Area District." Related provisions of the Salt Lake City Zoning Ordinance, Title 21A, may be amended as part of this petition. (Staff contact is Daniel Echeverria at (801)535-7165 or daniel.echeverria@slcgov.com) Case Number PLNPCM2016-00522

5. **City Wide Draft Transit Master Plan** - The draft plan, developed over the past two years with input from thousands of residents and stakeholders, is available for review online at www.slcrides.org. Public transportation is an essential component of Salt Lake City’s transportation network, and the plan creates a 20-year vision and action plan for service, transit-supportive investments, programs and policies. The plan also includes a comprehensive look at the City’s overall travel patterns, identifies places where transit would be used if it met the needs of potential riders, as well as areas where transit improvements are needed for existing riders. Public comment can be submitted through open city hall at www.slcgov.com or through the staff contact below. The Planning Commission is required to make a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council will make a decision on whether or not to adopt the transit master plan at a later date. (Staff contact is Julianne Sabula at (801)535-6678 or julianne.sabula@slcgov.com)

The files for the above items are available in the Planning Division offices, room 406 of the City and County Building. Please contact the staff planner for information. Visit the Planning Division’s website at www.slcgov.com/planning for copies of the Planning Commission agendas, staff reports, and minutes. Staff Reports will be posted the Friday prior to the meeting and minutes will be posted two days after they are ratified, which usually occurs at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission. Planning Commission Meetings may be watched live on SLCTV Channel 17; past meetings are recorded and archived, and may be viewed at www.slctv.com.

The City & County Building is an accessible facility. People with disabilities may make requests for reasonable accommodation, which may include alternate formats, interpreters, and other auxiliary aids and services. Please make requests at least two business days in advance. To make a request, please contact the Planning Office at 801-535-7757, or relay service 711.
A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at 5:30:03 PM. Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained for an indefinite period of time.

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were: Chairperson Matt Lyon, Vice Chairperson Carolyn Hoskins; Commissioners Maurine Bachman, Weston Clark, Ivis Garcia, Andres Paredes and Sara Urquhart. Commissioners Emily Drown and Clark Ruttinger were excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were Nick Norris, Planning Manager; Lex Traughber, Senior Planner; Daniel Echeverria, Principal Planner; Anthony Riederer, Principal Planner; Michelle Poland, Administrative Secretary and Paul Nielson, City Attorney.

**Field Trip**
A field trip was held prior to the work session. Planning Commissioners present were: Ivis Garcia, Carolyn Hoskins, and Sara Urquhart. Staff members in attendance were Lex Traughber and Anthony Riederer.

The following sites were visited:
- **350 East 800 South** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal. The Commission asked if the residential and commercial uses were allowed in the SNB zoning. Staff stated yes.
- **Trolley Square** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal. The Commission asked why the corner lot was not being rezoned. Staff stated because it was not contiguous to other Trolley property. The Commission asked questions regarding the setbacks and public comments on the proposal.
- **300 South and 600 West** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal. The Commission asked who owned the property and who would develop it. Staff stated the RDA and other developers.

**APPROVAL OF THE October 26, 2016, MEETING MINUTES. 5:30:38 PM**

**MOTION 5:30:43 PM**
Commissioner Urquhart moved to approve the October 26, 2016, meeting minutes. Commissioner Hoskins seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR 5:30:59 PM**
Chairperson Lyon stated he had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Hoskins stated he had nothing to report.
REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR 5:31:06 PM
Mr. Nick Norris, Planning Manager, reminded the Commission that the next meeting was scheduled for November 30 due to the holiday.

5:31:27 PM
Trolley Square Ventures Zoning Map Amendment - A request by Douglas White, representing the property owner, Trolley Square Ventures, LLC, to amend the zoning map for seven properties as follows: 644 E 600 S (Parcel #16-06-481-019) 603 S 600 E (Parcel #16-06-481-001) 652 E 600 S (Parcel #16-05-353-001) 658 E 600 S (Parcel #16-05-353-002) 664 E 600 S (Parcel #16-05-353-003) 628 S 700 E (Parcel #16-05-353-016) 665 E. Ely Place (Parcel #16-05-353-014) The subject parcels are currently zoned RMF-45 (Moderate/High Density Multi-Family Residential District), RMF-30 (Low Density Multi-Family Residential District) and SR-3 (Special Development Pattern Residential District). The applicant is requesting that the properties be rezoned to FB-UN2 (Form Based Urban Neighborhood District) with the intent to redevelop the site in the future as a mixed-use (residential & commercial) development. The properties are located within City Council District 4 represented by Derek Kitchen. (Staff Contact: Lex Traughber, (801)535-6184 or lex.traughber@slcgov.com) Case Number PLNPCM2016-00031

Mr. Lex Traughber, Senior Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was recommending the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The request from the Applicant for the zoning map change.
- If another zone would address the height and setback issues.
- The standards of review by the Historic Landmark Commission regarding compatibility.
- If there was a way for the Historic Landmark Commission’s approval prior to the Planning Commission making a decision on the project.

Mr. Douglas White, Mr. Scott Howell, Mr. Alan Roberts, reviewed the proposal and why the zoning met the needs of the developer. They reviewed the issues with noticing, timing and the owner’s attendance at all of the meetings for the proposal. They discussed the history of the site, the importance of moving the proposal forward and the time frame of the proposal.

PUBLIC HEARING 6:08:32 PM
Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing.
Mr. Michael Iverson, Central City Community Council, thanked the City for restarting the review process. He stated a formal vote was not taken at the Community Council meeting and read comments that supported the proposal but questioned the zoning. Mr. Iverson stated generally the community would like to see the parking lot developed.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Ms. Cindy Cromer, Mr. Jack Davis, Ms. Judy Short, Ms. Grace Sperry, Ms. Kira Wallace, Mr. Tray Wright and Mr. Steve Farr.

The following comments were made:

- A great amount had happened since the first proposal was approved.
- The FBUN zoning had been amended and was awaiting a rehearing.
- The FBUN 2 existed because it was companion zoned to FBUN1 zoning.
- All of the setbacks and step backs in the proposal are in the FBUN 1 and if the FBUN1 was not used in a comprehensive rezone the setbacks and step backs did not exist as they were not listed in the FBUN 2.
- The proposal was the only case in the city where form based zoning did not include setbacks and step backs.
- Cannot recommend an amended zone that did not exist yet.
- Encouraged that surface lots are being redeveloped for particularly mixed use development.
- The proposed zone (FBUN 2) as currently written, has specific issues with setbacks and step backs when used in infill applications.
- The proposal was the first time FBUN 2 zoning was proposed where adjacent parcels are not zoned according to other form based standards, FBUN 1.
- Proposal defeated the purpose of the form based zoning of supporting development of appropriately scaled buildings that respect neighborhood character but also allow for increased density.
- The proposal was against many prescription in the Historic Preservation Plan that stipulates the base zoning should be supportive of preservation considerations.
- Should table the proposal to the next meeting to allow the base zoning to be reviewed at the same time as the subject proposal.
- Proposal was not furthering the Master Plan.
- Master Plan called for livable communities and neighborhoods with vital and sustainable commerce but did not say to further intense development at the expense of neighborhoods.
- The Master Plan called for further preservation of existing housing stock and appropriate transition and multifamily housing with mixed land uses in designated areas to support sustainable development.
- The pictures of the dilapidated houses were a result of the City not enforcing proper zoning on a boarded house.
- Boarded houses have to maintain not just sit there.
- Nowhere in the city was form based code allowed without a buffer except for in this particular instance which was not a good solution.
• Concerned over the assumption that the development would include affordable housing in the project.
• If the rezone were approved it left the Historic Landmark Commission with the awkward job of trying to approve something that was compatible with historic designation but in the wrong zone.
• Should approve the FBUN zoning with its buffers before the proposal was approved then forward both proposal as a package to the City Council.
• If the proposal could not be tabled it should be forwarded to the City Council and request that they wait to approve it until they receive the FBUN zoning amendment and consider them both together.
• Homes had been left to deteriorate.
• Agreed the historic nature of the area needed to be protected but the homes were an eyesore.
• Against a hotel or any other development that was more than three stories in height.
• New building should not be a cookie cutter structure like what was being currently constructed in the city.
• Concerned about having mixed use developments change the character of the neighborhood.
• Unsure of how affordable housing would affect the area with bringing in undesirable individuals in to the area.
• Business owners in Trolley Square and the updates to the area have been positive.
• The improvements are wonderful but only on three sides of the center.
• The updates were needed to help the businesses survive, help draw people in, revitalize the center and the area.
• It was greatly important to keep the uniqueness of Trolley Square and the surrounding area.
• Excited to see the redevelopment of the area and bring people back to the neighborhood.
• Support the development of the property.

The Applicants stated the historic houses were not the issue at hand and were under the Historic Landmark Commission purview. They discussed the historic buildings in the area and those that had been removed over the years. The Applicants stated the houses were not significantly contributing structures, explained two would be moved to Ely Place and restored. They addressed the issue of not having the amended zoning regulations in place and stated sometimes the project preempted the governing documents. They stated they were asking the Commission to make the first step and let the other steps catch up in the review process as the petition moved forward. The Applicants stated the zoning allowed for height greater than three stories and there was a precedent for taller buildings in the area. They stated the only way the proposal would be feasible would be to have it taller than three stories. They reviewed the decision regarding the zoning and
why it was chosen for the proposal. The Applicants stated they had anticipated the setback and step back regulations of the future zoning.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The current height of Trolley Square and Trolley Corners.
- Why the form base code was chosen versus different zoning.
  - Other zoning did not allow for a hotel to be constructed.
  - Current zoning did not allow commercial uses.
- The size of the proposed development for the property.
- The review and feedback from the Historic Landmark Commission.
- The possible design for the structures.
- The affordable housing features of the proposal.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The review process for form based zoning.
- How the proposal fit with the character of the neighborhood under the new zoning.
- The difference between the FBUN1 and FBUN2 zones.
- Who made the determination on regulating impacts and what zoning was appropriate for different areas of the city.
- Who reviewed whether or not standards were met.
- The Planning Commission’s and Historic Landmark Commission’s role in the review process.
- How compatibility was determined in a form based zone.
- If the proposal had to meet the proposed amended standards of the ordinance.
- The Historic Landmark Commission had the authority to modify any of the standards of the base zoning district due to the fact the property was in an overlay district.
- The uses allowed under the different zoning.
- If it was the original intention to require FBUN 1 and FBUN 2 together.
- If the Planning Commission could add additional criteria to zoning or if the zoning carried the regulations.
- What a Certificate of Appropriateness was and what it regulated.
- The next steps for the proposal.
- The upcoming proposed zoning changes.

**MOTION 7:04:24 PM**

Commissioner Bachman stated regarding Petition PLNPCM2016-00031 – Trolley Square Ventures Zoning Map Amendment, based on the analysis and findings listed in the Staff Report dated March 9, 2016, and all the testimony from the public and plans presented, I move that the Planning Commission transmit a positive recommendation to the City Council for the proposed zoning map amendment to FB-UN2 (Form Based Urban Neighborhood District) for the following parcels: 644 E 600 S (Parcel #16-06-481-019), 652 E 600 S (Parcel #16-05-353-001), 658 E 600 S (Parcel #16-05-353-002), 664 E 600 S (Parcel #16-05-353-003), 628 S 700 E
With the exception of the property located at 603 S 600 E (Parcel #16-06-481-001) which shall remain zoned as RMF-30 (Low Density Multi-Family Residential District). Commissioner Urquhart seconded the motion. Commissioners Garcia, Bachman, Hoskins and Urquhart voted “aye”. Commissioner Paredes abstained from voting and Commissioner Clark voted “nay”. The motion passed 4-1.

**7:08:47 PM**

Master Plan and Zoning Map Amendment at approximately 350 East 800 South - A request by Suzette Eaton, the property owner, to amend the Zoning Map and the Central Community Future Land Use Map for one property listed at the above address. The subject parcel is currently zoned RMF-30 (Low Density Multi-Family Residential) Zoning. The applicant is requesting that the property be rezoned to CN (Neighborhood Commercial) to accommodate an existing nonconforming commercial structure. The property is located within City Council District 4, represented by Derek Kitchen. (Staff Contact: Kelsey Lindquist (801)535-7930 or kelsey.lindquist@slcgov.com)

a. Master Plan Amendment - A request to amend the Future Land Use Map of the Central Community Master Plan from Low Density Residential (1-15 dwelling units per acre) to CN (Neighborhood Commercial). Case Number PLNPCM2016-00660

b. Zoning Map Amendment - A request to amend the Salt Lake City Zoning Map from RMF-30 (Low Density Multi-Family Residential District) to CN (Neighborhood Commercial District). Case Number PLNPCM2016-00659.

Mr. Anthony Riederer, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was recommending the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council.

Ms. Suzette Eaton and Mr. Josh Eaton, property owners, reviewed the historic and proposed use of the property. They stated the neighborhood was in support of the proposal and was excited to move forward with updates.

**PUBLIC HEARING 7:17:51 PM**

Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Ms. Cindy Cromer

The following comments were made:

- Transformation of the property was great.
- Tenants would need more space than allotted for the commercial use.
- The housing mitigation ordinance was triggered when the property was rezoned not when the use changed.
• The property lost its status because of the recession but the use was still viable and should not be a factor for this process.

Chairperson Lyon closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission, Applicant and Staff discussed the following:
• If there was another way to reinstate the use without changing the zoning.

**MOTION 7:21:27 PM**
Commissioner Clark stated regarding Petition PLNPCM2016-00569 and PLNPCM2016-00660: Master Plan Amendment and Zoning Map Amendment for one parcel located at 350 E. 800 S., based on the findings and analysis in the Staff Report, testimony and discussion at the public hearing, he moved that the Planning Commission transmit a positive recommendation to the City Council for the proposed master plan and zoning amendments. Commissioner Garcia seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**7:22:23 PM**

**Station Area and Depot District Rezone at approximately around the intersection of 300 South and 600 West** - Mayor Jackie Biskupski has initiated a petition to rezone a number of properties in this area to facilitate their redevelopment as part of the Station Center project being pursued by Salt Lake City’s redevelopment agency. The project intends to redevelop the area with a mix of uses including retail, office, and residential. Currently, the land is home to a mix of commercial and light industrial uses and is zoned both D-3 (Downtown Warehouse) and CG (General Commercial). The proposed redevelopment project requires a rezone to GMU (Gateway Mixed Use). The subject properties are within Council District 4, represented by Derek Kitchen. Staff contact: Anthony Riederer at (801)535-7625 or anthony.riederer@slcgov.com) Case Number PLNPCM2016-00583

Mr. Anthony Riederer, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was recommending the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council.

**PUBLIC HEARING 7:27:54 PM**
Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing, seeing no one wished to speak; Chairperson Lyon closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:
• If the historic structures would be affected by the zone changes.
• If the proposal was part of the Salt Lake City Master Plan.
• The reason why the rezoning was being requested.
MOTION 7:31:01 PM
Commissioner Paredes stated regarding Petition PLNPCM2016-00583: Station Center Area Zoning Map Amendment, based on the findings and analysis in the Staff Report, testimony, and discussion at the public hearing, he moved that the Planning Commission transmit a positive recommendation to the City Council for the proposed zoning map amendment. Commissioner Urquhart seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

7:31:45 PM
TSA Zoning District Text Changes - A request by the Salt Lake City Council to review and modify the zoning regulations for the TSA Zoning District. The TSA Zoning District is located along North Temple between 400 West and 2200 West and along 400 South between 200 East and 900 East. The proposed changes to the regulations include: -Clarifying what land uses are allowed in the zone; -Changing how far buildings can be setback from the street; -Clarifying what types of uses are allowed on the ground floor of buildings; -Modifying design standards related to overall building size, street level design, building materials, parking garage design, mid-block walkways and other design standards; -Modifying the approval process and development guidelines to further incentivize affordable housing, higher quality development and other related issues; and -Minor changes to other sections of the TSA zoning district or other related provisions in the zoning ordinance. This zoning text amendment will primarily affect Section 21A.26.078 "TSA Transit Station Area District." Related provisions of the Salt Lake City Zoning Ordinance, Title 21A, may be amended as part of this petition. (Staff contact is Daniel Echeverria at (801)535-7165 or daniel.echeverria@slcgov.com)
Case Number PLNPCM2016-00522

Mr. Daniel Echeverria, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was recommending the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:
- Why some of the items were given a score rather than just made a requirement.
- If developers were involved in drafting the ordinance.
- The increase in the point system and when developments would or would not come to the Commission.
- If the proposal would generate more applications that required Planning Commission review.
- The approval process for proposals brought to the Planning Commission.
- How the new language addressed building footprints, massing and scale.
- The definition of an active use.
- Making midblock walkways a requirement not an incentive.
- Future master plan changes to address midblock walkways.
- Affordable housing index and incorporating it into the transit areas.
PUBLIC HEARING 7:55:51 PM
Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Ms. Cindy Cromer, Mr. Bryce Garner, Mr. Jade Sarver and Ms. Ana Valdemoros, Mr. Mathew Dfohl, Mr. Sean Neves and Mr. Tim Funk.

The following comments were made:

- Developers go to lengths to not come in front of the Commission for review.
- Need to help change up the design to benefit the City.
- Need to encourage midblock walkways and make them a priority.
- Variation in height was a concern and not creating a walled in effect.
- Need more points for preservation which added diverse height and character to buildings.
- Add recommendation for City Council to review the changes in three to four years for effectiveness.
- Giving negative points for over percentages of affordable units.
- Too many points are given for affordable housing.
- The issues with centralizing affordable housing in one area and the current percentage of affordable housing in the Fairpark area.
- Recommend moving forward with the design standards and continuing to study the affordable housing issues along North Temple and 400 South.
- In support of the proposal.
- Need to ensure quality structures are being proposed and constructed.
- One of the purposes was to incentivize more commercial and major businesses to come into the area but that was not happening.
- Table the affordable housing portion of the proposal to further study the issues of placement and saturation.
- Public process has been open and inclusive.
- Construction along 400 South was very common and uniform.
- Many of the affordable housing components have been removed from 400 South.
- Leaving sections out would hinder the overall use of the ordinance.
- Affordable housing was a must regardless of where it was located in the city.

Chairperson Lyon read the following cards:

- Mr. Jack Davis – I am supportive of these proposed text amendments.
- Mr. Michael Iverson – It’s rare of people to speak up when they are happy about something, but these changes to the TSA zone are proving to be very popular. Particularly happy about noticing requirements, building material and decreased distance between entrances. Very encouraging to see the noticing requirements too. Please forward a positive recommendation. Special thanks to Daniel in Planning for present at CCNC when he had no statutory obligation to do so.
Chairperson Lyon closed the Public hearing.
The Commission and Staff discussed the following:
- How to incentivize affordable housing and design standards in the point system.
- If it was possible to require a certain amount of affordable housing in developments located in different areas of the city.
- Need to balance out the affordable aspects with other incentives in the proposal.
- The purpose was to further incentivize affordable housing in the district as requested by the City Council.
- The legality of limiting affordable housing and having the City attorney draft a memo regarding this issue.
- The definition of affordable housing.
- How to balance higher quality buildings while accommodating affordable housing.
- The clustering of low income housing units and how to spread them throughout the city.
- If there was a process of review for the ordinance to ensure it was working as intended.
- How to vary building height and how it was regulated under the proposal.
- How to ensure the ground floor uses were active.
- How to make developers obtain points from different components of the point system not just through affordable housing.

MOTION 8:41:05 PM
Commissioner Clark stated regarding Petition PLNPCM2016-00522, TSA Zoning District Improvements, based on the findings and analysis in the Staff Report and testimony provided, he moved that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to adopt the proposed zoning ordinance text amendments related to the Transit Station Area zoning district with a recommendation for the City Council to look at a way to possibly include a base requirement for affordable housing units in all projects in this zone also a legal memo concerning the legality and constitutionality of this issue and if not that take into consideration policy that would affect the balance between affordable housing on North Temple and 400 South. Commissioner Bachman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

8:43:30 PM
City Wide Draft Transit Master Plan - The draft plan, developed over the past two years with input from thousands of residents and stakeholders, is available for review online at www.slcrides.org. Public transportation is an essential component of Salt Lake City’s transportation network, and the plan creates a 20-year vision and action plan for service, transit-supportive investments, programs and policies. The plan also includes a comprehensive look at the City’s overall travel patterns, identifies places where transit would be used if it met the needs of potential riders, as well as areas where transit improvements are needed for existing riders. Public comment can be submitted through open city hall at www.slcgov.com or through the staff contact below. The Planning Commission is required to make a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council will
make a decision on whether or not to adopt the transit master plan at a later date. (Staff contact is Julianne Sabula at (801)535-6678 or julianne.sabula@slcgov.com)

Ms. Juliane Sabula, Transportation, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff was recommending the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:
- The improvements to transit stops on 200 West.
- The overall investment to ridership increase and if improving infrastructure at transit stops was a cost effective approach.
- The public outreach for the proposal.
- Discussion between Planning and Transportation regarding increasing density in higher use areas.
- The city plans that coordinate transportation and housing density.
- Rider fees and if they had been addressed for lower income riders.
- Rider programs for low income riders, Salt Lake City residents, University of Utah students and distance based fares.
- The percentage of University of Utah students that use alternate modes of transportation.

PUBLIC HEARING 9:17:57 PM
Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing, seeing no one wished to speak; Chairperson Lyon closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:
- The timeline for the proposal.
- Whether to table the petition and if the Public Hearing should remain open.

MOTION 9:23:06 PM
Commissioner Urquhart stated regarding City Wide Draft Transit Master Plan, she moved that the Planning Commission continue the petition and Public Hearing to November 30, to allow for further review of the Staff Report. Commissioner Bachman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 9:24:12 PM.
SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA
In Room 326 of the City & County Building
451 South State Street
Wednesday, November 30, 2016, at 5:30 p.m.
(The order of the items may change at the Commission’s discretion.)

The field trip is scheduled to leave at 4:00 p.m.
Dinner will be served to the Planning Commissioners and Staff at 5:00 p.m. in Room 118 of the City and County Building. During the dinner break, the Planning Commission may receive training on city planning related topics, including the role and function of the Planning Commission.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING WILL BEGIN AT 5:30 PM IN ROOM 326
APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 9, 2016
REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR
REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR

PUBLIC HEARINGS
Unfinished Business

1. City Wide Draft Transit Master Plan - The draft plan, developed over the past two years with input from thousands of residents and stakeholders, is available for review online at www.slcrides.org. Public transportation is an essential component of Salt Lake City’s transportation network, and the plan creates a 20-year vision and action plan for service, transit-supportive investments, programs and policies. The plan also includes a comprehensive look at the City’s overall travel patterns, identifies places where transit would be used if it met the needs of potential riders, as well as areas where transit improvements are needed for existing riders. Public comment can be submitted through open city hall at www.slcgov.com or through the staff contact below. The Planning Commission is required to make a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council will make a decision on whether or not to adopt the transit master plan at a later date. (Staff contact is Julianne Sabula at (801)535-6678 or julianne.sabula@slcgov.com)

Legislative Matters

2. 27th Street Cottages Zoning Map Amendment, Subdivision and Planned Development at approximately 868 E. 2700 South and 2716 S. 900 East - Adam Nash, representing Growth Aid LLC, is requesting approval from the City to develop five (5) residential lots on two properties located at the above listed address. The existing home on the 2700 South property will be demolished and the home on the 900 East property will remain. The project requires a zoning map amendment, a subdivision, and planned development approval. The two properties are currently zoned R-1/7,000 (Single Family Residential District), and are located in City Council District 7, represented by Lisa Adams. (Staff contact: Lex Traughber, (801)535-6184, or lex.traughber@slcgov.com.)
   a. Zoning Map Amendment – A request to amend the zoning map for the subject properties from R-1/7,000 (Single Family Residential) to R-1/5,000 (Single Family Residential). Case Number PLNPCM2016-00577
   b. Preliminary Subdivision Plat – A request to subdivide and reconfigure two existing parcels into five new parcels. One parcel will contain an existing home and four new vacant residential parcel will be created. Case Number PLNSUB2016-00578
   c. Planned Development – A request for planned development approval to address the creation of a lot without street frontage and the creation of a development with average
lot sizes to meet or exceed the 5,000 square foot minimum in the R-1/5,000 Zone. Case Number PLNSUB2016-00579

3. **Cottage Court Development - Zoning Map Amendment, Subdivision and Planned Development** at approximately 3101 S 900 East through 3129 S 900 East - Adam Nash, representing Growth Aid LLC, is requesting approval from the City to develop sixteen (16) residential lots on four properties located at the above listed address. The existing homes on the properties would be demolished to facilitate this project. The project requires a zoning map amendment, a subdivision, and planned development approval. The two properties are currently zoned R-1/7,000 (Single Family Residential District), and are located in City Council District 7, represented by Lisa Adams. (Staff contact: Anthony Riederer, (801)535-7625, or anthony.riederer@slcgov.com.)

   a. **Zoning Map Amendment** – A request to amend the zoning map for the subject properties from R-1/7,000 (Single Family Residential) to R-1/5,000 (Single Family Residential). Case Number PLNPCM2016-00542

   b. **Preliminary Subdivision Plat** – A request to subdivide and reconfigure four existing parcels into sixteen new parcels. Case Number PLNSUB2016-00541

   c. **Planned Development** – A request for planned development approval to address the creation of a lots without street frontage, for relief from required yards, and for the creation of a development with average lot sizes to meet or exceed the 5,000 square foot minimum in the R-1/5,000 Zone. Case Number PLNSUB2016-00542.

The files for the above items are available in the Planning Division offices, room 406 of the City and County Building. Please contact the staff planner for information. Visit the Planning Division’s website at www.slcgov.com/planning for copies of the Planning Commission agendas, staff reports, and minutes. Staff Reports will be posted the Friday prior to the meeting and minutes will be posted two days after they are ratified, which usually occurs at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission. Planning Commission Meetings may be watched live on SLCTV Channel 17; past meetings are recorded and archived, and may be viewed at www.slctv.com.

The City & County Building is an accessible facility. People with disabilities may make requests for reasonable accommodation, which may include alternate formats, interpreters, and other auxiliary aids and services. Please make requests at least two business days in advance. To make a request, please contact the Planning Office at 801-535-7757, or relay service 711.
A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at 5:30:00 PM. Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained for an indefinite period of time.

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were: Chairperson Matt Lyon, Vice Chairperson Carolynn Hoskins; Commissioners Maurine Bachman, Weston Clark, Emily Drown, Ivis Garcia, Andres Paredes and Sara Urquhart. Commissioner Clark Ruttinger was excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were Nick Norris, Planning Manager; Lex Traughber, Senior Planner; Anthony Riederer, Principal Planner; Michelle Poland, Administrative Secretary and Paul Nielson, City Attorney.

Field Trip
A field trip was held prior to the work session. Planning Commissioners present were: Maurine Bachman, Weston Clark, Ivis Garcia, Carolyn Hoskins, and Sara Urquhart. Staff members in attendance were Nick Norris, Lex Traughber and Anthony Riederer.

The following sites were visited:

- **868 E. 2700 South and 2716 S. 900 East** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal. The following questions were asked:
  - Q - Location of the access.
    - A - There is an easement from 2700 South for three homes and one from the cul-de-sac.

- **3101 S 900 East through 3129 S 900 East** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal. The following questions were asked:
  - Q – Could the Planning Commission request a change from a long lot to smaller lots?
    - A – There were a variety of lot sizes in the area.
  - Q – Was the character standard referring to the existing home and did the homes provide that?
    - A – Yes the models provided were examples but they have to meet the zoning requirements and the neighborhood was eclectic.
  - Q – Were the homes all the same?
    - A – The developer could answer that question but the Commission could consider conditions to address the issue.

**APPROVAL OF THE November 9, 2016, MEETING MINUTES. 5:30:17 PM
MOTION 5:30:19 PM**
Commissioner Bachman moved to approve the November 9, 2016, meeting minutes. Commissioner Paredes seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR  5:31:35 PM
Chairperson Lyon stated he had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Hoskins stated he had nothing to report.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR  5:31:42 PM
Mr. Nick Norris, Planning Manager, reminded the Commission of the training meeting on December 1, and the next Planning Commission meeting would be held on December 14.

5:32:06 PM
City Wide Draft Transit Master Plan - The draft plan, developed over the past two years with input from thousands of residents and stakeholders, is available for review online at www.slcrides.org. Public transportation is an essential component of Salt Lake City’s transportation network, and the plan creates a 20-year vision and action plan for service, transit-supportive investments, programs and policies. The plan also includes a comprehensive look at the City’s overall travel patterns, identifies places where transit would be used if it met the needs of potential riders, as well as areas where transit improvements are needed for existing riders. Public comment can be submitted through open city hall at www.slcgov.com or through the staff contact below. The Planning Commission is required to make a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council will make a decision on whether or not to adopt the transit master plan at a later date. (Staff contact is Julienne Sabula at (801)535-6678 or julianne.sabula@slcgov.com)

Ms. Juliane Sabula, Transportation, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff was recommending the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:
- The Comments received from the public since the last meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING
Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. George Chapman, Ms. Judy Short, and Mr. Don Butterfield.

The following comments were made:
- The plan needed more work and public input.
- All public comments should be included in the plan.
- The airport Trax reconfiguration should be included in the plan.
There were too many items not addressed and that needed to be reviewed prior to the plans approval.
Priorities needed to be outlined in the Master Plan.
Bus service was cheaper than rail service and more of an immediate need.
Infrastructure needed to be updated and included in the plan.
Simplification and back to basics was a must then the plan could move forward.
Work to get the public on the buses now.
Implement the transit grid now and the other plans later.
Education on how to use the bus system would benefit the public.
Foothill plan should be included in the subject plan.
Transport hubs with park-n-rides needed to be part of the plan.
Needed to be more specific and give a timeline for implementation.
Plan should be tabled for further review.
Simple and elegant solutions were neglected.
Need to address the growth in population now and not later.
Services needed to be reliable.

Chairperson Lyon closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:
- The comments from Open City Hall and if those were included in the plan.
- The role of a Master Plan and how budgets are affected by a Master Plan.
- How bus service, security, safety and infrastructure were addressed in the plan.
- The access to the “HIVE” pass and education regarding the pass.
- The rapid bus transit to Davis County.
- How the Airport plan would affect the Transit Master Plan.
- The public outreach for the proposal.

The Commission discussed the following:
- Important for the public to continue submitting comments.
- Encouraged continued engagement outside of the normal structures.

**MOTION 6:00:34 PM**
Commissioner Bachman stated regarding Transit Master Plan, based on the analysis and findings listed in the Staff Report dated November 5, 2016, the testimony from the public and plans presented, she move that the Planning Commission transmit a positive recommendation to the City Council for the proposal. Commissioner Clark seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**6:01:29 PM**
27th Street Cottages Zoning Map Amendment, Subdivision and Planned Development at approximately 868 E. 2700 South and 2716 S. 900 East - Adam Nash, representing Growth Aid LLC, is requesting approval from the City to develop five (5) residential lots on two properties located at the above listed...
address. The existing home on the 2700 South property will be demolished and the home on the 900 East property will remain. The project requires a zoning map amendment, a subdivision, and planned development approval. The two properties are currently zoned R-1/7,000 (Single Family Residential District), and are located in City Council District 7, represented by Lisa Adams. (Staff contact: Lex Traughber, (801)535-6184, or lex.traughber@slcgov.com.)

a. Zoning Map Amendment – A request to amend the zoning map for the subject properties from R-1/7,000 (Single Family Residential) to R-1/5,000 (Single Family Residential). Case Number PLNPCM2016-00577

b. Preliminary Subdivision Plat – A request to subdivide and reconfigure two existing parcels into five new parcels. One parcel will contain an existing home and four new vacant residential parcel will be created. Case Number PLNSUB2016-00578

c. Planned Development – A request for planned development approval to address the creation of a lot without street frontage and the creation of a development with average lot sizes to meet or exceed the 5,000 square foot minimum in the R-1/5,000 Zone. Case Number PLNSUB2016-00579

Mr. Lex Traughber, Senior Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the Subdivision and Planned Development requests as proposed at approximately 868 E. 2700 South and 2716 S. 900 East, forward a positive recommendation to the City Council regarding the Zoning Map Amendment request as proposed and that if the City Council did not approve the Zoning Map Amendment request, any approval by the Planning Commission of the Planned Development and Subdivision requests became null and void.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:
- If a Master Plan amendment was necessary for the plan.
- The orientation of each property.
- The access to the properties.
- The location of the front yards and if the setbacks were met.
- The square footage of each lot.

Mr. Adam Nash, Growth Aid LLC, reviewed the proposal and square footage for the lots. He reviewed the alley access, parking and layout of the development. Mr. Nash stated there would be a walkway through the development to the school and the design of the homes.

PUBLIC HEARING 6:17:40 PM
Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Judy Short, Sugar House Community Council, stated the Community Council approved the proposal and it was a unique way to add single family housing to Sugar House. She stated they liked the sidewalk connection that would be added with the
proposal and the removal of the blighted homes in the area. Ms. Short reviewed the public outreach for the proposal and stated there was not a lot of objection to the project.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. Mike Jamesoul, Ms. Linda Thomas, Mr. Gary Wilkinson, Mr. Kent Frandsen, Mr. John Blankevoort and Mr. George Chapman.

The following comments were made and questions asked:
- Would the proposal set a precedent for the area?
- Would the development affect the property values of the neighborhood?
- The access to the development off of Sierra Circle.
- The parking for the proposal needed to be clarified.
- Four lots would be better than five.
- Should not allow properties to be landlocked.
- What was the timeline for the proposal and cleanup of the property?
- Supported the sidewalk through the property.
- Concerned over the increase traffic to the area.
- Did not like the sidewalk to Sierra Circle as it would promote bad behavior in the area.
- Roads in the area needed to be fixed before additional traffic was added.
- Was the alley dedicated, who owned it and who was responsible to maintain it?
- The city boundaries on the property.
- What was the mitigation plan to curb the loitering and crime in the area?
- What was the proposed zoning for the area?
- Supported the proposal as it would remove a vacant home.
- Would benefit the kids in the area to have the walkway through the block.
- The proposal was doubling the density but was minimal for what was allowed in the area.
- It was the quickest way to get rid of the blighted home.

Chairperson Lyon closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Nash reviewed the frontage, parking, benefits of and timeline for the proposal.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:
- The maintenance and ownership of the alley way.
- If an HOA would be part of the development.
- The timeline for the proposal.
- How the walkway would be laid out along the property.
- How the lot sizes and zoning compared to others properties in the area.
- How the proposal impacted the neighboring lots and affected property values.
- The cost of the proposed homes.
- The access from the street to Sierra Circle.
- Why the lot sizes changed in the area over the years.
• If a condition of approval requiring a study to determine if access to the property was achievable.
• The proposed density was less than the surrounding zoning allowed resulting in a benefit to the area.

The Commission discussed the following:
• There were concerns but the developer was willing to address the concerns for the benefit of the community.
• The conditions and language of the motion.

MOTION 6:54:30 PM
Commissioner Clark stated regarding Petition 27th Street Cottages – Petition PLNPCM2016-00577 – Zoning Map Amendment, Petition PLNSUB2016-00578 – Subdivision, Petition PLNSUB2016-00579 – Planned Development, based on the analysis and findings listed in the Staff Report, testimony and the proposal presented, he moved that the Planning Commission approve the Subdivision and Planned Development requests as proposed, and forward a positive recommendation to the City Council regarding the Zoning Map Amendment request to rezone the property from R-1/7,000 to R-1/5,000. If the City Council does not approve the Zoning Map Amendment request, any approval by the Planning Commission of the Planned Development and Subdivision requests becomes null and void. The Planning Commission finds that the proposed project complies with the review standards as demonstrated in Attachments E, F and G of the Staff Report and the approval of the Planned Development and Subdivision request is subject to the conditions listed in the Staff Report and in addition the confirmation of access to Sierra Park Circle and that the Commission was approving the petition as a Planned Development and all other zoning requirements still apply that are not modified by the Planned Development. Commissioner Urquhart seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

6:56:08 PM
Cottage Court Development - Zoning Map Amendment, Subdivision and Planned Development at approximately 3101 S 900 East through 3129 S 900 East - Adam Nash, representing Growth Aid LLC, is requesting approval from the City to develop sixteen (16) residential lots on four properties located at the above listed address. The existing homes on the properties would be demolished to facilitate this project. The project requires a zoning map amendment, a subdivision, and planned development approval. The two properties are currently zoned R-1/7,000 (Single Family Residential District), and are located in City Council District 7, represented by Lisa Adams. (Staff contact: Anthony Riederer, (801)535-7625, or anthony.riederer@slcgov.com.)

a. Zoning Map Amendment – A request to amend the zoning map for the subject properties from R-1/7,000 (Single Family Residential) to R-1/5,000 (Single Family Residential). Case Number PLNPCM2016-00542
b. Preliminary Subdivision Plat – A request to subdivide and reconfigure four existing parcels into sixteen new parcels. Case Number PLNSUB2016-00541
c. Planned Development – A request for planned development approval to address the creation of lots without street frontage, for relief from required yards, and for the creation of a development with average lot sizes to meet or exceed the 5,000 square foot minimum in the R-1/5,000 Zone. Case Number PLNSUB2016-00542.

Mr. Anthony Riederer, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was recommending that the Planning Commission approve the Subdivision and Planned Development requests as proposed at approximately 3075-3129 South 900 East, forward a positive recommendation to the City Council regarding the Zoning Map Amendment request as proposed and that the Subdivision and Planned Development are conditioned upon approval of the new zoning. Hence, should the City Council not approve the Zoning Map Amendment request, any approval by the Planning Commission of the Planned Development and Subdivision requests become null and void.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:
- The size of the surrounding lots.
- The setbacks for the proposal.
- The zoning request and how it differed from the surrounding area.
- Why the reductions in setbacks were being requested if the lots were smaller.
- The width of the street and why city garbage services would not be available on the street.
- Why an HOA was not necessary for the maintenance of the street.
- Emergency services access.

Mr. Adam Nash, Growth Aid LLC, reviewed the proposal, access to the property, and the maintenance agreement that would be recorded with the properties. He reviewed the surrounding uses and lot sizes, how the development would benefit the area, why the setback reductions were requested and asked the Commission for approval of the proposal.

PUBLIC HEARING 7:17:47 PM
Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Judy Short, Sugar House Community Council, reviewed the other projects given similar approvals. She stated the proposal was ideal and more lots in the area should go through the same process. Ms. Short stated the development was a benefit and kept with the trends of the city. She stated the only negative was that the garbage service would create issues with parking.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. George Chapman and Mr. Clark McIntosh.

The following comments were made:
• Increase in density would be double what existed.
• Would cause issues with emergency access to the properties.
• Table the issue to allow further review on setbacks.
• The homes were not affordable housing as stated.
• Mature trees were not being saved as required by the ordinance.
• The west setback was not an issue but the backyard setback should mirror what was required by other homes in the area.
• Water lines should be increase to allow for better fire suppression systems.
• Area was an eyesore and proposal would clean it up.
• Encouraged developer to buy other properties in the area.

Chairperson Lyon closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Nash stated the homes were affordable per HUD’s definition. He reviewed the emergency services access, garages and parking, the request for setback reduction and why the proposal would benefit the area.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:
• The definition of affordable housing and how the proposal fit the definition.
• The homes that were proposed to be demolished.
• The trees that would be saved or removed from the property.
• If the homes would be similar or vary in design.
• The other departments that reviewed the proposal and the comments from those departments.
• The conditions of approval that should be part of the motion.
• The standards for protecting existing trees and if conditions could be added to the motion.
• The approval process for the petition.
• Public comments from residences on Lincoln Street.
• How the proposal would affect the privacy of neighboring properties.

The Commission discussed the following:
• The reduction in setbacks and the effect to the area.
• The allowable building height for the area and the Commissions purview over the height.
• The response from the neighborhood regarding the proposal.
• If the applicant would be willing to change the setbacks for the proposal.
• How to change the design and allow for the requested setbacks.
• The Commission’s purview over the design of the homes.
• If the homes would be visible from the street and if the repeated design would be noticed.
• The size and scale of the homes along 900 East were a concern.

**MOTION 8:11:10 PM**
Commissioner Clark stated regarding Petition Cottage Court Development –
Petition PLNPCM2016-00542 – Zoning Map Amendment, Petition PLNSUB2016-00541 – Subdivision, Petition PLNSUB2016-00540 – Planned Development, based on the analysis and findings listed in the Staff Report, testimony and the proposal presented, he moved that the Planning Commission approve the Subdivision and Planned Development requests as proposed, and forward a positive recommendation on to the City Council regarding the Zoning Map Amendment request to rezone the property from R-1/7,000 to R-1/5,000. If the City Council does not approve the Zoning Map Amendment request, any approval by the Planning Commission of the Planned Development and Subdivision requests becomes null and void. The Planning Commission finds that the proposed project complies with the review standards as demonstrated in Attachments E, F and G of the Staff Report the Planned Development and Subdivision request is subject to the conditions listed in the Staff Report and in addition, on the eastern four lots the eastern setback will be ten feet, in exchange the garage door would be allow to be no more than 18 feet wide on the four eastern specified properties, any specimen tree that was in a required yard area must be preserved, a note put on the subdivision plat that these were private streets and responsibility of maintenance fell to the property owner. Commissioner Urquhart seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 8:16:28 PM
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT ON Tuesday, ____________, 2017 at 7:00 p.m. a public hearing will be held in Room 315, Council Chambers, City and County Building, 451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah, before the Salt Lake City Council to accept public comment and consider adopting an ordinance adopting the Salt Lake City Transit Master Plan. A proposed ordinance is before the Council that would adopt the Transit Master Plan, which establishes goals and recommendations for public transportation investments and policies City-wide over the next twenty years. The City and County Building is an accessible facility. People with disabilities may make requests for reasonable accommodation, which may include alternate formats, interpreters, and other auxiliary aids and services. Please make requests at least two business days in advance. To make a request, please contact the City Council Office at council.comments@slcgov.com, 801-535-7600, or relay service 711. (T 13-5)

Publish: ____________, 2017 (Deseret News only)
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