Homeless Resource Center Workshops Summary
January 2017

6 workshops with 665 attendees & with 981 comments

Comment Based on Locations (option to comment on multiple sites)
- 100 South: 108 comments
- 700 South: 79 comments
- High Avenue: 83 comments
- Simpson Avenue: 405 comments

Comment Based on Topics (some comments had multiple topics)
- **Location**: Specific comments about each site
  - 339 comments
- **Programming**: Program and physical elements at each center
  - 168 comments
- **Design**: Property, building or neighborhood design elements
  - 95 comments
- **The Road Home**: Direct references to current main location
  - 33 comments
- **Safety**: Safety concerns for centers or surroundings
  - 168 comments
- **Decision**: City decision process or on scattered site model
  - 127 comments
- **Population**: Population assigned to each new center
  - 39 comments
- **Affordable Housing**: Affordable housing needs or housing first policies
  - 28 comments
General Comment Summary
People were surprised at locations chosen. Future neighbors of the centers did not expect the announcement of a center in their neighborhood, especially the Simpson Avenue site. Residents and businesses are fearing the worst, a replication of conditions around Rio Grande Street. They feel the City has not provided enough information about how a situation like one on Rio Grande Street will be prevented. People want detailed and concrete information about:

- Neighborhood safety measures to prevent the increase of low level crimes
- Comprehensive service model (scattered site) so 150 bed cap will not increase and there will not be camping spillover into the surrounding areas
- Successful models from elsewhere, especially those demonstrating incorporation of homeless resource centers in single family neighborhoods

People wish that there was public input before locations were announced and feel this decision was made in secret. They are scared that, because the police cannot arrest for low level crimes, there is an affordable housing crisis, and a planned reduction in shelter beds, their neighborhoods will see decreased property values, loss of businesses and become unsafe for them and their families.

Comment Summaries
Affordable Housing
- Need more affordable housing or won’t move people through system and will have to increase bed count caps
- Need housing first, then build new homeless resource centers to assure system can handle reduction of beds

Decision
- City needs to engage community better in the location decision
- Want to give input on locations
- Should have taken public comment before location decision
- City is not listening to community concerns
- Decision was made behind closed doors
- Need better outreach to future neighborhoods
- Appreciate trying to improve homeless services but City is not going about it the right way
- More research is needed to show the new model and center locations will protect property values and keep neighborhoods safe
- Need evidence this plan will work
- Show research that homeless resource centers can work in single family neighborhoods
- Need to better explain to the public what will happen at each location
- South Salt Lake City should be involved in this process because Simpson Avenue site is close to its city limits
- Locations are displacing businesses
• Keep Simpson Avenue site if keeping others
• Create a new model, show it works, then change entire service system
• Consider the impact to the school district
• Land purchases were too expensive
• Need a unified homeless system
• Build sites outside of Salt Lake City
• Other cities should help
• Reducing number of beds is a bad idea, will cause problems at new locations
• Need to show proof reduction of beds will work

Design
• General Comments
  o Include community space to support neighborhood involvement
  o Zoning should allow uses that compliment shelter needs
  o Have space to accommodate all needs
  o Well-lit sidewalks and public spaces
  o Have centralized intake for all centers
  o Need to have safety measures at each center
  o Fences and security measures for neighborhood
  o Parking on site
  o Look welcoming
  o No outside queuing
  o Neighborhood improvements should be made to lessen impact
• 100 South Site
  o Isolated
  o Be strict about clients
  o Prevent camping nearby
  o Increased street lighting
  o Fence off rail lines
  o Security for nearby businesses
• 700 South Site
  o No queuing
  o Face towards State Street, not 200 East
  o Big windows
  o Parking for clients
• High Avenue Site
  o Need lighting
  o Fence blocking crossing of TRAX line
  o Communal space for visitors
• Simpson Avenue Site
  o Streetlights
  o Worried about alleyways
  o Limit number of beds
- Include neighborhood improvements
  - Consider public space improvements
  - Architecture should blend with neighborhood
  - Pedestrian scaled
  - Separate homeless portion from neighborhood

Location
- General Comments
  - Leave people Downtown
  - Shuttles to employment and services, or transit passes
  - Don’t push sites west
  - Property values will decrease around homeless resource centers
  - Unsafe for neighborhood children
  - Help impacted businesses and residences
  - Alternative location suggestions
- 100 South Site
  - Businesses will be hurt
  - Multiple access points
  - Crime increase
  - What about campers?
  - Already an issue
  - Close to entertainment district
  - Lose work garden
  - Hurt rehabilitation of North Temple
  - Too close to The Road Home
  - Doesn’t solve current problem
- 700 South Site
  - Impact businesses
  - Too close to other services
  - Too large for neighborhood
  - Protect property values
  - Increase police presence
  - Too close to residential uses
  - Move to non-residential area
  - Consider parking garage next door as safety hazard
  - Like the location
- High Avenue Site
  - Conducive to drug trade
  - People will camp along TRAX line
  - Potential to be hit by TRAX train
  - Hurt big retailers in area
- Simpson Avenue Site
  - Don’t like location
  - Goes against previous plans
o Too close to refugee services
o Hurt businesses
o Too close to single family residences
o No research done in picking sites
o Support if site is for families
o Pick another location
o Hurt property values
o No zone change
o Can’t mitigate issues
o Use old Desert Industries on Highland Drive instead
o Will kill neighborhood

Population

- General Comments
  o Have different centers for long term homeless and another for short term homeless
  o Take care of women and minorities
  o Consider youth-VOA too small
  o Space for married couples
- 100 South Site
  o Low risk populations only
  o Single Men
- 700 South Site
  o Women and children only
  o Families only
  o Single men suitable for this location
- High Avenue Site
  o Women and families only
  o No men at this location
  o Consider safety for children near TRAX line
  o Kids will be too much impact on schools
- Simpson Avenue Site
  o Women and children only
  o No men
  o Good location for families
  o Schools already overcrowded

Programming (Similar to input heard to create in Success Criteria)

- Include drug treatment
- Have needed services onsite
- Include services for larger community
- Jobs/skills training
- Kitchen/cafeteria
• Housing services
• Shuttle between services
• Pet services
• Keep centers clean
• Be able to stay onsite during the day
• Assigned beds
• No overflow
• Don’t allow number of beds to grow
• No people off the street
• Resource centers but no overnight sleeping
• Consider who accesses services during the day
• Cap on how long people can stay
• Safe place for women
• Higher barrier than The Road Home
• Adequate staffing
• Planning in place for when homeless resource centers are overrun
• Funding for continued operations
• Behavioral health services and centers specifically for that group
• Meetings with the community
• Allow people to work at center
• Centralized intake
• Access to services off site
• What about St. Vinny’s, Fourth Street Clinic and other services?
• Don’t duplicate services
• Medical onsite

Safety
• Consider safety of center and surroundings
• Have security cameras at center and neighborhood
• Increased police patrols
• Police substation should be onsite or nearby
• Better police response
• More police presence
• Have good lighting
• Need 24/7 security at centers
• Require drug testing
• Sanitation is important
• Keep out drug dealers, may not be able to
• Clients-only at centers
• Safety assurances for existing neighbors
• No loitering
• Discourage panhandling
• Curfews
• Drug trade off 700 East
• Need to feel safe in public places
• Worry about discarded needles
• Increase existing safety issues in neighborhoods
• Worried about overflow in public places
• Worried about camping in neighborhoods

The Road Home
• Keep The Road Home open to meet demand/population needs
• Close The Road Home because it is unsafe
• Make The Road Home safe

Ongoing Open City Hall Topic
Staff created an Open City Hall topic on January 9, 2017 for online input. Questions are about the impact of the bed cap, community management plan and CPTED standards, and each site. As of February 1, 2017 the topic has received 93 comments. Comments are similar to those heard at the workshops. The Open City Hall topic will remain active until the planning process is complete.

Open City Hall Comments
• Reduction of shelter beds is a bad idea
• Need to create a safe environment
• Transportation services are essential
• City needs to communicate better
• The centers will cause problems to their future neighborhoods
• Should include experts in process
• Have clients help at each center
• Cap beds at each site, do not allow overflow
• Will be a rise in crime
• 150 beds is too much at each site
• The decision was made in the dark
• Centers are too close together
• Need to Prove scattered site model works
• Need contact for escalations
• Hurt existing businesses and residences
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>SOLUTIONS</th>
<th>GENERAL COMMENTS</th>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>TAGS</th>
<th>TAG #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>You have 1100 Homeless people. These facilities only house 150 each. That means you will still be five hundred people that you can’t house. How will you get those who are being processed through these centers into affordable housing when the Housing Authority waiting list is already full. Why are you trying to ruin Sugar House, we already have drug problems in our area because of the proximity of the Freeway.</td>
<td>You don’t have this facility property zoned properly and do you have plan for what happens if people can’t adjust. How are you going to continue funding for these facilities? You think you have solutions to this problem. I see Sugar House becoming a ghetto in the future and you are trying to make it that way. Solution: Don’t build a homeless shelter on Simpson.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>What kind of bootcamp would one have to do to get in self housing and employment to stay out of going back to homeless</td>
<td>Because our goal is to shrink the population, we all need to start thinking and talking about next steps out of the shelter – permanent housing, MH treatment, long-term case management. How are we going to coordinate these services? How are we going to fund these services?</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Enforcement: when the public right-a-way has been taken over by those “camping” that land is no longer public. I believe the parkstrips &amp; open spaces in our city need to be treated similar to how parking is enforced in the city -- time limit. Enforce those uses &amp; time limits so it can be enjoyed by all.</td>
<td>Keep moving forward with affordable housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Resident concerns about increased crime, property value, dealing with root causes of homelessness and perpetual homeless vs. desires to provide better services for people in dire circumstances to help our community better overall.</td>
<td>I am in favor of services in our neighborhood, but I would like to see something that won’t be attracting more foot traffic for some of the reasons above. I suggest a rapid rehousing program or mixed housing to help working people or others with children to move beyond the hurdle of obtaining affordable housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>More Olene Walker, Not spot zoning, Build more housing, Become citizens, taking ownership</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>SOLUTIONS</th>
<th>GENERAL COMMENTS</th>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>TAGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>As a community, we have a responsibility to the homeless poor. Statistics show over &amp; over again housing is cheaper than sheltering. 1. Look into micro-housing! 2. Partner w/YWCA for women and women w/children. 3. Increase funding to help people stay in their homes; speed-up responses to this program. 4. Track success stories (from all entities that support at risk pop.) what works? 5. Track at risk families through the school system. The principals at those schools probably know more about the homeless kids, than the shelters/services do.; I am willing and I believe most of our community is willing to pay more taxes to help these people.</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Can a program of instant housing and payroll to meet rent and income. If and what would be needed to meet the requirment if possible for self housing and income</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Are these temporary fixes, are these emergency shelters?</td>
<td>Services and Housing (affordable) needs to be provided, look at research for Housing First, it works and it needs to be a part of these centers</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Need really affordable housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>What is the timeline for releasing the City's plan to develop more affordable and transitional housing for clients to make up the difference in beds between the current shelter and the new shelters?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$7 Million can provide housing a lot of homeless. $7 Million for a site too much</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Housing first</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Who do I report issues to when I encounter a problem with the resource center or a resident (management)</td>
<td>Get people into housing, ASAP! – Warehousing does not work.</td>
<td>Must have affordable housing, otherwise it’s the same situation that exists at Road Home area</td>
<td>AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Warehousing people – it doesn’t work – no matter what the number.</td>
<td>Affordable housing for each site</td>
<td>Limit the time someone can utilize the shelters – 2 years max.</td>
<td>AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>700 South: Partnership with the new Health Department clinic at 610 South</td>
<td>Affordable housing – plan? Will it be available when the four new facilities open? How will it be implemented? Vouchers? or triage?</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Need low income housing first.</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Why not state a trial run now with the kids?? This can convince us... Where is the evidence that housing first works? Start a trial run Now for RH kids/families. No Shelter on Simpson</td>
<td>SIMPSON AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Proposes smaller affordable homes instead. For sale units that are more economical. They could get 24 units on Simpson.</td>
<td>SIMPSON AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Can you help homeless as fast as if they were called to service the military to help support of the countys stufy and what would have to be done from them to meet the work requirements to be done to get that kind of help into a self housing</td>
<td>AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Affordable housing</td>
<td>AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Housing lists are too long</td>
<td>100 AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I have many concerns and I am against the shelter. First of all we were never consulted about this moving to our neighborhood. I am a single mom with two boys and I own a condo. I have seen how downtown has been affected by the homeless population being so large and how the apartments, art barn and Gateway has been affected and is now empty. I feel we needed to be consulted and this needs to be re-evaluated. Please look into this decision. The Mayor needs to close the housing gap before she shuts the shelter down and opens up four homeless shelters. Also, homeless shelter will be located close to I-80 and I feel will bring more homeless. Plus I feel Fairmont Park will turn into Pioneer Park. We also request a new police station to be located there as well if you choose not to listen to our concerns.</td>
<td>SIMPSON DECISION LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>How are you working with the Salt Lake City School District on the issues of what schools the children will attend? Washington Elementary currently serving this population in a fabulous way. Please think about this when you make decisions.</td>
<td>DECISION LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 The decision was made deceptively, behind closed doors. There are</td>
<td>No Shelter on Simpson! Use vacant location, such as old DI in Sugarhouse, that does not displace</td>
<td>The location displaces existing established local owned businesses. The location stresses out residents and homeowners of that community. No Shelter on Simpson!</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 No public input prior to site selection -- now we're being asked</td>
<td>Don't build on Simpson</td>
<td>No Shelter on Simpson! Use vacant location, such as old DI in Sugarhouse, that does not displace business, is closer to services. Use a location that does not stress out homeowners. Let the business district handle the impact. Much more appropriate.</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 No shelter! Why was this done behind closed doors? Why was property</td>
<td>Other sites that don't affect current businesses. There is plenty vacant site that are better suited.</td>
<td>No shelter! Why was this done behind closed doors? Why was property bought when it isn't zoned for this?</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Why was this loc Simpson Ave selected? Why not farther west?</td>
<td>Have public hearings in advance of site selection - you were elected to represent the people - have the managerial/leadership courage to do ... speak to use with open not closed doors.</td>
<td>Why was this loc Simpson Ave selected? Why not farther west?</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Break up the high concentration and homelessness in one area.</td>
<td>Keep sites close and accessible to transportation hubs. Provide electrical and gathering space options for heaters; food service. Create wellness spaced for clients to burn energy, talk to themselves and others. Engage in creative activity. Bring physical fitness programs to sites.</td>
<td>Measureable outcomes regarding effectiveness</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Unified homeless program all municipalities under central management sharing resources &amp; effort their power in unification</td>
<td>Keep sites close and accessible to transportation hubs. Provide electrical and gathering space options for heaters; food service. Create wellness spaced for clients to burn energy, talk to themselves and others. Engage in creative activity. Bring physical fitness programs to sites.</td>
<td>Unified homeless program all municipalities under central management sharing resources &amp; effort their power in unification</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 1. Facility is too small</td>
<td>1. Plan to acquire 2nd near by site</td>
<td>1. Facility is too small</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 2. Haven't seen any rehabilitation plans</td>
<td>2. If rehab plans exist. Start publicizing them if they don’t’s exist, develop them.</td>
<td>2. Haven't seen any rehabilitation plans</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 The shelter. 8 lane highway, freeway access. Drug use brought to</td>
<td>Do not build it!</td>
<td>The shelter. 8 lane highway, freeway access. Drug use brought to a very tight community. Every issue is a negative impact. Values of homes decreasing. 100s of people’s homes at risk of being taken for affordable housing. The Sugar House redevelopment going down the drain.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>The public is generally uneducated about the ramifications of these specific centers. They are having strong, emotional reactions. Explain, educate how these centers will be different than the Road Home and how the centers will benefit Salt Lake in the long run. Use fun infographics, articles, etc.</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>You decided on locations without public input. I am happy to pay taxes to help the homeless, but this will severely impact my property value and my rental unit next door. What are you going to do to ameliorate the spill over on to the</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Salt Lake was left out. We want to participate and say NO HIGH. Did anyone consider that in SSL there is an Odyssey Home &amp; refugee &quot;camp&quot; -- halfway house?</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>Simpson Ave. is not an appropriate site for that shelter. Too many alleys. Too residential. We need Lil Scholars daycare. Use the old DI on Highland, OR the Highland Drive and Simpson Fire Station locale. I bet the entire Sugarhouse community would get behind those sites!!!</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>A: We do not approve of a zoning change for Simpson Ave., B: If, the City disregards public opinion on Simpson Ave., then put a police substation in the same location</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>You have no right to your decision. No on Simpson!</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>We should have had our voices heard. How is this solving the homeless problem? Who will continue to fund the shelters? Where does the money come from? Maybe you should have not overspent on two of the sites and there would be some money to actually make some changes! This was all about money for Gateway, not the actual</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7 million just to buy the Simpson?! Too much! Cost doesn't include existing building demolition, tenant relocation assistance, environmental concerns. These costs will be staggering! You're asking us to pay for all this -- when we don't even want it?!</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>Disappointed that Mayor Biskupski created a perception that Simpson Ave may be off the table. Sugarhouse need to do their part in helping with this issue across the city.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>Why build 4 centers which together will not house the homeless already served at the Road Home &amp; us as overflow? I do not see these shelters as taking care of the homeless challenge -- but actually -- ultimately -- will make it worse!</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t lie to us about hosting a workshop when this is nothing more than an open house. Spewing pre-determined answers &amp; not really listening.</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>I am personally delighted that this city &amp; county are working together to create a more holistic approach to address the needs of the homeless population in SLC. I sincerely wish other cities &amp; counties in the valley will support this initiative as homelessness is not a &quot;Salt Lake&quot; problem alone. I am happy to see more resources geared at transitional housing &amp; helping people break the cycle of homelessness. Way to go!</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>Build a new wing next to the prison. House the Homeless; Send them back home; stop wasting my tax money; The jail is full, you will need to build more jails.</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>Firstly this is a difficult concept. I envy everyone involved for pushing it but don't envy you for the negativity. That being said, I resoundingly and overwhelmingly support all 4 resource centers. Something had to be done and unfortunately it took an uncontrollable boom in the homeless population to do it. I think it is unfair that people assume the whole population are criminals. Here people could be veterans, families or friends. Everyone has had trouble landing on their feet before, however some, if not most have had the good fortune of friends and/or family to fall back on for support. I understand the difficulties and understand the grievances of the people against the sources. What happens if they're in our backyards? What happens if they walk-up my street? I'd suggest say hi, ask them how they are doing, let them know you care. I don't know, you have a tough job. But, I just hope you understand there are supporters out here, and we have your back! Sorry very long winded. But Thanks!</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Sites are too near each other. I think if someone wants to sell drugs or meet up (men and women in separate places), these sites are easy to walk to. (Therefore spreading out crime and issues). Sites need to be further apart.</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Three sites are too close, should be more evenly spaced around the City.</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Why South Salt Lake is not included in the process? We also want to say no to Simpson.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>We are moving to Sandy of this choice</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>I feel this, especially the plan for Simpson Avenue now, was not done with transparency. The people have a right to know what's going on all the time. They are or have been tax payers. I'm aware of the drug problems at the Road Home-because of it many don't want to go there, they feel unsafe. I've long hoped for something better, but am not sure how this will work. Who will pay? Will homeowners' property taxes rise? What about if people want to sell their homes and because of changes in neighborhoods, they are not able to do so? Home values will depreciate, drugs in the neighborhood will be a problem, kids will have easy access right on their street or in their neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>South Salt Lake was left out. We want to participate and say No Homeless</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>South Salt Lake is right at 500 East. This will greatly impact South Salt Lake but we do not receive notices or information. Also, there is a wonderful refugee center in South Salt Lake on 500 East, same South (ie one block from Simpson site). Please do not jeopardize their success. The South Salt Lake area needs input and information.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>How can communities trust the city and welcome these INNOCENT and VULNERABLE homeless people when we are being lied to about the process? Homeless deserve better! NO SHELTER ON SIMPSON!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Is this based on evidence with success?</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Did any independent expert give his/her opinion about the plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Not enough capacity to serve the homeless.</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Please give examples of communities where the &quot;scattered site model&quot; has been effective</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>We need to increase the number of beds not decrease them.</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>This is a horrid idea and you are ripping people (taxpayers) on land and buildings-will ruin neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Stop the behind closed door decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 My home was sold with NO notice. I am very upset and feel blindsided. I live south of Lit' Scholars, NO SHELTER ON SIMPSON!!</td>
<td>Bottom line, 4 homeless shelters should equal 4x the shelter! Not less</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Bottom line, 4 homeless shelters should equal 4x the shelter! Not less</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Gather more data on scattered site model, then adapt to residential areas &amp; go through public comment to create community buy in.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 I love this approach to resource centers!</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 Too much money spent for this site.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Perhaps helping Little Scholars get a nearby facility. (The old tennis courts @ Simpson and 9th?)</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 Educate people on plans for homeless population success and help towards these actions.</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 A great effort to solve a complicated problem</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 A diversified, coordinated help system is a great step in the right direction! I hope we can build on this as time goes on, and we work the bugs out.</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Build one shelter and prove that it works.</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 Homeless shelter? Call it what you like. Find better positive definition as far as transitional sites. Center. I was a homeless/transitional, love looking forward with positive atmosphere.</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 Look for opportunities offered which make this such a great site -- ways to help residents integrate into the neighborhood community, and opportunies for neighbors to volunteer and get involved w/programs at the center so people can meet each other and realize that homeless people aren't scary.</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 Open voting for what specified population goes to which zone</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 Bottom line, More Beds! Not less!</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Find people like me who look at this as an opportunity and give us info and support in helping our neighbors see the benefits.</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 Continue the process of public input in order to identify issues and work out the kinks as the plan is rolled out, and into the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79 Build one and prove it's successful!</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 Community oversite!!</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>More than 4 locations (6-8) so people do not need to leave their community to seek services</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Also for the homeless to do better for everyone.</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>No more secrets and lies</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Vote no</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Try being honest with us. This is a bad choice of site and had you done your work you’d know that. The option for three sites is better.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Assess what is happening now first. Analysis of current calls? Solutions?</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>&quot;Neighborhood against neighborhood&quot; is a totally incorrect, false narrative, in the same spirit as &quot;fake news&quot; on the websites and right-wing cable news channels during the 2016 election!!! In SLC the reality is: &quot;neighborhoods fighting mayor/city Council subterfuge.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>By government fiat, to drive out small, profit-making small businesses, tear down the attractive 1-story buildings (which all look decidedly different from government EXPERIMENT is SOVIET-STYLE COMMUNISM.</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>That this is done by elected officials (afflicted with superiority complexes) in total secrecy - and then announced as a 'done deal' and unchangeable, it is an action known historically as &quot;DEMOGRATIC CENTRALISM&quot;, an organizational device that was used by the Bolsheviks to form into the Communist Party after they took over the Russian Revolution, and subsequently used by Stalin to take totalitarian control of the party and the country.</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Where is the evidence-based practice?</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Please improve communication for the final sites - progress, next steps, timeline.</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Who does Jackie owe to not care about 100's of people?</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Government unwilling to hear citizens</td>
<td>Impeach Jackie!</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Maybe this is just what I'm hearing, but I think people feel a sense of betrayal that &quot;the City&quot; made this decision without concern for them (us). I want to see a commitment not to forget the people who are about to have a shelter a block away. In what ways will the City promote the development of my neighborhood as a mini-community? How can I be sure the City won't give us up as a last cause if our streets start to look like the Rio Grande area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Was the small business advising board consulted before you made this decision? Why not? Does the board even exist any more? Stop acting like citizens are children to be told what to do and who have 0 input to give. The lack of effort to get public buying was appalling. Next time - ask first. Don't just tell us how it's going to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Salt Lake is not a town anymore. It is becoming a City. So learn to communicate and solve the problem the right way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>How can this be a jumping off point to not simply &quot;put a band-aid&quot; on the issue of homelessness but also end homelessness as a whole?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Sustainable funding?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>I like the diversified location concept. Good public policy. Support Simpson location to be first developed so issues can be addressed-need to keep same beds at Rio Grande to provide ability to house people when other resources not available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Please build shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>What are we going to do about losing 400+ beds for the homeless population?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>How can we address the problems that create homelessness?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Great in theory, not in practice. Too many variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>I support the principle of this initiative. Please prove to the communities affected that the numbers add up for beds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>More accepting! Not less! The goal here should be more shelter and beds not less!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>The Mayor-She is an idiot (Ad Hominem, Invalid Argument)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Why won't any trial run??</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOLUTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stop acting like citizens are children to be told what to do and who have 0 input to give. The lack of effort to get public buying was appalling. Next time - ask first. Don't just tell us how it's going to be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May this be a jumping off point to not simply &quot;put a band-aid&quot; on the issue of homelessness but also end homelessness as a whole?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAG #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOLUTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stop acting like citizens are children to be told what to do and who have 0 input to give. The lack of effort to get public buying was appalling. Next time - ask first. Don't just tell us how it's going to be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May this be a jumping off point to not simply &quot;put a band-aid&quot; on the issue of homelessness but also end homelessness as a whole?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAG #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147 Please consider the safety of surrounding area (Simpson Ave) to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consider women and children to be housed there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148 We are a public charter school -- Salt lake Arts Academy -- located</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 844 S 200 E. Over 400 students regularly walk throughout our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighborhood -- to the public library, liberty wells rec center, to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAX, etc. We are concerned about pedestrian safety in the neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149 Please include in the zoning codes provisions to reduce crime in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the neighborhoods of the sites as well as keeping trash off of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>streets around them, that is a lot of what makes the Rio Grande</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area look so terrible and makes the state look really bad. Also, not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leting people loiter outside the buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 The primary issues in our neighborhood have to do with our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alleyway. There is a lot of loitering, theft and prostitution... Oh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and drug deals going down in the alley way. Very poor lighting in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>block located on South Richards St. between Merrimac Ave and Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 People crossing the Trax line between 1700 S and 1300 S. They could</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be killed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152 How open will it be? (Restrooms etc.) Attracting more external</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>campers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153 Parking (unsecured and unmonitored) always has huge issues, necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to increase lighting, visibility from building (natural surveillance),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154 All proposed solutions to issues (population, noise, loitering,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smoking, debris, trespassing, damages) are all passive solutions. Signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lights, bins will not prevent people from doing these activities. What</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are active solutions to these</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155 Facilities absolutely need to be open and accessible. If the population is intimidated, uncomfortable, or unwelcome they won’t access services at these places. Though the landscaping and design needs to still be safe, meaning the centers need lighting. Complete surveillance and fewer places to hide or store caches of belongings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156 Degradation of neighborhood, lower property values, lack of continuity with surrounding neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157 1. Large groups of people loitering around can lead to unsafe conditions and create an &quot;eye-sore&quot; for the neighborhood. 2. I worry about the motives behind the site choices and move in general.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159 I would prefer architecture to blend into neighborhood and appear residential NOT commercial. Comparing property value increase at YWCA is not a fair comparison. Our area is single family dwellings and occupants of YWCA have different issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 Do not allow loitering and hanging out in the neighborhood but use space for services and during the day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161 Alley Way -- Please look into closing Behind Wilmington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162 Street Engagement, offices located at street for engagement. Modern open design. Enough room to expand for future growth. Cap occupancy at 150 beds. Show communities example of other cities that have solved these issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196 The architecture of new building is not neighborhood friendly. Building too high to be across from one story homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197 Make sure the purchase and development of this site includes design and construction to finish the adjacent S-Line 700 east Stop/Plaza. The south walking pathway is currently forced to the main trail at about midblock. Help this feel like a place for all people. And follow the S Line design standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198 Real or perceived loitering around the structure spilling into the neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>The Simpson location is not an appropriate location for a homeless shelter. When St. Joseph's Villa attempted to expand in 2009, the Council decided the expansion was not consistent with the &quot;small scale residential character&quot; of the neighborhood. Fast forward 6 years, and suddenly our neighborhood is right for a homeless shelter? and the SOR expansion had some neighbor support the Simpson shelter has little to none. How can the Mayor's Office announce this facility as a fait accompli? An overnight shelter will undoubtedly change the neighborhood. And this is a neighborhood that is already doing its part. The South Park Townhomes on 500 E. house many refugee families. This is the only model that the City should be considering for this neighborhood for homeless women and families - centralized services with dispersed single-family or apartment housing. The expense of the new facilities is also a serious concern. The story in the City Weekly today highlighted the deaths at Palmer House and the crushing case load that social service worker have makes clear that there are more urgent needs than a shiny new building that no-one wants. Lastly, there is a serious concern about property values. This is a modest residential neighborhood with modest property value increases the comparison to the YWCA is apples and oranges!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>The neighbors are against it instead of trying to make it work, potential for loitering/camping, far from schools, this is one fo the more secure sites - would be great for singles like women since transportation is harder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 259    | 1. Neighborhood resistance - rejections - stunting dynamic development.
2. too small.
3. overrun area, especially Sugar House Park.
4. All the "required" solutions are too idealistic and difficult to conceive as workable. |

### Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>If the City is adamant that a facility be located in this neighborhood, do not create on overnight shelter - build a services facility and secure the necessary housing in nearby rental properties - like CCD has done for the refugee population at the South Park Apartments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>- to avoid overflow, build more sites, no family/kids, write oversight into zoning via neighborhood council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 259    | 1. find a new site and cancel this one.
2. plan 2 sites (in open forum) to replace Sugar House.
3. See solution #1.
4. Spell out specific details of what will be "required" solutions to issues and hire people trained to implement solutions. |

### General Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Mayor and County Council are taking a gamble on this facility with our homes and our families' safety without taking into account the neighborhoods needs and concerns. It is reckless and cruel and if this location goes forward, we will not forget when these leaders are up for re-election.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site

| SIMPSON |

### Tags

| LOCATION |

### Tag #2

<p>| PROGRAMMING |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>SOLUTIONS</th>
<th>GENERAL COMMENTS</th>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>TAGS</th>
<th>TAG #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>Single chronic homeless now for at least 3+ years. My main concern right now is being able to keep and hold down employment. My main concern is where I would basically work and how to get to my job. I go back and forth by UTA trax and bus, I have no vehicle. Shuttles or help to employment would help greatly! Tokens are very scarce, emergency services only offers 16 tokens per six month periods. I am a very simple person when it comes to a roof over my head. I just want to hold a job and be able to stick with it. Thank you.</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>Tax benefits for residents drop-in property value, taking care of grafitti, etc. for extra cost. Need street cops not patrol cars to monitor owners -- satalite cop stations near or onsite; Mitigate individual costs to home property owner</td>
<td>700 &amp; SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>The proposed homeless resource center will have negative implications on the character, safety and economic development of our neighborhoods. I do not support the amendment to the zoning title of the Salt Lake City Code or any provisions that will allow construction of a homeless resource center in our neighborhood.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>I’ve admired &amp; enjoyed the beautification along the Trax line. It has always felt like a safe recreational route for walking, running &amp; biking for a single woman. It provides a main thoroughfare to parks &amp; other tails. This would undo all the great work that’s been done along the route &amp; make it feel unsafe to use this route. No on Simpson please. Thanks.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>Placing a shelter at the Simpson Ave Location is illogical and not in the best interests of the local residents or the homeless population that would be using it. The busy street of 700 east is dangerous for them the ease of freeway access will increase drug trafficking., and would open the area to human trafficking. The adjacent neighborhood being very dense and contains many alleys will make the police work even more difficult than it already is.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265 I own office space on 2nd West and between 8 and 9th South, what will keep the overflow from drifting into my property</td>
<td>Increase police presence in area to protect my property from becoming a little Pioneer Park; Keep &quot;Road Home&quot; open to deal with overflow.</td>
<td>700 &amp; HIGH</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266 Drug use, inappropriate behaviors around children at the child care at Salt Lake Community College. This includes knife fights, sex, smoking, drugs, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267 Prowlers, drug items found on private property</td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268 Trash, crime, property value</td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269 Potentially camping along the TRAX line. Difficulty of policing this area many nooks and crannies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270 Are there any similar projects in other cities in residential areas? We need some assurances this will be safe for our children and neighbors. I don't feel safe. Don't know if I can sell my home in a year or two if this turns out to be a fiasco!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271 No vision of how to shape a city which all will be safe and proud of. As it is, this further stiffens any business presently and in the future, it will introduce more crime vagrancy and problems.</td>
<td>The sites all need to be located near the freeway in the industrial area which the city owns vast blocks of property already</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272 Simpson Ave is not a good site. St. Ann Catholic School is too close to this Homeless Center. Crime is way too bad now in the area.</td>
<td>Move to 204 West 2100 South, vacant building, formerly Club Expose'.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273 Value of property going to go down. Who is paying for this? Safety; we have little children! Where are the kids that are in shelter going to go to school? Does this mean that property taxes are going to be half, because the value of the house will not be worth anything? What about kids and</td>
<td>Don't put it on Simpson</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274 I live in Sugar House, very close to the Simpson Ave shelter site. We already have problems with drugs being used near this area, plus homeless and general robbers, crime, etc. This is not a good site. Too close to St. Ann Catholic School</td>
<td>There are vacant buildings at 204 West 2100 South, next to the centerpoint TRAX station. This building former Club Expose has not been used since 2007. Please consider this mentioned site instead of Simpson Ave site. Thank you, citizen since 1995.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>Too close to residential neighborhoods and parks, especially in an area that is on the verge of redevelopment. This proposed site will harm a safe family environment and use my own tax dollars to decrease my property value. This will ruin Liberty Park (a shining star for the city) and further damage the small park on 600 South. Put on west side of I-15 where home prices are not as high and houses are not as dense.</td>
<td>700  LOCATION SAFETY                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                cean, Safe, Family Environment, Homeless, Tax Dollars, Property Value, Liberty Park, Small Park, Home Prices, West Side, I-15, Home Prices, Houses, Density.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>All business on that block will suffer and lose money. Drug use and exposure to drug para/items will increase in that area. Loitering in private parking lots adjacent to site will increase.</td>
<td>700  LOCATION SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>Car break-ins and theft at the Salt Lake Arts Hub and event parking on the street</td>
<td>100  LOCATION SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>Assault and harrassment by homeless toward community members attending classes at the Salt Lake Arts Hub</td>
<td>100  LOCATION SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>Insufficient monitoring and security crime rates possible to rise at the Simpson Avenue Resource Center</td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>The Simpson Ave. location is NOT APPROPRIATE for a homeless center. DO NOT change the zoning to approve this site. My property value will likely decline compared to other neighborhoods. PUT THIS FOURTH SHELTER AT THE OLD DESERET INDUSTRIES SITE ON HIGHLAND DRIVE, OR THE ADJACENT FIRE STATION. There are too many secluded alleys near Simpson.</td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>Less than 1,000 feet from freeway offramp, walking distance to Fairmont Park and liquor store</td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>Too close to residential, nearby alley is an asset now but not with a nearby shelter!</td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>A. too many alley ways for illicit activity. B. Property values if and when crimes loitering increase C. Community-centric daycare displacement. D. Too residential, already a crime-sensitive area. E. We DO NOT want zoning changed to permit shelter.</td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utilize the Highland Dr. D.I. site or bldg. Utilize the Highland Dr. Fire Station (moving) site, in conjunction with a police station. Either of these sites is much more child and women friendly with Fairmont Park and Sprague library both within sight.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>SOLUTIONS</th>
<th>GENERAL COMMENTS</th>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>TAGS</th>
<th>TAG #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>Concern for ... Saint. Ann School. The only school in the area of 2100 S and 1700 S and 7th E and State Street. A block to the west of the school is Odyssey House rehab Ctr. And two blocks to the east is Deseret Ind. Our school and church are already inundated with homeless folks (... such for believes, used needles with the parking lots; many approach us daily for .. stare we acknowledge the gospel call to care for the homeless.</td>
<td>But we also care for the children and people of our parish. The only soluction I see is to place the shelter west of State Street - oh there's the Granite Elementary there (where the old hospital was located)</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>Concerned Liberty Park, the Ball Park on 1300 so 700 E, and Fairmont Park will become another Pioneer Park with drugs, prostitution and crime</td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson Put it somewhere else.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>Displacement of well established businesses and the jobs they create. Bringing the dangerous element of drugs, violence and theft to the area. Proximity to major freeway junctions and corresponding drug traffic. Proximity to a residential area. This will prevent further development of the community.</td>
<td>There is no logical solution to mitigate the concerns and problems associated with this location for this use other than removing it from consideration.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>Proximity to nearby residential area. Why eliminate existing businesses rather than develop underused sites? If criminal activity can't be dealt with at the Road Home site why would this site be any different. In an area zoned for single family housing and small multi-family bldgs. How does a space for 150 people make sense? where are those with cars going to park?</td>
<td>Choose more suitable site on 2100 S if it seems crucial to have a center in this area. Provide ACTUAL RESOURCES!!! Not just a bunch of crowded beds and too few beleagured staff. Reduce size of center to 50 people or fewer.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>They haven't chosen these sites based crime rates, they haven't considered the negative effects on Sugar House of the neighborhood surrounding. The city has given up on location further to the proximity of free way entrances - this sight is even closer. Taxpayer Money has gone into the beautification of this area including the new SLine train no business will want to buy property near a homeless shelter. Property values will go down.</td>
<td>Solutions: reevaluate moving the homeless shelter - instead use the money to building facilities where it's already located to help with job placement, mental health, drug and violence issues, etc.. They need help but not at the expense of another community's health.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Making several local businesses more that have been there for decades (where do they go?) site not large enough to accommodate required parking along with the facility, excess traffic from staff, service providers, etc. will be too much for the street/neighborhood. Introducing a population of clients and service providers to a neighborhood they don't have any ownership interest in. Taking away an 1100 bed site and replacing it with 600 beds. (go back to math class).</td>
<td>Keep Road Home open. Build the Simpson site down on the Boyer Parcels between State and Main - South of 2100 South.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>I understand that of the original 11 possible sites, there were others in the general area of Simpson ave - Perhaps one of those would bring up fewer concerns for local residents. I favor 4 sites, but an alternate to Simpson Ave. I have heard concerns voiced about lower traffic and property values. I would like to put my concerns for the beautiful &amp; Unique store Dancing Cranes and the cafe Solstice, which would be razed to make way for the Simpson Shelter. These two establishments are run by local, independent business people who are models of entrepreneurs who greatly enrich their community. I am concerned about their ability to financially survive a move, and about their ability to continue providing all the services that make their current location a haven for so many. Lets treat them well! Any site in that area I would like to be for women and children. Also crucial to the overall plan is emphasis on really affordable housing, jobs, integration into the community. I know the City is already working on this angle. Thank You</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>I encourage the City to remove the Simpson Site. Pursue alternatives, perhaps what Mayor McAdams proposes with regard to affordable housing. The Simpson site was inappropriately selected and should be withdrawn.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>SOLUTIONS</th>
<th>GENERAL COMMENTS</th>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>TAGS</th>
<th>TAG #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>292 1. were any site locations outside of SLC considered? Why are all locs in the City?? This is a problem impacting more than just SLC. 2. how will the safety and security of St. Ann's School be protected?? This school has approx 225 students in grade preschool to 8th grade.</td>
<td>1. Identify appropriate sited else where in the County that have minimal or no residential impact. 2. locate farther west below State Street.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293 1. I urge the City to follow Mayor McAdams recognition that the Simpson site is not the appropriate location for a resource center. The City is breaking its promise to keep that neighborhood safe and residential by moving forward with Simpson</td>
<td>Move the Simpson site to another appropriate location or eliminate the site altogether, and place affordable /mixed-use housing in the Simpson location instead.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294 1. Mayor staff making comment last week at library and possible relocation of current business already on Simpson making way for more housing for homeless and taking away current business. Safety for residents. No services available for homeless, homeless must use the S Line and must have transfer from Best Buy for services.</td>
<td>The 4th homeless shelter should be closer to services</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295 1. No shelter on Simpson!! Save $7Million, spend it on new ideas to reduce the homeless population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296 1. No homeless shelter on Simpson Avenue. Do not change the zoning without the city voters doing so via a ballot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297 1. Who's going to pay us for the decreased value in our property? No one will want to buy our house we plan to move in five years and won't be able to sell.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298 1. The Simpson site will become a drive through for the drug trade. 700 East is the busiest street in Salt Lake. The site will be one block from I-80. It will destroy Sugarhouse. Diminish our home values and bring drugs and violence to the area. A homeless shelter should not be in a residential area. It should be in an industrial retail area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299 1. Shelters don't belong!! We work during the day!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td>The rezoning of this area to accommodate the addition of a resource center will result in the removal of businesses that enhance our community through the services they provide. Furthermore it will stunt any progress being made by residents &amp; entrepreneurs alike by preventing them from investing into this community. Please do not destroy west Sugarhouse by going forward with plans for the Simpson Av location.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is a viable neighborhood please don't destroy it. No zoning change.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td></td>
<td>Please quit interfering in our neighborhood. Do not change the zoning. No new developments. Save preserve the Simpson businesses. Spare our neighbors &amp; neighborhood. Preserve the character of our neighbor -- No &quot;affordable&quot; housing &amp; no zoning change on Simpson. I do NOT support the amendment to the Zoning title of SLC code or any other related provisions which would allow construction of a homeless resource center near Simpson. A resource center should be in an industrial area, NOT a neighborhood.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td></td>
<td>We are homeowners and we are very concerned about our property value going down and our taxes going up in order to pay for this facility. Huge concern! No Simpson</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td></td>
<td>Concerns - relocation of 4 locally owned businesses, impact to residential neighborhood. Solution - move shelter to another neighborhood that is still starting to improve or commit to resources (police, etc.) to minimize impact. Please note what is within 1 mile of site: golf course (that can only be golf course), K-8 school, dimly lit residential neighborhood, multiple business complexes, Fairmont park already has issues, double market pricing-could do a lot of service with that money</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td></td>
<td>The same reason the shelter is being moved from downtown (development) will be the same reason it will need to be moved from Simpson. Avoid another move -- keep it out of this developing neighborhood.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td></td>
<td>You destroy your own neighborhood -- no on Simpson!</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td></td>
<td>If the Simpson site goes in (it shouldn't) then a precinct can go on Highland.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td></td>
<td>Re: Simpson Avenue. Homeless shelter should not be in the mist of residential property. Residences are within a few hundred feet in all directions.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td></td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td></td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td></td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td></td>
<td>THIS CANNOT HAPPEN ON SIMPSON This is too residential. We can find a better solution a better location. This is in direct opposition of the criteria that should be used to decide locations. Please do not build on Simpson please restore my faith in the system in our elected officials vote NO on Simpson.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td></td>
<td>I am a recent home owner three blocks from the proposed Simpson Site. I feel that anyway you put it the value of my home will be negatively impacted. Why not give tax rebates for people who had no voice in this process? NO ON SIMPSON!</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td></td>
<td>It's a good site that will allow for employment locally and reintegration into society.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td></td>
<td>I, along with many other west side residents are happy to participate in this process and take up our fair share of work. However, it is my concern that locations change to, once again, push a disproportionate amount of responsibility on the West.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td></td>
<td>Too close to residential, too small an area to have this many shelters so close together. I LOOK FORWARD TO VOTING YOU ALL OUT OF OFFICE NEXT ELECTION :)</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>I believe that this is a very bad location for a shelter, not just on Simpson. But in city residential area. I believe there should be a buffer zone -- maybe old Deseret Industries building. I don’t have any faith that it won’t affect this neighborhood badly, crime up, property values down. Just the fact that other developers are upset should tell how it will effect development. This is a good area and a very bad choice. The people do not want it that live in this area. There is no proof that we can mitigate the negative impacts. maybe open 1 or 2 not near residential.</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>The solutions can’t fix the issues. It's not good enough. The Homeless Resource Center is going to reduce the value of our homes. How does government resolve it? How to compensate our loss? How many policies are you going to add to this area? 8415 is a problem area, if you can’t fix it now, how can you fix it in the future?</td>
<td>Pay/money or free tax for our homes. please provide the numbers. proof it now! Take away the clubs, Walmarts, HRC.</td>
<td>700 &amp; HIGH</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Sites are too close to one another. Less than 5 mins walk. Too close to Odyssey, house family center, senior center and youthworks. Already vulnerable populations.</td>
<td>Move sites further away from vulnerable populations (seniors, recovery addicts, at risk youth). Actually, research and test the model before implementing it on such a large scale.</td>
<td>700 &amp; HIGH</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Site seems a bit small. Proximity to Health Dept &amp; Workforce services. Could be beneficial or could result in greater issues due to increased density of people needing social services.</td>
<td>Larger site</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Smaller towns have no shelters, so everyone homeless heads 4 SLC.; Lots of married people imagine that single people are sinful or criminals -- But not necessarily true. Lawmakers have “broadened definitions” such that 25% of Americans are currently, or have been incarcerated at one time or another. Educate via Legislators.</td>
<td>Nov. 1 to March 20 -- some &quot;public parks&quot; aren’t being used. Some buildings with a central &quot;open area&quot; could be built at the parks; homeless sleep in rooms for a maximum of 15 days while plans develop for more permanent housing (with possibility of 5 extra days in emergencies.) March 20-Oct31, building get used for Community Education classes (Homeless at campgrounds).</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>Especially during warmer months, we get a large amount of the homeless population camping out on the property grass and parking lots. When we’ve addressed them, some responses have been: “Where should we go? We’ve already been moved multiple times. what should we do?”</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>Highway noise and air pollution</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>My business and property are close to the 100 South Center and I am very concerned about not only my clients coming to the business but more importantly my property values—which is a big part of my retirement!</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Close to existing site</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>Dragging the neighborhood down.</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>Overflow on vacant property</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>Figuring out how to deal with the increased number in homeless people already in this area</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>Through traffic to North Temple</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Potential of tent city</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>One way street equals how will you deal with bottlenecking of homeless/prostitution/drug use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>Within two block radius of &quot;entertainment district&quot; (Depot, Complex, in the Venue, Metro Music Hall). How will you keep the &quot;all ages&quot; 500,000+ concert attendees safe?</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>Currently a therapeutic work garden for homeless-sad to lose.</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>25% of kids at The Road Home go to Washington Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>Perception of the resource center being across the street affecting businesses that are at the Salt Lake Arts Hub</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>No neighborhood? Sure looks like a bunch of citizens live right next door, down the street across the Interstate and more HUGE development going in.</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>North Temple and 300 North are already corridors being used by homeless populations to move between resources and the Jordan River (encampments, etc). Regular attention will be needed on these streets to make them comfortable for others.</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>700 South location buildings adjacent to site with dark underground parking-significant supervision would be needed. Thanks for thinking of it!</td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>Why not use the Northeast corner of State Street-the loss of the Deseret Industries (that did help the poor)? I have noticed areas on State Street that seemed a better site than the location you</td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342 Use the purchase of the site to advance other goals-with the &quot;DI&quot; site, we have a great chance to extend a midblock walkway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343 Vagrancy, will hinder redevelopment, No one will build near shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344 Loss of commerce to all existing businesses and future development along a &quot;showcase&quot; street, in addition to increased vagrancy and drug use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345 I support the Central City site! Thanks for trying this, it's about time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346 Loitering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347 Liquor/wine store very close by-addiction issues, litter, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348 Crossing tracks between 1300 S and 1700 S and getting killed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349 How will Salt Lake City tax revenue be affected if people from West Valley City and South Salt Lake stop spending money at Costco, Walmart, etc. due to increased panhandling? They have other options, how will we keep them still spending money that benefits Salt Lake City?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350 What are we doing to minimize the spillover effect on the neighborhood that currently is not being addressed. I have two rental units half a block from the 700 South Building.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351 Strained relationships with our critical big box stores in the area, who will have to spend additional money to police their properties and parking lots-or who will otherwise lose customers to West Valley City, Murray, Millcreek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352 How will we stop the many empty lots along 300 West from becoming tent cities similar to what has already happened along Rio Grande? Also, how will you stop squatting from happening in the many empty store/shop fronts? Squatting is already a problem happening in some of them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353 Instead of spending $3 Million, use RDA sites already owned by Salt Lake City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354 Transportation-all sites outside free fare zone. 700 E a dangerous, busy street/unsafe for kids.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355 No shelter on Simpson-too residential does not make sense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td>I live on Lake Street, near 2700 South. I support the Simpson site. It is an excellent choice.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>Residential proximity is not the same as other sites! Too close! No center on Simpson.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>The shelter is two blocks from my home</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>This is bad idea. Unreliable data. And bad for the neighborhood in general-no zoning change. No new shelter-don't ruin our neighborhood. Bad for surrounding properties-bad-much better choices elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td>This creates a financial hardship for me, my neighbors, and ultimately the area/community. So much has been done to improve the area, but this change will create an unchangeable impact on the area. I have spent three years and $120,000 remodeling my home and now I'm sure the value is decreasing as we speak. Not Okay.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>Property values will decrease</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
<td>Property values??</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>I live near State Street and the Salt Lake County Government Center. Some cleanup is needed surrounding the hotels. Buy the property at Fadel's furniture for shelter.</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>Kids walk neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>Sleeping on private property/streets</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>Leave garbage</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>Criminal activity</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td>Needles/drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>Human waste</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>Filling garbage cans</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>I am a resident of the People's Freeway neighborhood and will be neighbors with two sites! Would love to know how we can be involved in bringing the community together.</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td>I am a neighbor in favor of the Simpson site. Excited for our neighborhood to become even more diverse and ready to be welcoming.</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td>Does not belong in a neighborhood!</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>I oppose zoning amendments! I bought a house in one zone, not another. Don't throw us under the bus!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>People in neighborhood not in shelter...weather/overflow?</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>No Simpson. Affects the character, safety, economic development of our neighborhood. Do not support the zoning amendment. Also, I think it is WAY overpriced. Too many taxpayers dollars.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>Where do the children go who currently go to Little Scholars?</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>At Simpson they plan at the facilities &quot;shelters&quot; release homeless during the day while we are working. Solution-No shelter on Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>DI site is better. No shelter.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>Further away from freeway location entrances</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>Too close to the freeway, S Line taken over to close to Sugarhouses to our homes- We already have needles and drugs here. We have four homes and live in one. We have spent from 1994 in the neighborhood and upgraded four drug houses, 13% loss of revenue! We rent to good people.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>No drugs!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>Find another location!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>Positive development along North Temple -- NOW -- before its already troubled culture in exacerbated by a new influx of people with out-of-control problems.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>Making this location more of a resource center with high activity bed numbers; potentially more beds</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387</td>
<td>No site on Simpson.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Simpson</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>Please keep the Simpson Site! The community access is better than the other sites! -- the scattered site model is a great improvement over / at Rio Grande</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td>Have 3 centers and not on Simpson</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>131 700 S Site: County is building new clinic to the North 600 S 200 E.</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>No Shelter on Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>Look at the old DI building!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>No Resource Center/Shelter on Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson. Use RDA properties</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>SOLUTION</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>No Shelter on Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>No Shelter on Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>No Shelter on Simpson!!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Pick another location</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>No Shelter on Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>No Shelter on Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson, too close to families!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>Move this shelter from Simpson to the Highland Drive D.I!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>No Shelter, NO zoning change</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson, No zoning change</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>Reduce to 3 sites of 200 beds, no zoning change -- No shelter on Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson -- 0 zoning change</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson -- no zoning change</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>No shelter on simpson -- no zoning change</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>Please put a shelter on Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>Do not de-centralize SLC homeless. Spreading across the city will make</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>Simpson Avenue is inappropriate, to many alleys, too residential</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson! No zone change! Too residential</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>The area is Too Residential! No shelter on</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td>Do unto others... Yes on Simpson.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>Put the city's criminals elsewhere!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>Don't change the zoning! Replace Simpson w/the Highland D.I. site!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>It should be in a industrial/retail area.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>Don't have shelters on Simpson Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>Are you serious? Who gave your committee the right to destroy my neighborhood?</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>No Shelter on Simpson Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>A good solution is to not change the zoning and pick a different site!!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>I do not support an amendment to the zoning title of Salt Lake City Code or any related provisions that will allow consideration of a homeless resource center in our neighborhood. Especially at 653 E Simpson Ave. in a single-family residential neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427</td>
<td>Property values are all about perception -- the &quot;no on Simpson&quot; community is going to lower my property values by pitching this as such a negative thing.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428</td>
<td>Move to a more commercial site with at least 1/2 city block buffer like other 3 sites!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td>Move to sugarmount site and build in conjunction with police satellite locations with woman &amp; children -- great place for families to live, protection, no immediate single family houses. Save Simpson!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>Find another property that the city owns &amp; upgrade -- like they did to south High School.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>No site on Simpson!! Save 7 million and improve other shelter sites</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>Move it!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>No site on Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td>No sites on Simpson!!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435</td>
<td>Please consider placing these centers in non-residential areas. Particularly those close to big parks like liberty and fairmont.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>Locate SH Resource Center @ old D.I. Highland -- move liquor store!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>Yes! Keep this site -- to solve homeless problem we need to be more integrated -- the entire community needs to become involved -- churches, civic organizations, businesses. I love the Simpson site.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>Make use of the old DI site, maybe resources but not residential.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>This is an excellent site for a children to integrate to a more stable position and life.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>No zoning change on 700 S and Simpson.</td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>Add sites for additional shelters</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>Offer assistance to displaced business, to help them find new locations. Offer tax breaks to home/property owners within a 1 or 2 block radius to help offset any potential loss in property value.</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>Move the location to 400 West and 800 South</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>How are you going to mitigate the Simpson, High Ave, &amp; 700 S because of how closely together they are located?</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON &amp; HIGH &amp; 700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>Not on Simpson, too many single family homes. We work in the day.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448</td>
<td>Put it somewhere with the proper health, wellness, social training, security facilities so you can actually help them. Don't destroy a community that has worked hard and continues to work to improve their community. WE DO NOT WANT IT. No shelter, no affordable housing, no zone change.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>Consider the DI site in Sugarhouse. The children would have so much more there and it does not displace six local businesses.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson! Please reevaluate the DI site at Sugarhouse.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
<td>Property values will decrease 1/2 block from liquor store? Next to apartment kids and family? Next door to light rail trax!! Not a good location!!</td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>This is so close to the Road Home, will it actually make a difference? It's really close to the train station - that will be a problem for commuters</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454</td>
<td>How does this site solve any of the issues of the current Road Home location - porosity, public/private/vacant delineation, day/night control, and inability to secure such a large area? Site has the same issues, if now even less eyes on the street, even less traffic and worse ability to police</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455</td>
<td>Why build “new” housing with tax payers monies, if only moving a few blocks out? Waste of funding/money</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456</td>
<td>1. this is the only site bordering another city, South Salt Lake begins at 500 E (same south) SSLC has not been included in any planning. 2. There are not enough planned total spaced in the new plans 3. hospital help is not near centers</td>
<td>1,2. in order to &quot;share&quot; the problem, additional sites could be near each city that borders SLC (Magna, W Valley, Murray, Etc.. And include SSL governance. 3. Site should be nearer medical resources U of U hosp, L.D.S. hosp and utilize North and East sides of SLC NOT just lower income areas.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>457</td>
<td>I appreciate the thoroughness, thoughtfulness and hard work put into this challenging situation by the City and Mayor. I think 3 of the 4 sites are acceptable. But the situation at Simpson Ave can not fit into your mold of criteria. How can you with a clean conscious uproot so many successful businesses? Surely there must be a better</td>
<td>Find other place that doesn’t disrupt successful businesses. Lots that are in Disrepair, parking lots, etc.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458</td>
<td>Proximity to liquor store, panhandling is already a problem, distance to highway offramp, crime and drugs</td>
<td>Require all resource centers to be a certain distance from a liquor store and highway offramp</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459</td>
<td>My 5 Year old son goes to Little Scholors Preschool 2 blocks from our home. We have enjoyed walking him to school. We are angry and heart broken that our son is losing his school and the shelter so close to our home.</td>
<td>No homeless shelter on Simpson Ave</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>The Little Rascals, hair salon, Zumba and Dancing Cranes have been in business for ever. Why this location??</td>
<td>Find a different location - hear the Oddesey house or Main Street where they are tearing down buildings and businesses that were out of business already.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461</td>
<td>Relocate elsewhere please – worry about disruption to existing businesses such as the Dancing Crane.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462</td>
<td>Distance to &quot;Project Reality&quot; – methadone dispenser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463</td>
<td></td>
<td>Simpson is the wrong choice; too residential. We have just begun to fight.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464</td>
<td></td>
<td>No rezoning of the FBSE, which just changed in 2016. Shelters can be placed in current conditional zoned areas: CG, D2, D3</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td></td>
<td>A dispersed system of four homeless sites would be in zoning areas already in place within the city, CG, D2, D3</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466</td>
<td></td>
<td>We need this in a spot that doesn't have single family houses. We need a new fire station soon!</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467</td>
<td></td>
<td>I am totally opposed to the homeless shelter on Simpson. It will devalue our property, keep businesses from coming and turn Sugar House Park into another Pioneer Park. Vote NO!</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td></td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson! Move to the DI site. It's not residentially zoned and the city will be held accountable.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469</td>
<td>Issues are legion - too expensive, too residential, is currently being mismanaged.</td>
<td>Consider 204 W 2100 South. It is already empty and close to transit. Its still very close to freeway, but no closer than the Simpson site. It's commercial and has few points of entry. It's also very close to the east side.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470</td>
<td>Displacing what is arguably SLC's most unique locally-owned, long-standing business (Dancing Cranes)? Their clientele is predominantly from the neighborhood and walks there. They may not survive a move to the west. The property owners who have bought in a more affordable neighborhood to put energy and money into fixing up their properties to better our city and invest in their futures will certainly be negatively impacted.</td>
<td>There are a lot of empty industrial sites that you could probably pick up for less money than the Simpson site, that aren't smack dab in the middle of a neighborhood of families, that you could build very wonderful resource centers. Choose locations with good public transit options, but not where local stores and restaurants will be harmed due to people not wanting to shop/eat there due to panhandlers. Thank you!</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471</td>
<td>Not a good area for a homeless resource center. Much better locations instead of Simpson Ave.</td>
<td>Move Simpson Ave location. Somewhere not residential.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>Where will children access schooling?</td>
<td>Continue to direct them to the nearest public school.</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
<td></td>
<td>How about Federal Heights or U of U area?</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474</td>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t support the zoning amendments for the Simpson site. I think that site is way too expensive as a taxpayer. I recommend the site be moved to the old DI on Sugarmont Dr. There are successful businesses that actually provide jobs that are being driven out. I thought it was unconstitutional to not let the neighborhood know what was going on BEFORE they made decisions. Ultimately it was poorly thought out. Please move the Simpson site. Thank you. I also think there are safety issues to put a homeless shelter in a neighborhood. I am not opposed to helping the homeless, just thought it was not right to put in a neighborhood. Again, please move it to the Sugarmont Dr. site. Also, I was so bummed to realize that our home will decrease in value. I feel like someone came in the night and stole from us. I do want the homeless to be helped, don’t get me wrong. Just not in such a jam packed neighborhood.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475</td>
<td>Our Mayor has made a major mistake and has decided to make Sugar House a ghetto.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476</td>
<td>This unwarranted controversy has provoked much discussion among Sugar House residents generally, among Simpson residents specifically. We are not against homeless relocation centers per se; we would have willingly answered Mayor Jackie’s call for our area to do its part for the ‘solution’ if only, if only, she has ASKED US FIRST! 1a. Convert (don’t tear down) former Deseret Industries Bldg. 1b. Convert (don’t tear down) fire station when firemen vacate for new station after it is built. 1c. If needed, build added new structure on that triangle property. 2. Build new center on vacant lot on NE corner of 21st So and Windsor St. where Councilwoman Lisa helped us get rid of partially demolished car wash. 3. Build 4th new relocation center in westside industrial areas - just like AS WAS DONE SO SUCCESSFULLY - for the family shelter in the repurposed railroad warehouse in Midvale. (what a model. What a</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Move it to Granite High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478</td>
<td>This neighborhood is one of the neighborhoods that flipped for Jackie so that she could defeat Mayor Peckerwood (Ralph), who ignored, did not pay attention to, let fester the fetid, bleeding, open wound of the EVER INCREASING, always increasing homeless situation. AND THIS IS THE WAY SHE REWARDS US?????? (If you don’t believe me, go to County Clerk’s Office and check voting statistics. She represented this area when she was state representative. She was considered much better than Joel Briscoe, who we’re stuck with now.) If she chooses to run for a 2nd term, we will vote for anyone else but her. She has lost this neighborhood, the same as Peckerwood did one term before her!!!</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479</td>
<td>If we had been asked first, Simpson Ave would not have been suggested, and you would not have seen this massive opposition and blowback!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>Not in Sugar House. Displacing good businesses.</td>
<td>Purchase the old Granite High School and build there. This is away from main traffic corridors.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rental spaces will decrease in value</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>482</td>
<td>Conditionally-zoned areas for homeless shelters already exist - CG, D-2, D-3 - use these locations! Do not rezone/recommend such at FB-SE.</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>483</td>
<td>Simpson Ave is located directly next to freeway overpass, which is conducive to trade of drugs. Ideally the family unit would be most successful to help curb the drug issues currently running rampant within our homeless shelters.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>484</td>
<td>Children in shelters must be bussed to original school.</td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485</td>
<td></td>
<td>Try to put a shelter in the Avenues.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486</td>
<td></td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488</td>
<td>Jackie Biskupski: treats local kids as resource, not a normal human child that can play safely</td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489</td>
<td>Told at ribbon cutting of new playground at Fairmont Park “Please use these facilities - if you and your family enjoys the park the people who should not hang out will not!” Homeless will hop on the TRAX (free of charge) and hang out in the park and Sugar House.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving crime from one part of SLC to another</td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More effective use of tax dollars at a location in a lower value area that still has accessibility to TRAX, bus, etc. Loss of daycare center valued by community and it appears other businesses as well. Loss of jobs, lower value on homes = less taxes to the city. RDA wants the downtown buildings as that property is even more valuable. Sorry about my Jackie vote. Can't believe the secrecy and refusal to listen to the community</td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Line and bike paths are bordering shelter. If citizens are encouraged to use these to help environment and traffic, why build a shelter where bike path and S Line will become unsafe and unwelcome.</td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson. Move to more commercial area.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The crime will most likely increase in the area</td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long will the security promised be around?</td>
<td>No Shelter on Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property value will plummet. We put everything into buying our first home in the beloved Sugar House neighborhood and will be upside down. Safe, high -valued neighborhood - doubtful. Listen to your literal millennial constituents, Jackie.</td>
<td>Homeless shelters do not belong in residential areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless means that you are without a home 'no matter' what the situation. There are homeless people all over SLC, both on the east side and west side. Therefore, shelters should be built to support both sides of town!</td>
<td>Build a shelter on Simpson!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every other homeless shelter was in a primarily commercial area. This one is in a primarily residential area. The house values will go down and the children around won't get to walk to school. How are we going to keep the S Line safe and open? My brothers walk to school on the bike track but if the homeless shelter goes up they can't walk anymore.</td>
<td>Move the homeless shelter to a more primarily commercial areas - not Simpson and not a residential area.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three primary businesses being shut down. Childrens school cares for neighborhood families, Dancing Crane is entreprenurial small business, beauty school is training our young adults for positive future.</td>
<td>No Shelter on Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>No Shelter on Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>The proposed homeless shelters will have a negative implication on the character, safety and economic development of our neighborhoods. I do not support the amendment to the zoning title of the SLC Code or any related provisions that will allow construction of a homeless resource center in our neighborhood.</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>People are telling me, &quot;well no one wants a homeless shelter in their neighborhood.&quot; That's right - no one wants one because they don't belong in residential areas. Don't build them</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>No to Simpson!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>I think the Homeless Center should be put in another place like downtown where the Sears building is on State Street and 8th there has to be a better place so it doesn't hurt the value of our homes. Thanks.</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>NO HOMELESS SHELTER ON SIMPSON as a 15 yr resident of the area and a mother of 2 young boys I am very disappointed in the government not getting citizen input, especially on this residential location. You need to accept you make a mistake on this location and decide somewhere different or only build one and see if it work first. NO SIMPSON</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td></td>
<td>I think the decision to place a homeless shelter on Simpson Ave. is BAD! We have enough homeless people around already in this area they panhandle on freeway exit or 7th East - they even use the bathroom in public! We have a liquor store and park within walking distance to see drug and beg for $ at Smiths (I have seen a mother with a baby asking for $5 in the winter and summer &quot;Enough&quot; it seems like you want to relocate shelter because of the new buyer for Gateway and people buying condo's and businesses!! the shelter was there long before now they want change money talks!! SAD! so we have to suffer lose property value...</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
<td>My Wife and I purchased our home just 3 years ago, in what is becoming a fixed up, very nice community. I'm afraid that putting the resource center will not only decrease my property value, but it will make it unsafe in my neighborhood. I wont feel comfortable leaving my wife home alone or adding children to our family while living there. Its upsetting that decisions like this can be made without involving the community first.</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508</td>
<td></td>
<td>My husband and I purchased out home 3 years ago and we are very concerned about our homes property value with the addition of the homeless resource center. We don't understand how this is a good or sensible decision. Residents and local businesses have been blind sided by this and as a result local businesses are being forced to close their doors after serving the community for many years. We are also concerned about how the resource centers will impact crime in our area. We have neighbors who have already been victims of crime. Building these resource centers in a residential area will invite a criminal element. I don't believe that the local police force will be able to prevent our neighborhood from becoming a haven for crime.</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509</td>
<td></td>
<td>The area near Simpson Ave. is beautiful and continually growing. Don’t stifle that growth. Listen to the community/defend. NO SHELTER, NO ZONE CHANGE</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is not a good use of tax payer money. Use the Money to improve the existing location. They need job training, mental/physical wellness classes, rehabilitation facilities, drugs and violence protection. LEAVE THEM WHERE THEY ARE</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Mayor and her associates have failed the City immeasurable. To use the Simpson Ave locate as a homeless shelter is an obscene oversite. The fact that they paid 2.5 times the value is a terrible use of funds. The safety concerns for the neighborhood as well as the homeless have been ignored. this will be this City's biggest failure ever. Re-think this please. Impeach Biskupski!</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td></td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson Avenue. The City could have bought another place instead of the kindergarten. Try put a shelter in the Avenues, or next to Biskupski' s house!</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513</td>
<td></td>
<td>It is disappointing that elected officials think the know better than those they represent and choose not to listen &quot;that (their) plans are not wanted.&quot; No building should EVER be built that those elected officials who are supporting it are not willing to move themselves and their families if they have them next door to it. If they themselves are not willing to relocate for whatever reason - I wonder how they sleep at</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514</td>
<td></td>
<td>Families must have environment where they can easily acclimate within a neighborhood of other families. The Simpson Ave Resource Center location at this time, does not have facilities or environment which these two groups can gather with So.SL to the west and expressway (700 E) to the east. By incorporating a double or dual immersion site, such as a community center, both residents and resource center live-ins will have the ability to commune together. The neighbors of Simpson Ave will view the R.O.I. of this high priced tag of such a facility. After resource center resident populations decline due to the success of the program, all communities win!</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td></td>
<td>When people are turned away at the Resource Center. Where do they go? This center is in a residential area, people will end up sleeping on sidewalks in public parks, in front yards, etc. There needs to be a shelter available for people who aren't willing to get help. These needs to be a better services available for the mentally ill because they will be less likely to follow through on expectations/requirements for these resources centers.</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not close to downtown resource services Provide UTA bus/Trax passes for shelter residents 4th St Mobile Clinic</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>What is happening to Lil Scholars Daycare? No one is talking about the 150 children who will be displaced. Lil Scholars deserves assistance in relocating.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518</td>
<td>Too costly at Simpson Avenue. No site at Simpson Avenue!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519</td>
<td>Neighborhood’s gathering place is being destroyed</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>Declining property values</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>Don’t close Little Scholars preschool</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>Discourage new investment from in community from residents and business!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523</td>
<td>No Simpson-neighbor lost contract on his house last week when buyer found out about shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>No zone change</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>A homeless shelter should not be in a residential area.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td>Too close to have three shelters within such a short distance.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>No Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>$7 Million on land</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>No-new zoning code? No modifications to current zone of IB-SE at 653 E Simpson Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>Distribute shelters throughout UT, not just in SLC</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>Non-residential Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson. So much improvement has happened and a shelter is not a plus.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533</td>
<td>Don’t displace viable business</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534</td>
<td>Do not build a shelter on Simpson, not the residents job looking for better location. SLC, do you job!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535</td>
<td>A shelter doesn’t belong in a neighborhood where we all work during the day</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536</td>
<td>No shelter on simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537</td>
<td>No shelter on simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538</td>
<td>The shelter. No transparency.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539</td>
<td>Why displace hundreds of workers? Why effect hundreds of residents; all for 150 beds? Who does Jackie B owe?</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td>Homeless people don’t contribute to society so why build the shelter in a nice neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541</td>
<td>Is this just to create jobs? Costs do not support benefits if loss of support to homeless community.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542</td>
<td>Mental health facilities nearby</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543</td>
<td>Have rental housing nearby for those who qualify</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544</td>
<td>Close to TRAX</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545</td>
<td>Good location</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546</td>
<td>Don’t like the location</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547</td>
<td>Close to County Health Department</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td>Near bus lines</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549</td>
<td>Easy to find off State Street</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>Close to DWS</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551</td>
<td>Close to the Main Library</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552</td>
<td>Good location</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>553</td>
<td>Near services</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554</td>
<td>Near WalMart</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>Near TRAX stop</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556</td>
<td>Nice area, nice neighborhood</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td>Close to Deseret Industries</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>Close to Smiths</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559</td>
<td>Close to rehabilitation facilities</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>Haven't been to Sugarhouse</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>I like Sugarhouse</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>Dog park nearby</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563</td>
<td>Fairmont Park nearby</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>564</td>
<td>Recreation Center is nearby</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>Whatever Derek Dyer says :)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>566</td>
<td>Nate Salazar has been fantastic! He has worked with me the entire process</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>567</td>
<td>I am a stay-at-home mom and would love to know how I can volunteer to help. Ideally, I’d like to include my daughter, who is 2 1/2. Anything that I can either bring her to, or errands I can run? Are there opportunities for families to volunteer together on a regular basis? Please let me know.</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>568</td>
<td>I would love to get a story with someone from my post</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>569</td>
<td>Show it’s good so people will donate</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>The community is deeply opposed to this shelter. However there are still homeless people in the community that need help and resources. As a homeowner in Sugar House I am also concerned about my property value</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td>AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>571 1. Political leaders are flip/flopping.</td>
<td>1. Keep this site. It is important to the stability of the process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Site needs to house women and children.</td>
<td>2. House women with children at this site. It integrates with neighborhood best and has the easiest access to Elementary School and High School of all 4 sites. Educate the kids to get them off poverty cycle!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lowest number of existing residents in the neighborhood affected.</td>
<td>3. The Simpson Ave Site affects the smallest number of existing residents, but they are the loudest. Thousands of residents impacted by High Abve and 100 S Sites. Hundreds at 700 S site. Less than 200 at Simpson Avenue that would have a measurable impact on.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Political Never actually read these cards of the compiled comments.</td>
<td>4. No Solution really, most are lazy, and certain that they are always right.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572 Con-Large building (3 story pictured in newspaper and large enough to fit 150) does not belong adjacent to residential 1 and 2 story homes. Neutral-What about childcare as mothers follow path/process set up for accessing jobs and rentals-what about schooling for kids? Con-Why a residential setting shelter if the plan is for folks to spend only 30-60 days there? Absolutely no place for future male homeless residency/shelter. Already creepy with new folks panhandling/behaving inappropriately. This public input process (current) seems designed to divide public responses rather than allow a sharing of thoughts and reactions. Not what I would have expected or wanted from Salt Lake City. I wish that Mayor, etc. would have had a live program like Doug Fabrezo/ KUER discussion/explanation before starting this muddle. Thanks and good luck to us</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td>DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573 This location would be a good option for the women and children's resource center - near resources, downtown amenities and service, etc. There is a good daytime and night-time presence of activity with the mix of uses, lending a baseline level of eyes on the street to have proactive oversight and interaction with the resource center. The context can support a center at this site more effectively than the Simpson location.</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td>DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>574</td>
<td>People who oppose Simpson Avenue shelter seem to have a strong opinions and it makes me wonder if women and children would be safe there. Does SL County have homeless shetlers?</td>
<td>They need to be educated that the homeless shelter is currently in a neighborhood &amp; every where else is a neighborhood as well. I hope I will be able to volunteer to help these succeed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575</td>
<td></td>
<td>Women shelter for the prostitution problem in the neighborhood (1700 S. Main) -- prostitution row basically. Wing for prostitution in shelter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576</td>
<td></td>
<td>Simpson Ave. should support families, and have training resource center to assist with job development. No limit to population access.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>577</td>
<td></td>
<td>It seems like a lot of thought and planning have gone into this but I feel like some parts are missing. Why are the populations not divided by people who are temporarily homeless and those who are permanently homeless? It seems like none of the sites is geared towards keeping people who choose to be homeless from freezing to death. We need more small sites. 4X150 is not enough. We need to address the other problems of homelessness at other new sites beyond the four sites. Please consider using some of the millions being thrown at the homeless issue to create more clean, safe restrooms and hygiene facilities around town. These should be pristine public restrooms and to take the burden off the city library and to allow everyone, homeless or not, a place to pee &amp; shower. Homeless people deserve the dignity of being seen and not pooping in Taufer park or my driveway (yes, it was a human, not a dog :) .</td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td></td>
<td>Make sure you take care of women and minority populations - Make sure you help people get to the places they need to go (doctors, job interviews etc.) - Treat people like people not numbers and problems - help people with things like rehab, etc. Don't just them up. - Don't make this a meaningless change. Meant to make us look better from the airport. You are responsible to this community those of us who can will hold you accountable for it. - Please monitor but no police state! Do not question those who live nearby (like me just because I am an Immigrant).</td>
<td></td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>SOLUTIONS</th>
<th>GENERAL COMMENTS</th>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>TAGS</th>
<th>TAG #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 579    | 1. proper population  
2. security  
3. community involvement | 1. must be families  
2. a 24 hr SLC cop, b proper lighting, c no lining up outside  
3. community advisory board. | | | |
| 580    | | As director of child care and family services at SLCC I am concerned that we need the following.  
1. more funding for HP or Police presence.  
2. more beds NOT less 3. Different shelters for women v Men, Children, and teens. | | POPULATION | SAFETY |
<p>| 581    | | Space for drug users for safety of others | SIMPSON | POPULATION | SAFETY |
| 582    | | Keep Simpson location. Designate it for women with families; provide robust police presence to deter drug sales; Educate/outreach to public and share a lot of information about services provided, populations served; Be transparent about reasons for closing Road Home. If it's for economic and redevelopment reasons, come clean with that info; Outreach/education on fact that homeless beds are not a 1-to-1 relationship; there are not 15,000 homeless people in SL Valley. There are 5 or more times that, that are homeless or at risk of homelessness; Maintain and require new affordable housing. Work w/ legislature to require medium to large developments to have specific, real affordable housing; Enforce leasing of affordable housing. | | |
| 583    | | I'm concerned for the 5,000 homeless youth in Utah. One of these sites should be a safe space for homeless youth that currently only have one small, 31 bed location at the VOA. I also do not think The Road Home should be dissolved. Do not fragment the community, add to it. Make it safer. | | POPULATION | THE ROAD HOME |
| 584    | | I think the 700 South location would be a good site for a family center. The site is a short distance away from single family houses, central city recreation center, Lincoln Elementary, Youth City, etc. I think women and children would feel welcome in this atmosphere and there are lots of services that will help families with children. | 700 | POPULATION | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>SOLUTIONS</th>
<th>GENERAL COMMENTS</th>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>TAGS</th>
<th>TAG #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td>1) High Av site would be beneficial for family use because of the close proximity to Walmart. 2) The site would be an unfortunate fit for adult males due to the location of the liquor store. My father is an alcoholic and he's had difficulty recovering due to the walking distance to a nearby liquor store.</td>
<td>700 POPULATION</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586</td>
<td>Neighborhood is already depressed but serves poor families well; Local parks (taufer) is a homeless hangout. Positives: easy walk to Lincoln Elementary; Near free fare zone, library and more (if you've ever tried to ride the bus with kids, you know of accessible bus routes like those along state are a lifesavers)</td>
<td>Place parents and children at this shelter — many resources include wic, central city rec, affordably cheap housing for transition; With kids at 700 S, the park will be full of families instead of camping adults; limit occupancy -- budget for clean up; Write a neighborhood oversight by community council into the zoning (provide for an oversight board)</td>
<td>700 POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587</td>
<td>Has new low-income housing being build nearby; Close acces to Liberty park &quot;day center&quot;; Single male population should be housed here and at 100 S Site. Keeps the male population from getting too spread out and affecting other homeless populations.</td>
<td>Put single male population @ 100 S and 700 S</td>
<td>700 &amp; 100 POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>588</td>
<td>Keep it to women/children/endangered populations.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589</td>
<td></td>
<td>I'm very in favor of the Simpson site being dedicated to women and children. It's close to a prime residential area and it would be a great opportunity and location for the families it would serve, and it would do the least damage to the surrounding area.</td>
<td>SIMPSON POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>Will the sites ensure the populations go to the right place? What happens if the budget is slashed? No Simpson Site</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>591</td>
<td>Serve a low-risk (to other community members) population such as women &amp; kids</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592</td>
<td>If this site were to be unaccompanied male resource center, we're basically supplying the prostitutes with customers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>593</td>
<td>Make Simpson family shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594</td>
<td>Make the shelter for women &amp; children</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>595</td>
<td>Use this site for women and children</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>596</td>
<td>Where will homeless single men get to legally mingle with single women or families if they must stay at a single male shelter?</td>
<td></td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>597</td>
<td>Impact on the neighborhood school - (Whittier Elementary) just north of this site is the Enclave Apts. When they were in the process of being built, the concern was presented to the School Community Council about getting potential students safely to the school. The natural route to the school where there is a crossing guard was at 1700 S. The train is traveling at a high rate of speed at this crossing. Since a bus was already bringing students to Whittier for the gifted program, there was the ability to pick up these students. The principal and head secretary still had to call all potential students’ parents to find out if they would send their students on the bus. Because the location is still within walking distance of the school. The district may, but is not required, to provide busses. It was worked out for the Enclave, but the same may not be true for this location, if children are located here.</td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>598</td>
<td>Student achievement; Whittier Elementary serves a very diverse student population. We have students that have come as refugees from African Countries, Tibet, Nepal, etc. With the diversity come both great opportunities, but an increase in trying to meet the diverse needs that these children are experiencing. The School Improvement Plan is addressing truency in the school. Our school is already having 25-35 students in each of the classrooms. Our teachers are dealing with a very diverse student population and the resources are being tapped. As a teacher put it, we are a Title 1 school without the Title 1 funding. We have many students that are struggling with their academic achievement. The teachers are doing the best that they can to help the students accel. We are also close to student capacity in the amount of students that can be at</td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599</td>
<td>The women and children should be located at this sight. It is only 4 blocks to the neighborhood school and they wouldn’t be crossing any major roadways.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>This location should be a women and children’s shelter only given the neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>Men’s shelter only at this location – a bit more isolated</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>MH/SU will there be mens/womens facilities with or without children accommodations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>Which site is most appropriate for families? In-house schooling or school support systems like tutoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td>Women and children only at Simpson Ave. Shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>The issue of state funding is unclear. Is there none? The Capitol City should lobby and include strategies for constituents to lobby for state funding because this successful outcome/model for the state. Southern Utah is next. Keep Simpson site family friendly; educationally oriented.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>I support this plan, including sending any kids at this Simpson Site to Nibley. My concern is that Nibley, as a school is over crowded already. My daughter is in the 3rd grade with 35 other kids in her class. If Nibley takes not these children, this school needs the resources to handle them. including more teachers, integration and counseling resources, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>Space for married couples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>What populations go where?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609</td>
<td>I had worked on a housing study funded by HUD. I interviewed over 100 families who had been homeless and then housed. The study has great data and I would be happy to share my experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td>AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>Drug and Alcohol programs with housing and felon-friendly to give individuals chance for permanent housing (low-income) up completion of programs with certificate of accomplishment, free laundry, showers with loan jumpsuits for better hygiene and appearances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td>AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>How will this be funded? Having mental health, job training social work, etc. Onsite at each site is great! Including beefed up security in the surrounding neighborhoods! Is there funding (sustainable) set aside? Do you know how much this will cost annually?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td></td>
<td>Make the shelter site at Simpson an asset for the community by addition to the shelter site, bring and/or maintain other quality amenities for the community -- child care center, pre-school center. Incorporate more assets for the community.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td>DESIGN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613</td>
<td>What will prevent the City from changing the maximum occupancy in the future?</td>
<td>700 PROGRAMMING DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>Have shuttle to move people to right resource center</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615</td>
<td>There's graffiti, tobacco, the populations too high, and it's noisy</td>
<td>Paint over the graffiti, no smoking signs, spread the population out, and find a quiet part of the neighborhood. PROGRAMMING DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616</td>
<td>Increase center sanitation</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617</td>
<td>Clean bathrooms</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>618</td>
<td>Daycare facilities</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>Arts and crafts area for children</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td>Have outside heaters for winter</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>Need storage</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622</td>
<td>Kitchen to fix on meals and learn a trade</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>Allow people to stay during the day</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624</td>
<td>On site dining facilities</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625</td>
<td>Personal storage</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>626</td>
<td>Multi denominational worship center</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627</td>
<td>Learning centers</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628</td>
<td>Women need a safe place so they won't be attacked. Everyone needs a warm place to be 24 hours a day</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629</td>
<td>Assure that health financial, social work, job training services are available on site. Find a more suitable location not in the midst of an already struggling neighborhood.</td>
<td>SIMPSON PROGRAMMING LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>It's important to teach people HOW TO FISH; not just give them fish. We need resources and services in place that can expedite self-reliance and independence. As a homeowner, how do we ensure SAFETY and PROPERTY VALUES?</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631</td>
<td>Locality homeless don't have bus money for trans 100 S site which is near the old Road Home</td>
<td>100 PROGRAMMING LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>Despite assurances I don't believe the neighborhood will be safe nor does it require zoning changes.</td>
<td>Change the max # of beds to 200 each and reduce the number of sited to 3! Simpson does not need to be changed. SIMPSON PROGRAMMING LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>633</td>
<td>Match service with needs.</td>
<td>SIMPSON PROGRAMMING POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634</td>
<td></td>
<td>Have a six month homeless to work program as one facility</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635</td>
<td></td>
<td>Have assigned beds</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td></td>
<td>Protect people of color from increased police presence and put it in policies tied to this initiative. It is still a low barrier shelter if they can't drink, smoke, or do drugs within the facility and vulnerable to do it outside?</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637</td>
<td>How do they get a bed? Will it be totally self contained? - more pan handlers at Wal-Mart and Lowes that is very close by? Or will Lowes and Walmart become like the downtown SLC Library filled with pan-handlers and homeless? Walmart already gets many police calls a day.</td>
<td>What do we do about overflow? They shouldn’t be able to just camp out at any place they want</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638</td>
<td></td>
<td>Multipurpose buildings. Useful resources that not go to waste. Accept only people (homeless) that are ready to go back to work. Have a program that select and gives priority to people that are going to change. Day center/recreational services.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>639</td>
<td>Drug spread. Violence. Pan handling. People hanging around without doing anything. Handicap assistance.</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td>Kids at The Road Home get minimal medical care at Washington Elementary's school nurse. What school will they go to? Care assistance needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>641</td>
<td>Need to address current shelter facility and management now - can Rio Grande Street be leased to shelter then fenced/secured? CUC suggestion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642</td>
<td>I would like very much to see that shelters would provide kitchen for clients so they can cook their own food. At the Road Home for single people there was no facilitator- I taught cooking at the Weigand Center (across the street) and the desire from the clients was the desire to cook their own food. I would be happy to discuss this more and help implement food services for clients.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643</td>
<td>A unified homeless authority would be a step up. If all municipalities shared resources and effort it would be a win for everyone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644</td>
<td>Make sure the reg have a max center size (# of people in the family).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>645</td>
<td></td>
<td>Access to center should only be allowed by referral from . . . (?) Include this provision in the conditional use zoning.</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>646</td>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t make these centers Homeless Shelters. Make them available for resources to people who actually want help. Do not let them sleep in the centers. People need to be conditioned to knowing they can’t sleep in these centers. This will support those who want to be homeless from those who don’t. SLC residents should get at least a cut for living in areas with these facilities.</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>647</td>
<td></td>
<td>I’m highly supportive of this entire plan. I think it’s a huge step in the right direction. I have experience working w/ homeless youth in LA, and have found it to be really important to have coordinated services, spread out to prevent “mass”/overcrowding issues at any one site, and have opportunities and things for people to do during the day. I look forward to what’s ahead here in SLC.</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>648</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Transportation is key. Social and Work 2 The resource center clients should have cell phones, social connections. 3. Efficiently use food from other places for resource centers.</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>649</td>
<td></td>
<td>Are the resource centers going to be accessible by only those people seeking short/long term housing? Or, will someone who’s on hard times, perhaps about to be homeless, have access to the center to prevent them from becoming homeless? And, if both types of folks can access, do you have a plan for the flow of people based upon their need(s)?</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td></td>
<td>Work Program</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ingress egress issues of panhandling; Vacant buildings on both sides of 700 S. 700 S. - Job training and job solutions; more flexible in use, more utilities than just homeless resource; Program and enforcement</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>652</td>
<td></td>
<td>Access to free mental health-Valley Behavioral Health provides to the Road Home now</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>653</td>
<td></td>
<td>Behavioral issues/not allowed back, wandering streets</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>654</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pets?</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm concerned for understaffing (ex. Palmer Court WAY understaffed and</td>
<td>How will you address this issue? What services will you provide?</td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not effective in providing service for 200+ people.) How will you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>address this issue? What services will you provide?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More elementary schools, recreation centers, swimming pool, day care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there funding in place for onsite mental health, social work, job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training, etc?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What behavioral intervention plan are being used? Where's the evidence?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If current site isn't managed/run well, what assures us the new one</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will be?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need to have &quot;backup&quot; plans for when people don't get &quot;through&quot; the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>system fast enough or capacity gets overloaded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't just give them a home-help give them a job!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are other sites planned for temporary living space? How long do you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intend to have people reside in these shelters? Will the services be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>united or provided by different groups at each site? I would think a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cohesive &quot;agency&quot; working at all sites would be constructive. How can</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the City make people use these shelters?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned to make sure treatment (mental health) is provided at each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shelter, adopting the current mental health provision at The Road Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perhaps, where a full-time clinician from Valley daily provies referrals,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crisis intervention and ongoing treatment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halfway houses? Treatment for the mental ill!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular meetings with property owners to discuss what is and what isn't</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a unified community valley wide homeless resource system --</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>base it on the unified police of 1st responder model! Win win for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>everyone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please fund more beds not less. Also fund increased police and HP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presents in target areas. Lastly, fund more drug and mental health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services for homeless to keep them functioning :) Thanks :)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ groups of homeless to shovel snow for elderly or disabled around</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>669</td>
<td>Family shelter services are often geared towards families with 1 or 2 parents and 1 or 2 children. What plan is in place to serve families of different configurations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670</td>
<td>Establish employment opportunities at Walmart &amp; Lowes</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>671</td>
<td>Educate liquor store employees to monitor for this vulnerable population and give them the power to choose to not sell to this population</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>672</td>
<td>I would limit size to not more than 100 at each site -- ideally 30-70 -- best practice &amp; chance for successful integration into neighborhoods and reintegrations of individuals back into society.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>673</td>
<td>A resource center is not the same as a shelter</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>674</td>
<td>Partner with those entities you say do this well (i.e. YWCA) to assist in making this succeed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>675</td>
<td>Day program for residents!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>676</td>
<td>Ongoing resources going into areas near the centers and extending between areas frequented by the homeless populations that are not being helped inside them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>677</td>
<td>What will actually happen to people who try to go to a shelter that is at zoning capacity of 150 people? Transportation? Turn away?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>678</td>
<td>This location could use some emergency beds to take pressure off the Road Home. There needs to be case management and diversion services. This location is ideal for additional storage so those using it don’t have to carry belongings across the city.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>679</td>
<td>Central intake downtown. Confirm availability before being assigned a site.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680</td>
<td>Need experienced case management and housing first, it could work. Share the load, Sugar House.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>681</td>
<td>Start a trial run now (if you dare). Get the kids out of The Road Home. Convince us! No shelter on Simpson.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>682</td>
<td>A homeless resource center is not the same as what people believe The Road Home is like. I work at the Youth Resource Center on 888 S 400 W, where a lot of needed services are being provided, driving by you would never know that the center is for the homeless.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>683</td>
<td>Take Seattle at-risk and these various homeless services as an example of all the good that can be done despite being in residential areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>684</td>
<td>Current high population of chronically homeless and campers may migrate to open property near the shelter</td>
<td>Heavily invest in mental health and rehabilitation services in this shelter to transition high population of homeless into stability</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>685</td>
<td>The existing job training farm located at this site has had a positive impact on the participants (all homeless women) and the neighborhood.</td>
<td>Integrate a garden/farm into this shelter site, particularly because it has such a large footprint.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>686</td>
<td>How will the new resource centers serve clients with many barriers and challenges and assure that they are not turned away?</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>687</td>
<td>Will the centers be low barrier shelters?</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>688</td>
<td>How will we ensure access to other vital services with providers now scattered? (i.e.- access to the 4th Street Clinic, daily meals, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>689</td>
<td>How will clients understand which facility they are supposed to go to? Are there ways to lower barriers for transportation for clients that go the “wrong” facility?</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>690</td>
<td>What will be the feeding arrangements?</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>691</td>
<td>Will St. Vincent’s supply meals from a central kitchen?</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>692</td>
<td>Can there be space for job training/enterprise like Head Start’s restaurant that can also be a place for the surrounding community to come in, eat and purchase goods and engage in productive ways with the clients?</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>693</td>
<td>Be strict about admittance.</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>694</td>
<td>Required ID cards for services.</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>695</td>
<td>Effective case management.</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>696</td>
<td>Holistic programs and plans for cases</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>697</td>
<td>Bus pass requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>698</td>
<td>Licensed health care facility</td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>699</td>
<td>Behavior health</td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>Primary healthcare use allowed?</td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701 Integrated or next step?</td>
<td>Work with programming through the Department of Workforce Services.</td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702 Avoid duplication of services.</td>
<td>Community service program within each site to help improve the neighborhood (shoveling snow, graffiti removal, yard clean-up, etc.)</td>
<td>Raise the threshold so that minimum standards of behavior are enforced (see Lantern House model).</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703 High barrier center won't attract low barrier users.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704 High barrier center won't attract low barrier users.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705 High barrier center won't attract low barrier users.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706 High barrier center won't attract low barrier users.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707 High barrier center won't attract low barrier users.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708 High barrier center won't attract low barrier users.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>709 Who do programs prioritize for long-term housing/ assistance/ other? First come, first served or whomever is deemed most in need?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710 Who do programs prioritize for long-term housing/ assistance/ other? First come, first served or whomever is deemed most in need?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711 I am concerned about enabling the homeless lifestyle by simply providing needs to this city's homeless. I would hope Salt Lake City would reach out to other communities and ask for best practices.</td>
<td>Do not enable the homeless, please research best practices to aid the homeless in becoming self-reliant citizens.</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712 Mental health services</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>713 Services and jobs</td>
<td>Work with DWS and providers</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>714 Rehabilitation back to society</td>
<td>Funding / work with non-profits etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>715 Providing beds does not solve the problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716 Nibley K-8 cannot support an influx of students in a transient situation - Dilworth can</td>
<td>Provide services to the shelter so they can access the services: rehab, counseling, job skills, etc.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>717</td>
<td>People need to be evaluated for physical disabilities and mental illness. Those who have one or both should be given priority for space in shelters. Use physical therapists and occupational therapists to do the evaluations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>718</td>
<td>Provide these services all together and don't make this an emergency shelter. Think of the needs and barriers of homeless individuals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>719</td>
<td>UTA to provide adequate enforcement for increase homeless ridership.</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720</td>
<td>Family Promise= Mountain vista, United Methodist Church, Parkland LDS Stake. Demonstrates small scale approach to hosting homeless families.</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721</td>
<td>Located next to S-Line, which could be great - folks NEED access to transportation, but can't afford fare. Will resource center provide tokens/tickets so people can actually utilize UTA?</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>722</td>
<td>Will there be medical care on site? This site is furthest from 4th Street, which is the medical home for most people facing homelessness. How will they be able to get to their doctor or get their prescriptions?</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>723</td>
<td>Case workers should be available on all shifts to be able to process and assist folks coming to the centers for help.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724</td>
<td>Once admitted to the center, folks should be provided with a minimum number of days they are promised a bed and location so they don't have to be re-assigned a bed/room each day.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725</td>
<td>$7M = 23 homes valued at $300,000 at 4 tenants per house that equals 92 total at another $4M for building that equals 23 fulltime managers per group home at $50,000 per year for about 3 1/2 years. To me, security, supervision, medication, regulations, life skills, and acclimation to returning to society is much better mannered than an expensive shell on overpriced land.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>726</td>
<td>Will homeless follow rules given?</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727</td>
<td>Integrating center into neighborhood instead of it being a perceived nuisance Add community center, rec center, daycare or other social programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>728</td>
<td>Funding for resources, services and programs to get people off the street!</td>
<td>Thank you for giving us a chance to speak. I’ve come to learn that to resolve homelessness, more than beds are needed. Employment, education, medical and mental health services - as well as homes - are key to improving and permanently resolving homelessness. (rather than cycling and repeating through the system) What other resources are being funded to address the homeless? Where is the funding coming from?</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>729</td>
<td>Thank you for giving us a chance to speak. I’ve come to learn that to resolve homelessness, more than beds are needed. Employment, education, medical and mental health services - as well as homes - are key to improving and permanently resolving homelessness. (rather than cycling and repeating through the system) What other resources are being funded to address the homeless? Where is the funding coming from?</td>
<td>I want to see these Resource Centers work. Seeing the impact of homelessness over this past summer in Richmond Park made me realize how important and needed the are. I would like to see a neighborhood representative a part of an advising committee in order for them to be a voice for concerns. Having a police officer on site would also be appreciated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730</td>
<td>I want to see these Resource Centers work. Seeing the impact of homelessness over this past summer in Richmond Park made me realize how important and needed the are. I would like to see a neighborhood representative a part of an advising committee in order for them to be a voice for concerns. Having a police officer on site would also be appreciated.</td>
<td>Run a sustainable place. Change the way they operate. Give [homeless] responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731</td>
<td>Run a sustainable place. Change the way they operate. Give [homeless] responsibilities.</td>
<td>I’m for the shelter size, it can be available to anyone</td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>732</td>
<td>I’m for the shelter size, it can be available to anyone</td>
<td>Many people who are unsheltered prefer to camp.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>733</td>
<td>Many people who are unsheltered prefer to camp.</td>
<td>Concern about total number of residents receiving services at each center-total traffic to each site.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>734</td>
<td>Concern about total number of residents receiving services at each center-total traffic to each site.</td>
<td>Coordinate release from jail to some kind of shelter.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>735</td>
<td>Coordinate release from jail to some kind of shelter.</td>
<td>How are the programs with these new facilities any different from the failing current ones?</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>736</td>
<td>How are the programs with these new facilities any different from the failing current ones?</td>
<td>Staff get no pay for overtime - pay them!!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>737</td>
<td>Staff get no pay for overtime - pay them!!</td>
<td>More showers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>738</td>
<td>More showers</td>
<td>Center employees should have de-escalation and mental health training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>739</td>
<td>Center employees should have de-escalation and mental health training</td>
<td>Offer in-house job referrals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740</td>
<td>Offer in-house job referrals</td>
<td>Have a job board available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>741</td>
<td>Have a job board available</td>
<td>Offer mail service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>742</td>
<td>Offer mail service</td>
<td>Center employees should have de-escalation and mental health training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>743</td>
<td>Center employees should have de-escalation and mental health training</td>
<td>Have doctor visits and vaccinations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>744</td>
<td>Have doctor visits and vaccinations</td>
<td>Offer life skills training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>745</td>
<td>Offer life skills training</td>
<td>Have a women’s salon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>746</td>
<td>Have a women’s salon</td>
<td>Offer exercise space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747</td>
<td>Offer exercise space</td>
<td>Offices for workforce services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>748</td>
<td>AA and NA classes</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>749</td>
<td>Offer job resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>LGBTQ services</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751</td>
<td>24/7 clothes pantry</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>752</td>
<td>Help with money issues</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>753</td>
<td>Financial services</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>754</td>
<td>In house employment/mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>755</td>
<td>Mental health services</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>756</td>
<td>Digital services</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>757</td>
<td>Free laundry</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>758</td>
<td>Motel vouchers</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>759</td>
<td>Haircuts available on site</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760</td>
<td>Weekly food donation pick up</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>761</td>
<td>Consider food allergies or diabetic needs</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>762</td>
<td>Volunteer opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>763</td>
<td>Medical care facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>764</td>
<td>Need shuttles or bus passes</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>765</td>
<td>Dental and optometry services</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>766</td>
<td>What's included on the site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>767</td>
<td>Individual case management</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>768</td>
<td>Children services</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>769</td>
<td>Domestic violence counselors on site</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770</td>
<td>Housing and job information help, resume building help</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>771</td>
<td>Computer lab</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772</td>
<td>Locker rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773</td>
<td>Quick safety net for those that just need a little help</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>774</td>
<td>Counseling services</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>775</td>
<td>Shuttle between centers</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>776</td>
<td>We need cleaner, better mats that are no bio hazards and a little thicker than 1/4 inch that we are sleeping on.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>777</td>
<td>Living for single women. More insensitive for single men and women to get to and from work. Like a van or some shuttle services. So that we can feel more like getting out there to want to go to work and not feel like we are all stuck and not going no where. I know there's a lot of us out there that do want employment but at times we feel stuck because of employment areas and time's to get there. Thank you</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>778</td>
<td></td>
<td>There must be more community involvement in this process for it to be successful. The trust of the community has already been left out of the decision process about site locations, etc. Parks like Liberty, Herman Frank, etc. need camera supervision in addition to patrolling policemen now and the homeless shelters haven't even been built yet. Our neighbors have already posted signs in Herman Frank park stating &quot;Stop selling drugs here. We are watching you and will call the police.&quot; The public needs a huge increase of police officers monitoring our homes and neighborhoods if you’re really going to put all these homeless people right in our community. Having separate sites makes sense if they are farther apart than these sites are. People who you will be trying to keep separate are still going to be able to meet up and traffic drugs, etc. This would make much more sense in my mind if there was a site in Sandy, West Jordan, West Valley City. Why is Salt Lake City taking all of these people? Salt Lake City residents should get a tax cut for having to accommodate this change.</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>779</td>
<td></td>
<td>Requesting dialogue or meeting notes on the conversations between SLCPD. Specifically, the reports of the Mayor’s Office of giving advice to the Simpson Ave site.</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>780</td>
<td></td>
<td>This neighborhood is a very dark neighborhood with poor lighting. I think it would be dangerous for the people staying at the Simpson shelter as well as the people of the neighborhood. Already it is too dark for the safety of the residents even without the vulnerable people. Buy the old Granite High Building it has more acreage and is much less expensive.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>DESIGN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>781 1) Safety concerns for those using the shelter and residents in</td>
<td>Make sure to have 24/7 on-site security/police as has been discussed along with more frequent patrols (maybe try to have the same officers to build up rapport with residents and those using the facilities and so they know the area better and can notice subtle problems), 2) Invest in aesthetic appeal of the facilities so they fit in with surroundings, 3) Ensure there are diverse resources ie food/shelter, healthcare concerns (including mental healthcare), job counseling/training</td>
<td></td>
<td>700 &amp;</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>DESIGN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surrounding areas, 2) Decreasing property values in surrounding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>areas, 3) I'm worried this will turn into long-term stays instead of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a bridge to help people get resources including jobs/housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>782 Only one street light on Green Street (safety issue)</td>
<td>Mandatory drug testing for admittance to the sites (especially for the women/children HRC). Increased street lighting in the areas surrounding each site. The city needs to ensure that we are continually investing in these neighborhoods and keeping streets, parks, alleyways clean and in good condition.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>DESIGN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>783 Neighborhood safety concerns - theft, drugs, etc.</td>
<td>My car was broken into and I called police-Their response: &quot;There is no proof, fill out police report on line.&quot; We need more police patrol. We have no city lights. I called and we only have to have one on our block. We have a lot of trees. We need more lights.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td>DESIGN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>784 PD substation</td>
<td>Will we see more law enforcement in the neighborhoods? Concerns about having patrols to watch areas around the centers. More manpower, lighting, contingency plan for any overflow seem to be commonsense :) Any plans to coordinate with drug courts or have drug courts for this population</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td>DESIGN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>785</td>
<td>Commitment from City to the neighborhoods where HRC are located Fairpark area increase surveillance. What will you do to stop more people from coming if it works? Who will stop crime on North Temple?</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td>DESIGN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>788 Higher potential for camping in the area. People already loiter in the area. Site is less secure (surroundings not safe at night). Area is already depressed.</td>
<td>Do not serve non-residents of shelter so that no one will camp to wait for breakfast. All business must be conducted indoors. This would be a better location for singles/couples with no kids. Write neighborhood council oversight into the</td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>DESIGN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>789 No respect for the Mayor Homeless people in hallway - everyday for 11 months. Last Sunday I was shoe in the foot while watching TV - All calls on hold 45 minutes. Drugs, Needles - ran over in parking lot Georgia Apts - Trash - Mailboxes broken - Sex in the hall 2 stolen vehicles in 9 months.</td>
<td>Need a fence around apts. Better communication with officers - patrol the area more often. Too many stolen vehicles left in the parking lot - need a spoke person for the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>790</td>
<td>Please talk about the intense policing that has to take place. Please put the Simpson entry door on seventh rather than on Simpson so residents feel safe not seeing the lines and entry issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>DESIGN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>791</td>
<td>I would like to request to the City Representatives to ensure the homeless resource centers and their neighborhood are secure and peacefully help improve the community. Please make systems of security in/out of resource centers which fully open to the public. I would also like to request that the daycare at the Simpson Ave will continue as a part of the resource center. Thank you</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>DESIGN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>792</td>
<td>There is and has been an ongoing issue of loitering and vagrancy in the business and residential area surrounding the Simpson Ave site. This location is too close in proximity to TRAX, parks, liquor store, recreation center (cheap showers), and DI drop-off zone. This process needed more due diligence, oversight on funds and transparency. Solution: please reconsider the site and use the funds to purchase a more appropriate location that does not cost $7M just for the land. Also, a site that does not need rezoning.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>793 The Neighborhood will become crime ridden (violent), as per research, the area will not be safe for children and others. Property values will drop extensively. Our dollars are being spent unnecessarily to buy a property and take down good businesses. $7 million, which was not approved unanimously.</td>
<td>Plenty of areas to build in that are not in a tight knit community with vulnerabilities. Build in more commercial areas. Spend money on resources and training; not expensive property in good neighborhoods.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>794 Sanitary issues, high homeless population because of location by Smith's. Panhandling issue - in traffic, Smith's parking lot business impact especially in better weather. Customers won't come if property value impact non-voting property owners. They have to step over people medical facilities not close.</td>
<td>Foot patrols for visibility - friendly neighborhood cop. Mobile medical services.</td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>795 I'm concerned that homes and residential areas closest to the new site could experience a wave of property crimes like thefts, vandalism, burglaries, etc.</td>
<td>Is constant police presence in an area around the site a possibility? Seeing an officer (regularly) would make me feel safer. What about fewer officers but they are assigned only to that neighborhood? It would bring back the friendly neighborhood cop who would know when something is wrong.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>796 Shit in our doorways used condoms, drug needles, booze bottles all over! Break ins - when Walmart opened we were broken into many times - had to get bars on windows safety of our employees and customers.</td>
<td>Move to big empty site on state street</td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>797</td>
<td>No shelter on Simpson. My wife walks our dog every day in her wheelchair and would not feel safe! We just took a boy from the youth shelter and he takes TRAX to get to school every day. Neighbor selling house had buyer back out of contract when they became aware of the shelter moving to Simpson.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>798</td>
<td>Our home is east of an alleyway &amp; we are concerned with the homeless doing drugs and building tent cities in our alleyway. We don't have police patrolling our neighborhoods now what happens when we have more issues than we do right now? No Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>799</td>
<td>Drug dealers Peds No On Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>This Neighborhood already is faced with high drug use, prostitution and theft w/o the homeless shelter. Move it to one of the many empty businesses that fit this model. Sugarhouse DI</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801 More police calls to Walmart?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802 Drug dealing along the TRAX line, which already is happening!!!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803 Crime (more than now)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>804 More drugs (I have found needles in my yard-now)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>805</td>
<td>How can we keep our law enforcement safe when much of the nooks and crannies around High Avenue will only be patrolable on foot? This also includes the TRAX corridor.</td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>806</td>
<td>Fairmont Park is a pick up place for prostitutes-a walking distance from this site.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>807</td>
<td>Police can’t keep up with increased drug trafficking as it is. Odyssey House already brought crime and drug trafficking into the neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>808</td>
<td>Adapt/invest in area homes to compensate for post home value &amp; increase safety.</td>
<td>Move the location to the “industrial” area. And when you do please monitor the building and tenants with cameras.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>809</td>
<td>Outside of the blatant this will introduce more crime and destroy all commerce present and future development. It will also destroy all real estate values and cripple the community.</td>
<td>Move the location to the “industrial” area. And when you do please monitor the building and tenants with cameras.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810</td>
<td>We already have a methadone clinic and Odyssey House and drug houses in our neighborhood. How are you going to keep us safe when we already have a crime problem in our area and nothing gets done about it. There are already homeless people sleeping on S Line walk ways. Now there will be more. Our area isn’t secure now. How do you expect to keep us safe. Taking an affordable daycare that is one of the only one in area is b.s. where are us low income families to take our children! NO to Simpson ave.</td>
<td>Have a police precinct in the ”Resource Center”. Move shelter. Have no shelter in our area.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>811</td>
<td>Should not be rezoned. Some homeless now going to fairmont park. Cars have been broken into. There has been theft at the Fairmont pool, where some homeless have used the locker rooms. There are now signs at the pool not to leave anything in cars or even locked up in the lockers or shower room. Does there need to be more crime before something is done?</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>812</td>
<td>This neighborhood is already struggling with crime and drugs. Please do not put this facility in this neighborhood and cause local businesses to go out of business. We do not need more crime and drugs!</td>
<td>Change the location for this facility.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813 What are you going to do about the freeway/grain access next to Simpson Ave? Concerned about drug trade. Is there a way to incentivize neighboring property owners in the area? Like property tax increase.</td>
<td>This area has increased in drug trafficking and crime since The Odyssey House moved in. The police can’t keep up with that small influx. How can they possibly keep up with major traffic access to the 700 East and I-80 escape access?</td>
<td>SIMPSON SAFETY LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>814</td>
<td>This area has increased in drug trafficking and crime since The Odyssey House moved in. The police can’t keep up with that small influx. How can they possibly keep up with major traffic access to the 700 East and I-80 escape access?</td>
<td>SIMPSON SAFETY LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>815 Crime is already out of control in Liberty Wells/South Salt Lake - We can’t get police to respond to theft, robbery calls. Homeless center will increase crime in this neighborhood.</td>
<td>Don’t build on Simpson.</td>
<td>SIMPSON SAFETY LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>816 No Shelter on Simpson. No Zoning Changes. Bad location idea. The trail walkers could be put in jeopardy or harassed. Thriving businesses which serve our neighborhood could be lost. Bringing an unsavory element with people using the shelter including drugs, sexual abuse, crime, theft, animal abuse. Change of the now pleasant atmosphere to one of fear and fear of personal threats.</td>
<td>Put the shelter above the new police station planned on being built. The best solution would be to go back to the two location idea as long as one of them would not be Simpson OR ANY NEIGHBORHOOD location. Lease current thriving businesses along - they currently serve our neighborhood.</td>
<td>SIMPSON SAFETY LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817</td>
<td>Trash, Crime, property value of homes, public safety, there is already drugs and prostitution in area, cost $$$, spreading homeless throughout city.</td>
<td>SAFETY LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>818 Turning away business because of crowding, drug use, loitering, invasion to nearby properties.</td>
<td>Make sure this center is the women’s and children’s center to reduce impacts if no other choice that what it should be. Also, no strictly free services. If a pantry or emergency beds are available here the impact on business will be too</td>
<td>700 SAFETY POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>819 Less than 1,000 ft from freeway overpass. Located on two high-traffic roads 700 east 2100 south. Walking distance to fairmont park and liquor store. Surrounded by residential housing on three sides. Highly accessible to drug trade.</td>
<td>Use this facility for women and children. Build playground for children in the shelter.</td>
<td>SIMPSON SAFETY POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820</td>
<td></td>
<td>Because of it’s proximity to so many residential areas, I strongly believe that the Simpson Ave site should be dedicated to women/children only. I also believe this will be for their safety as well since it is the most removed. I’m very worried about safety and property values; they should be priorities throughout the planning process. I want to make sure these sites have many resources to help people into more permanent housing/jobs.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>821</td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Ongoing agreement should remain at 150 people max!! 2) Additional security in nearby neighborhoods. 3) Area already vulnerable! Not a good fit for single males.</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>822</td>
<td>1. Existing issues including prostitution, Pan Handling, Crime, Property Theft. 2. Existing liquor store in close proximity 3. Discussion on Eliminating sites</td>
<td>1. Increase police presence and implements street light program. 2. Family demographic or woman and children 3. Model advertised and presented displays ISO PPC which was determined to be max # for be effective. Don’t eliminates sites!</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>823</td>
<td></td>
<td>It is concerning that there will be fewer beds. I feel like there needs to be more beds and more support and funding for law enforcement in the surrounding areas. Many of the other ideas and proposals sound good as long as they actually come about. Such as therapy, job placement, rehab facilities etc. Also consider playgrounds &amp; equipment for children of homeless families.</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>824</td>
<td></td>
<td>By spreading everyone out from Downtown, drug dealers will have to move. Even though there will not be a daily line, what is going to prevent it from following?</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>825</td>
<td></td>
<td>Drug Use more beds for homeless people (no person should sleep on the streets) More clothing, food for the homeless. Also, their drug on playground which is also dangerous for kids to be around.</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>826</td>
<td>Security; There have been security concerns addressed by the architecture, but what about the surrounding blocks? Will the drug trade spread across the city?</td>
<td>I wish I had one :) Perhaps, allow people to stay for awhile and provide drug treatment</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>827</td>
<td>Police presence needs to be guaranteed. Resources need to remain in place. Have to have 24 hour staff medical and psychiatrists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>828</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would love to see police officers become familiar, friendly faces in the neighborhoods surrounding the shelters in residential areas. That would help me feel more comfortable reporting things I might see and I think it would help the neighborhood feel like the City still values it.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>829</td>
<td>Loitering in the parks, illegal activity in the parks (Richmond Park and Tanner Park)</td>
<td>Curfew, the facility being accessible during the day. Having a neighborhood representative be a part of an advising committee to address community concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830</td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety patrols of dorms</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>831</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neighborhood watch type organization of clients</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>832</td>
<td></td>
<td>Client ambassador to Police Department and neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>833</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase security at showers and for transgender clients</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>834</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exit clients for vandalism</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>835</td>
<td></td>
<td>Offer security and privacy for clients</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>836</td>
<td>State street, particularly the section between 1300 S and 1700 S, already has a huge problem with drugs and prostitution. What measures will be taken to ensure this site does not further perpetuate these problems?; What plans are there to enhance/ensure overall security?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>837</td>
<td></td>
<td>This decision was hidden from the public because you knew it was the wrong decision. Simpson Avenue is 30 seconds from I-80 and 2 minutes from I-15. Please do not put the shelter so close to drug traffic. Women use drugs too. I do not want this shelter in a family neighborhood. Before sheltering and closing program, build affordable housing units to serve the hundreds on the County housing lists. They are all closed because not enough available housing for low income people. Get people housed first and then start addressing the treatment, resources and solutions</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>838</td>
<td></td>
<td>Guarantee safety lifestyle senior citizens; safety in neighborhood.; property value</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>839</td>
<td>I have the unfortunate opportunity of living within a triangle of 3 of the proposed sites (all within 3 miles, 2 within blocks). I am concerned with the safety and property value aspects of this proposal. We already have a fairly high crime rate; loitering, drugs, etc.) occur regularly within the alleys around my property -- I’ve caught people shooting up in my driveway -- there is a lot of dumping as well. Also, I've put a lot of money into my home and property values have begun to climb. I’m afraid that now as I near my 60’s my investment will disappear. I am upset that the city has not been transparent in this decision, but has listened and been influenced by wealthy corporations (Gateway, purchase, City Creek (LDS Church), and Gail Miller). Our taxes will increase while property values go down. Experimenting with the welfare of people is not democratic.</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840</td>
<td>Concern: 1. History -- Pioneer Park Drugs Heavy police presence moved problems to Liberty then to Sugar House, finally settled back @ Pioneer. This seems like you are repeating something that already did not work. 2. No meat in trespassing laws. SLC Police officer told me today that if someone puts a sleeping bag down on the area between sidewalk and street -- it may not be considered camping and they may not be able to move the person!! Police need enforcable laws to prevent the tent city moving around these locations. 3. Proximity to Tram Spur = goes right to SLC Boys &amp; Girls club, Fairmont Park to swimming pool catering to children &amp; Families &amp; short distance to Sugar House park. This is a gross risk of ruining family oriented facilities built &amp; operated by city.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>841</td>
<td>Concerns- Traffic Speeding Through Neighborhood Resident/Children Safety -- Known Drug House already in neighborhood, more increase drug trafficking -- Loitering Theft safety</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>842</td>
<td>Both these sites are in such proximity to the Main/State Street that already are infamous for drugs/ prostitution</td>
<td>More Polic sub-stations. Investigations &amp; cleaning up the motels on Main Street</td>
<td>700 &amp; HIGH</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>843 Trash, Crime, property value of homes, public safety, there is already drugs and prostitution in area, cost $$$, spreading homeless throughout city.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>844 If you place a single male population here you will have to include the male sex offenders homeless population. That may present a public safety concern because of Fortitude Treatment Center (FTC) nearby. They separate general population from sex offenders to protect sex offenders from violence. The FTC people must walk by High Street daily to reach AP&amp;P office and will possibly seek to harm people living on High Street center due to perception that they are all sex offenders.</td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>845 High Avenue proximity to no-tell motels and massage brothels!!</td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>846 Panhandling at Walmart, Lowes, liquor store, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>847 Alleyways near Simpson Avenue already have high drug use. Worried about drug use increasing. Also safety for children in neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>848 Pedestrian safety (kids in neighborhood)</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>849 Mentally ill/heightened safety concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850 Panhandling</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>851 No new beds for criminal element. Police cannot lock up non violent criminals because there's no room. We must have more jail space and more jail funding. Homeless criminals are getting bus passes from all over to come to Salt Lake City. Residents are victims of these criminals. We need the great police force to have somewhere to put the criminals that are picked up. I do not mean to have beds for criminals given to drug offenders. I mean we need more jail space to put the people who are stealing our cars, breaking into our cars, stealing our bikes, stealing our packages, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>852 Wrong location, freeway access-does not meet safety #1 criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>853 Concerns: 1)safety, 2)property value, 3)crime, 4)long term issues, 5)drug use, 6) you are uprooting (destroying) a whole community in favor of a program (experiment) that is not working. No!!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>854</td>
<td>Traffic safety. Lots of cars now because of Enclave Apts. We get large delivery trucks almost every day. Begging - I hate having people approach me for money.</td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>855</td>
<td>Increased crime likely</td>
<td>Increased police presence</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>856</td>
<td>Safety of neighborhood residents. Use of the S Line - more homeless - no resources at Sugar House - taking away charm. No guarantees that shelter will be occupied by women and children. There has been no public expert except after the</td>
<td>Look at your other sites.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>857</td>
<td>Safety, camping, open overnight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>858</td>
<td></td>
<td>Find housing for clients asap.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>859</td>
<td>Trash, Crime, property value of homes, public safety, there is already drugs and prostitution in area, cost $$$, spreading homeless throughout city.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860</td>
<td>Safety for homeless on 7th East, safety for community members on S Line and in neighborhood.</td>
<td>This is the worst location for emergency beds. Recommend more specific services, treatments, housing first.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>861</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>862</td>
<td>Safety concerns - increased drug activity in the surrounding neighborhoods. What happens to those who are turned down for services at the site? Decreased property values in surrounding neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Simpson designated for battered women who are less likely to be drug abusers. Those are refused services need to be physically transported out of the area. Increased police presence around the centers, including the alleyways between the streets. Reimbursement for loss of house value.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td></td>
<td>Concerned about safety of our Sugar House parks</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>864</td>
<td></td>
<td>City is requesting a new zoning of the area. Redistribution of crime within city. Businesses in the area will leave.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>865</td>
<td>Already high homeless population because of location of Smith's Grocery. Panhandling issue - street corners, Smith's parking lot. Good weather big problem sanitary issues ever next door to Public Safety Building. Property values - business areas - nonvoting property owners.</td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>866</td>
<td></td>
<td>Families have put all of their resources into their home in a safe neighborhood. The homeless shelter will more than quadruple the dangerous crimes in the area, as per research!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>867</td>
<td>Trash, Crime, property value of homes, public safety, there is already drugs and prostitution in area, cost $$$, spreading homeless throughout city.</td>
<td>No shelter here</td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>868</td>
<td></td>
<td>Will there be a police officer on site 24 hours a day? What will prevent transients from coming and going and being vagrants in the neighborhood? Will you allocate more police to the shelter neighborhoods?</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>869</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Parleys Trail and Trolley will become a homeless highway and Fairmont Park will be a dumping ground for the homeless. It is just beginning to move out of this phase. Need more patrol-cops and bikes-aggressive anti-panhandling signage.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>870</td>
<td></td>
<td>Concern: crime -- daytime while people working, alleyways -- school children -- St. Ann's &amp; Hawthorne. Relocation assistance &amp; finance help for businesses -- potential people out of work -- loss of jobs, revenue, stable community friendly businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>871</td>
<td></td>
<td>Simpson Avenue: This is an outrageous facility to spacing onto a residential community w/ no public involvement. Personal experience with other shelters is that the problems associated with shelters as such cannot be contained. The Simpson Avenue facility will create a neighborhood that requires steel bars over people's windows.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>872</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not safe for the neighborhood. Not safe area from 7th east railroad tracks for homeless children. The drug situation is uncontrolable now. Without all the extra people.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>873</td>
<td></td>
<td>Security of course is a top concern, but it would be a shame to see more intrusive policing tactics such as a &quot;stop &amp; frisk&quot; take precedence. I spoke with an officer at one of the public meetings, Officer Farillas, I believe, and he said SLC used to be much more involved in community policing tactics. I think this is a fantastic idea and I believe this type of policing should be encouraged. How can we encourage community policing in our neighborhood and the areas surrounding the proposed shelters? What steps can the community take to ensure a good balance between security, policing, and respect for individual civil liberties? Thanks!</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>874</td>
<td></td>
<td>W/Security being a concern, I want to make sure neighborhoods are safe. At the same time, being aware of the strife between people of color and police, I fear over policing and hurtful tactics like &quot;stop &amp; frisk.&quot; With the shooting that took place by the Rio Grande with Abdi Mohamed, what tactics can we ensure our PD uses without the promotion of/ or resulting in gun violence while keeping our neighborhoods safe?</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>875</td>
<td></td>
<td>I fully support the creation of there homeless shelters, but we need more funding allocated to our police forces so that they are able to handle the problems that are associated with homelessness. On my block there have been multiple breakins and vandalism, and my neighbors are moving because they fear more criminal incidents. The police expressed being overwhelmed with calls. Clearly we will need a stronger force in place to deal with a potential influx of homelessness in response to our homeless programs.</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>876</td>
<td></td>
<td>I work at SLCC - SCC child care. We need more beds not less. We don't want more homeless people leaving drugs where they can be accessed by children.</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase drugs; old needles and syringes left for children to pickings.; Police forgetting about us once this center is built.; With just a building to live-in -- they need a JOB to help them busy and feeling useful. A lot of people are just giving up.</td>
<td>Having frequent meeting in the community for police to attend and for us to voice our concerns.</td>
<td>700 &amp; SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already have issues with people hanging around outside in neighborhood by park &amp; Rocky Mtn Power Station. Causes lots of littering and petty crime already.</td>
<td>Need outdoor space for residents NOT visible to larger neighborhood, &amp; lots of security in the area. Would prefer that city improve street lighting, etc. in area &amp; just clean up more in general.</td>
<td>700 SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am concerned about violence against homeless people, some have talked about obtaining guns for protection. This further isolates homeless people.</td>
<td>Community education on topics like: number of homeless, families and children statistic showing mental ill people on more likely to be a victim rather than a perpetuation of violence.</td>
<td>ALL SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will there be security around at all times or part time?; How can we make sure neighborhoods are safe? What will happen to existing hotels and motels that are susceptible to drugs and prostitutions that are part of the problem?</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALL SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do I have to pay for new security fencing? New cameras? Security guards? Or can the city subsidize this?</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination with surrounding property owners for security purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has there been an increase in crime or drug activity in the Midvale Family Center location?</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This site is: not avoiding the drug trade -near Fairmont Park, just off I-80 drug corridor, a facility that attracts crime is put in an established neighborhood, parking?</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous for pedestrians on 700 East, can't stop traffic more than now, too close to freeway-no center on Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 E at Simpson is a VERY dangerous place to be a pedestrian. Look at crash data here. It's amongst the worst in the City.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further criminal and disruptive activity moving into the neighborhoods. With State Street development in progress, there are already a higher number of people and activities moving into Liberty Wells neighborhood. I am concerned adding a resource center on 700 East will create more &quot;activity&quot; between State and 700 East.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>General Comments</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Tags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>888</td>
<td>Drug trade variable-we don't know for sure scattered site will solve drug trafficking, it may still just move or adapt-no center on Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>889</td>
<td>Simpson and 700 E is very dangerous street. No center on Simpson.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>890</td>
<td>There's a lovely pedestrian/cycling public space along the S Line that is dark and can harbor illicit behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>891</td>
<td>Simpson Avenue is in an established neighborhood. Inviting drugs and registered sex offenders in will destroy the progress Liberty Wells has had the past 15 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>892</td>
<td>Known shelter issues and dangers, Displaces established local owned businesses, Keep local business where they are successfully operating currently, more crime in a neighborhood that is already struggling with crime!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>893</td>
<td>Do not risk our neighborhood-which is finally improving the last ten years which was riddled with crime, drugs, defacing property.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>No shelter! My wife is disabled and would not feel safe walking on her own</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>895</td>
<td>The TRAX route has always felt safe for recreational walking, running, biking for a single woman. This will no longer be the case and will detract from the great strides made.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>896</td>
<td>Trash and crime all over in the streets of the sites-like the current Rio Grande situation</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>897</td>
<td>Kids picking up dirty needles, being exposed to lewd behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>898</td>
<td>We need more police to adequately patrol the areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>The centers need to accommodate the homeless during the day. Working at Salt Lake Community College (an open campus) we see many homeless who are sent here during the day, and as a result there are many problems with drugs on the day care playground, knife fights, people stripping naked in front of the children, and other extreme behaviors.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>Kids exposed to drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901</td>
<td></td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>902</td>
<td>Coordinate with local property owners and managers on security concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>903</td>
<td>Maintain police presence here -- I’m not sure private security will work well here. A full-time station? I do think police presence will increase generally in these area, which is a good thing.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>904</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>905</td>
<td>Please put policies protecting people of color and at-risk populations from negative impacts of the increased presence of police officers in communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td>Designate a SLCPD substation within the 653 E Simpson Resource Center (Heavy bike patrol as an alternative)</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>907</td>
<td>Find a location with less drug trafficking access!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>908</td>
<td>Trash, crime, drugs, property value, loitering proximity to liquor store. Proximity to big box store parking lots for pan handling (Walmart, Lowes)</td>
<td>Not putting alcoholics at this location</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>909</td>
<td>This will make the Walmart even scarier - will the homeless end up concentrating around these big box stores?</td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910</td>
<td>The closeness of this site to Liberty Park creates a high potential for crimes and drug activity to increase in the park. This will put out children who play in the park in danger of being exposed to drugs in a way they might not otherwise. It also increases the dangers posed by drug needles that are left in the park.</td>
<td>CONSTANT police presence (especially around the playgrounds and water play area). Also strict consequences for those who use drugs of alcohol in the park.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911</td>
<td>Nearby railroad tracks are already an issue. Crossing the tracks and camping by the tracks or under the viaduct is common.</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>912</td>
<td>Litter is a problem on the street.</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>913</td>
<td>Dumping of gifts.</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>914</td>
<td>Camping in area will be exacerbated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>915</td>
<td>Bussing from other cities – transferring issues to SLC</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>916</td>
<td>Once built it will attract people to the area for the new services.</td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917</td>
<td>Location is already high on police calls.</td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>918</td>
<td>Overflow will end up being Freemont Park and there will be an increase of people under the I-80 overpass.</td>
<td>Will there be an increase in police presence in the surrounding area? Will this take away from police current duties? (most actually increase number of officers). The site is not just where the physical location as &quot;potential solution&quot; says. &quot;Potential solution&quot; must encompass the whole neighborhood.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>919</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collective Impact citations, security, how do you keep people (like men) not at this shelter when the women show up at the shelter?</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920</td>
<td>Cleanliness</td>
<td>City jobs to keep it clean</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>921</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Onsite security officer</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>922</td>
<td>Possible car break-ins at nearby apts and homes. Happened three times Monday 1/2 mile away from Nibley.</td>
<td>Added security patrols. Fence between apt parking lots and facility. Maybe a variation of the sand walls used along the interstate; make it unclimbable.</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923</td>
<td></td>
<td>Police need more than 20 people to help adequately monitor and support facilities in 4 different areas. Do not wait for uptick in crime before providing resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>924</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. neighborhood health continual analysis and crime rates and property values with guaranties to affected neighborhoods if ill effects. 2. improve existing crime - State St and surrounding areas host prostitution and drug abuse City needs to step in and purchase these areas to clean up existing neighborhood issue as the same time they are building the shelters</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925</td>
<td>I am concerned with the increase of crime in the area. How will the City and the police stop the spread of crime from State St. to the Simpson Ave center? Also, how will the shelter prevent the congregation of homeless that don’t have a bed at the center? Where will these people go? How will the city Prevent home depreciations in area?</td>
<td>You tell me</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>926</td>
<td></td>
<td>Can we use data about crime, etc. near existing facilities (Odyssey House, other side Academy, other recovery services) to help the community understand that these services do not harm their neighborhoods? They are already in our community and yet we are okay.</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>927</td>
<td>I think the cops would stop giving us a hard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>928</td>
<td>Our &quot;world class&quot; library has become a haven of drug deals and squallor</td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>929</td>
<td>Fairmont Park nuisance issues</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930</td>
<td>Need more than four locations, spread apart, more anti-panhandling laws and enforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>931</td>
<td>With limited occupancy will come more people being turned away...sleeping in cars and on the street nearby.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>932</td>
<td>You're moving this issue from Downtown to a highly residential area.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>933</td>
<td>Fairmont Park and Liberty Park are too close to this site. We all know what happens when you place a homeless service close to a park. Look at Pioneer Park.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>934</td>
<td>How can you assure us the drug trade won't simply move/adopt to keep their income? Save Simpson, no shelter on Simpson. How can you take an untested model and test it on families rather than businesses who can adapt? No Shelter on Simpson. What will happen to the single family houses if the system is underfunded in 20+ years? What will happen if the case managers are overwhelmed? Move the Simpson site! No shelter on Simpson!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>935</td>
<td>Homelessness is not a crime!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>936</td>
<td>Close 700 E exit off I-80!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>937</td>
<td>Fairmont, Liberty and Sugarhouse Parks-Keep Clean</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>938</td>
<td>Prove drug reduction with trial model first! Save Simpson Avenue from pestilence and putrifications. No Simpson shelters!</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>939</td>
<td>More policing</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>940</td>
<td>More security patrols</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>941</td>
<td>Cut down on police harassment of clients</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>942</td>
<td>Stop drug dealers from being near by centers</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>943</td>
<td>Keep needles away from area and not in public</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>944</td>
<td>Clients should behave so they aren't kicked out of neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>945</td>
<td>Where is not much getting done in a meeting for just homeless people. The theft and drug use is rampant and atrocious, not acceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>946 If the Road Home closes, there will be greater demand on this shelter which will be capped at 150</td>
<td>Keep the Road Home open, create more affordable housing to reduce the need on emergency shelter and then close the Road Home when it is no longer needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td>AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>947 NOT in Sugar House - safety, property values, displacing good, local businesses.</td>
<td>Many locations already exist, ie. RDA sites, improve/rebuild the Road Home and make it look like that neighborhood. Keep homeless shelters/resource centers in conditional use zoned areas (CG, D2, D3) and not attempt new zoning amendments for FB-SE.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>948</td>
<td>I support the dispersion of the Road Home into 4 smaller sites around the city. If possible consider additional sites. I would gladly recommend my neighborhood for another site.</td>
<td></td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>949</td>
<td>Need to move most vulnerable population out of Road Home first – single women and families.</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950</td>
<td>If you keep The Road Home open, please hire people who are dependable, strong, educated, sympathetic (understanding). There is no backbone to The Road Home.</td>
<td></td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>951</td>
<td>As cleanup of Rio Grande has occurred, over the last year or so, the crime rate has dropped in the Road Home area a reported 5% (Chief Brown) but that crime rate has only transferred that much or more to my neighborhood. Law enforcement works tirelessly, but can't rid our area and street of crimes that render us vulnerable. How can we trust that criminal activity won't worsen? I am in support of this new model and locations, but don't trust the management outside the gates.</td>
<td></td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>952 Too close to big parks - same that happen at Pioneer will happen at Liberty and Fairmont. All of the studies you chose to back up your decisions were hand picked to justify your decision; I don't care what your studies say, I can just look at the issue downtown and tell that these facilities do affect crime and quality of life in the area.</td>
<td>Build these in non-res areas. Reform the Rio Grande Instead!!!</td>
<td></td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>953 The Road Home is too large and leads to overcrowding and unsafe conditions. Too many places for drug users to shoot up. Too many instances of violence.</td>
<td>I think the 700 South shelter is a great site. However, you absolutely must close down The Road Home site for any of this to make a difference.</td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>954</td>
<td>We live downtown near The Road Home and other facilities. We are so happy to see this plan. We couldn't be more excited to see The Road Home close. It has absolutely blighted our community and is threatening our way of life downtown. These smaller, more diversified locations are a great start -- a wonderful idea. We're totally supportive.</td>
<td>Please close The Road Home. There also must be facilities in other cities outside of SLC. Sandy, Draper, Holladay, Orem, etc. These other cities must quit sending all of their problems to the city. They must be forced to participate and provid facilities.</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>955</td>
<td>400 less beds than now-where will those people go?</td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>956</td>
<td>Keep The Road Open</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>957</td>
<td>Keep The Road Home open &amp; funded</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>958</td>
<td>Why not just redevelop existing site in phases?</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>959</td>
<td>The Road Home is too big and needs to be closed. If you don't close it, it will never be closed. The crime and drug problem is out of control.</td>
<td>Close The Road Home</td>
<td></td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960</td>
<td>How will you deal with the shortfall in the number of beds if The Road Home is closed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961</td>
<td>How will you deal with the shortfall in the number of beds if you close the Road Home?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>962</td>
<td>Keep The Road Home open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963</td>
<td>Keep the Road Home open. Keep Access to Public transportation so people can access 4th St. Clinic.</td>
<td>How do I get involved when/if the downtown location is closed?</td>
<td></td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>964</td>
<td>Keep the Road Home open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>965</td>
<td>Keep the Road Home open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>966</td>
<td>Keep the Road Home open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>967</td>
<td>Keep The Road Home open</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>968</td>
<td>Keep The Road Home open as well as the new centers. It still fills a need. Use it for overflow.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>969</td>
<td>Keep The Road Home open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMENTS</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>TAGS</td>
<td>TAG #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>Clean up the crime that has overflowed as a result of clean up @ Road Home over the last year that is in my/ours/your neighborhoods before the $$ is all used up.</td>
<td></td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>971</td>
<td>Keep The Road Home open</td>
<td></td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>972</td>
<td>Keep the Road Home Open</td>
<td></td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>973</td>
<td>Do a better job at keep The Road Home open and police it.</td>
<td></td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>974</td>
<td>Keep Road Home open</td>
<td></td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>975</td>
<td>Keep The Road Home open &amp; funded</td>
<td></td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>976</td>
<td>Questions on the closing of the Road Home and time frame for that action.</td>
<td></td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>977</td>
<td>What will happen to the medical beds that are currently at the Road Home that hospitals will discharge patients to?</td>
<td></td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>978</td>
<td>What will happen to the medical beds at the Road Home?</td>
<td></td>
<td>THE ROAD HOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?
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What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?
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All Responses: 95
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This topic started on January 10, 2017, 10:43 AM.
Responses

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.

Answered 45
Skipped 14

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What should be included in the community management plan?

Answered 45
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers
What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

Skipped 14
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Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?

Answered 46

Skipped 13
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Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.

Answered 22
Skipped 37
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Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.

Answered 20
Skipped 39

area center central close community do easily facility from great homeless housing how impact like locations more neighborhood part people property public residential S see services shelter site slc so t they transit up very want what which who work

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.

Answered 22
Skipped 37

above access accessible all area being community do dollars drug even
Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.

Answered 50
Skipped 9
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Additional Comments:

Answered 38
Skipped 21
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Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers
What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

who within
The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community? Other - Size isn't the most important factor in 'fit'. Define 'fit into the larger community'.

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
For a homeless facility to 'fit' into a larger community, the surrounding property use must be compatible. Single family residences next to homeless shelters isn't a good fit, no matter how big the facility is. Forcing local business to move to accommodate a homeless shelter is also not a 'fit'.

Community Management Plan
To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities? No

What should be included in the community management plan?
Seriously, making a single person be responsible for complaints is an ignorant idea. If a plan were to be implemented, make Mayor Biskupski be the contact person for complaints.

Designed for Safety and Security.
The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger
sense of control and discouraging trespassers. Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

**Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?**
Yes

**What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?**
These suggested CPTED Standards should be considered as minimums, not maximums. These Standards will also make 'fitting' these facilities into locations adjacent single family residential very difficult, if not impossible. Extra lighting, Separation of Space barriers, and access control are all not congruent with residential neighborhood uses.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

**648 West 100 South**

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

**Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.**
No response

**131 East 700 South**
Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible
Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
The Simpson Avenue location is unacceptable for many reasons including the price that was negotiated, the location of the site being within a residential neighborhood and near on-and-off ramps of I-80, current property zoning, current Master Plans governing the site, displacement of several local businesses, parking and traffic issues, along with construction related costs and impacts on the residents within and surrounding the neighborhood.

The price negotiated for the Simpson Avenue site is absolutely appalling, as was the entire process of Salt Lake City’s acquisition of the site. While we understand that assessed property values can be lower than the actual fair market value of a property, we do not believe the entire Simpson Avenue property is worth more than 2½ times the assessed value. The fact that the Mayor and the City Council were unaware of the actual purchase price negotiated for the site is completely unethical. The Mayor is the chief executor of appropriated funds and as such, she should have been aware of all of the facts pertaining to the purchase of the homeless resource centers being proposed within Salt Lake City, especially if the purchase price is significantly higher than the assessed property value. Why do the funds earmarked for the Simpson Avenue site include paying $300,000 to settle a law suit between the property owner and the UTA? Isn’t this a misappropriation of funds and a possible conflict of interest? Also, why was a price threshold never discussed between the Mayor and the Real Estate Team prior to site acquisition? Determining a price threshold should have been one of the first orders of business prior to empowering the Real Estate Team to move forward with any property purchase. The fact that the Mayor and City Council approved the site purchases without ever physically seeing the sites is irresponsible.

The Simpson Avenue location violates the most important Site Selection Process recommendation from the Salt Lake City Homeless Services Site Evaluation Commission (HSSEC). This location is right by an on and off ramp to I-80. The Salt Lake City Police department confirmed that locations near on and off ramps to an interstate have the potential for increased local drug activity. It is obvious that this fact was ignored when selecting the Simpson Avenue site. The neighborhoods surrounding Simpson Avenue are working diligently to decrease crime and drug activity. Constructing the proposed Homeless Resource Center will only increase crime and drug activity associated with this type of facility. Consequently, the increased police and EMS presence resulting from the facility will negatively affect the neighborhood. While most of the residents of the surrounding neighborhoods would appreciate an increased police presence to combat current crime, we do not welcome additional crime resulting in excessive police presence.

The Site Selection Process recommendation from the HSSEC indicates that selected sites should have easy access. The Simpson Avenue site does not have easy access. It is extremely difficult to turn left onto Simpson
Avenue when traveling north bound on 700 East, as there is no light; only a short left-turn lane. Traffic attempting to access the site from the south (Freeway) would be forced to use 2100 South, 600 East and the surrounding neighborhood streets, which were not designed for this quantity of traffic. Surface street access to the Simpson Avenue site will be difficult during demolition, construction, and throughout the life of the facility. The residents in the surrounding neighborhoods should not be forced to endure such traffic. The fact that this location is adjacent to a single family residential neighborhood and near I-80 make this a poor choice.

The proposed facility on Simpson Avenue is not compatible with the surrounding land use. The existing site is not currently zoned to accommodate this proposed facility, either. Planning and Zoning could only recommend a zoning change to the Salt Lake City Council if the proposed use were compatible with the surrounding properties. We do not believe that a homeless resource center, with 24 hour services, is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood land uses. The current local businesses on the site close in the early evening and are quiet throughout the night. This a peaceful single-family residential neighborhood. The proposed Homeless Resource Center would not preserve the historic quality of the neighborhood and would introduce unwanted activity, including loitering, drug activity, solicitation, and the resulting police response.

We are Utah natives and we appreciate and support our local businesses. It is disheartening that the local businesses on Simpson Avenue would have to be relocated, or possibly put out of business, if the proposed Homeless Resource Center were to be built there. We believe that the current benefits that these local businesses provide to our community outweigh the proposed benefits of the Homeless Resource Center (which aren’t guaranteed). Also, displacing local businesses is not congruent with the Sugarhouse Master Plan goal of protecting and preserving stable and well-kept neighborhoods. The Lil’ Scholars Daycare has a lease through December 2019. To displace them and the other businesses would be unethical. The hundreds of local families, clients, children, and employees would all be negatively affected if the existing businesses were forced to vacate. Quality childcare in Sugarhouse is difficult to find. We can’t afford the loss of the Lil’ Scholars Daycare. Additionally, offering these businesses relocation assistance using tax payers’ dollars isn’t what tax payers want. We would rather see our money and these businesses saved.

We are concerned about the parking and traffic issues that would accompany the proposed Homeless Resource Center on Simpson Avenue. As stated previously, access to Simpson Avenue from northbound 700 East is extremely limited. Adding a light or turn signal to turn left would be excessive, considering the existing S-Line light and the adjacent lights on 2100 South Street and I-80. Increased traffic, comprised of delivery trucks, service providers, staff, police, EMS, clients and others through the residential neighborhoods surrounding the Simpson Avenue site will create a huge impact to residents and the infrastructure itself. During demolition and construction these traffic impacts will be exacerbated. Simpson Avenue was not designed for the amount of heavy truck traffic that would be required to facilitate the proposed development. This heavy truck traffic will destroy the current road conditions, causing tax payer money to be needed to reconstruct them. There are unforeseen costs in the form of tax payer money to rebuild the roads and the resulting traffic disruption to the neighborhood during road reconstruction. Parking opportunities on Simpson Avenue are limited as is. The additional parking needs of the proposed facility are greater than the site can accommodate. The high ground water table in the area creates an extreme obstacle to constructing an underground parking structure. The costs to develop adequate parking at the site would be astronomical, compounding the already outrageous price for the site.

The construction and demolition related costs and impacts of the proposed Homeless Resource Center cannot...
be fully known at this time, and are likely much higher than anticipated by the selection committee, City Council
and the Mayor. Based on the age of the existing buildings, an assumption must be made that asbestos
containing building materials, lead based paints, mercury containing light ballasts, and other potential
environmental contaminants exist at the site. The cost to properly mitigate environmental concerns during
demolition could be exponential, again compounding the absurd price negotiated for this proposed site. Design
and construction of liquefaction and earthquake-induced settlement at the site must also be considered, further
increasing the site costs. Some of the costs and effects of site demolition and construction on the surrounding
neighborhood would include migrant dust, light pollution, mud, noise, and increased traffic. Increased traffic
would include heavy trucks, excavation and heavy equipment and their transports, contractors, subcontractors
and employee vehicles, site security, media and others. Dust, noise, light and mud pollution and increased
traffic are costs that would be unequally born by the residents of the surrounding neighborhoods.

**Additional Comments:**

We appreciate the new “scattered site” model for the Homeless Resource Centers in addressing the increasing
homeless problem in Salt Lake County. While we do not feel the Simpson Avenue site is an appropriate
location for such a facility, we believe that a nearby location may be. Although this location is not in Salt Lake
City limits, the property bounded by 2100 South, Haven Avenue, State Street, and Main Street in nearby South
Salt Lake should be considered for a Homeless Resource Center. Including the City of South Salt Lake as a
partner in combating homelessness in Salt Lake County, while repealing the Simpson Avenue site could be a
winning solution for all stakeholders. The South Salt Lake property does not have nearly as many challenges
as the Simpson Avenue site. At the South Salt Lake location, the demolition is already complete. The costs of
building at the South Salt Lake site would be significantly cheaper than Simpson Avenue. Seven million dollars
would likely pay for not only the site acquisition but also the complete construction of a Homeless Resource
Center at the South Salt Lake location.

Proposed construction at the South Salt Lake location includes retail and commercial buildings as well as low
and medium income housing. Adding a Homeless Resource Center to the South Salt Lake development would
complement the proposed construction there and enable clients of the center to easily access all services
recommended by the Salt Lake City Homeless Services Site Evaluation Commission (HSSEC). The proximity
to the S-Line also makes the South Salt Lake location desirable. This location would provide many
opportunities including access to housing, jobs, services, transportation, recreation and retail. With the South
Salt Lake site being completely open at this time, design of a Homeless Resource Center has substantially
fewer boundaries and impacts than the Simpson Avenue site. The South Salt Lake site is large enough to
address pre and post construction parking and traffic concerns. Please contact South Salt Lake Mayor Cherie
Wood and Mike Florence and Francis Lilly at South Salt Lake Community Development to see how constructing
a Homeless Resource Center on their property can be part of a successful solution to the Simpson Avenue site
problems, while providing for a Homeless Resource Center in this area.

Construction of a Homeless Resource Center on Simpson Avenue in Salt Lake City presents too many
detrimental effects including the price that was negotiated, the location of the site being within a residential
neighborhood and near on-and-off ramps of I-80, current property zoning, current Master Planning,
displacement of several local businesses, parking and traffic issues, along with construction related costs and
impacts on the residents within and surrounding the neighborhood. Constructing a Homeless Resource Center
in South Salt Lake could alleviate many of the adverse concerns associated with the Simpson Avenue site.
Thank you for taking our comments, concerns and suggestions into consideration.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
John Gurr inside Council District 4  
February 1, 2017, 5:19 PM

Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
Yes

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
Without some type of cap, there may be unlimited growth and an inclination to expand as shown with The Road Home facility.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
Yes

What should be included in the community management plan?
Communication and expression of opinions and comments cannot ever be a bad idea and should help bridge the gap between perception and reality.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
Security goes both ways: residents of the facility need to feel safe in their environment as do the neighbors (something terribly lacking now at places such as The Road Home and the Catholic Community Center).

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
This facility should be built last! Due to its close proximity to The Road Home, the ever present problems will just spread to the new facility. It would be best to have The Road Home close simultaneously upon opening this new facility.

All of these facilities should be what they say: centers with multiple available resources for the homeless to not only provide food and shelter, but social, mental and physical referral systems, financial advice and assistance, drug and alcohol rehabilitation assistance, and the ability to transport residents to helpful and needed facilities as mentioned plus less critical but necessary places, e.g., DMV, etc.

131 East 700 South
Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
See above. This seems like a great site that fulfils the various requirements needed.

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
See above. This seems like a great site that fulfils the various requirements needed.

653 Simpson Avenue
Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
See above. Residents need to get over themselves and understand that this is not going to be like The Road Home, but similar to Lantern House in Ogden, YWCA in Salt Lake and the facility in Midvale which have really nice operations similar to many commercial businesses. And with regards to the price, being a commercial real estate broker for over thirty years, the assessed value rarely is a market value ... assessed values are typically based on historical data that lag behind the market. Indeed, I would suggest each property owner look at their last property tax notice and see how closely it aligns with their own perception and would they agree to sell at that price.

Additional Comments:
No response

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
Other - Only if it is in addition to the existing facility.

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
SLC Mayor really dropped the ball by NOT including the community in the planning process. Huge mistake! And, she and her committee obviously grossly overpaid for at least one piece of property. That said, our community needs to meet the needs of the homeless and to take steps to integrate them into our community in a compassionate and thoughtful manner. So far, I have seen relatively little compassion when it comes to meeting the needs of those who struggle to make it through one more day. (Without a "team" - my mentally ill son would be on the streets or dead by now.) Getting help should not be that difficult! That said, I am concerned that it appears the current plan is the develop 4 facilities that will each house 150 people and to eventually do away with the current 1100 bed facility. So...how does this new solution help the homeless? By removing them from downtown Salt Lake we may make some businesses happy - But it also means that there are fewer beds available to meet the demand of the current homeless population. Knowing that there have been times when there is not a single bed available in any mental health facility in the state when my son desperately needs that level of help - I cannot help but believe this current "plan" will worsen an already deplorable situation.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
No

What should be included in the community management plan?
We need more beds and more help - not fewer beds spread out throughout the city. What plan exists to help those who are in the facilities to move forward and not back onto the street? My son waited 5 years to get Section 8 housing. So, where are the very limited number of people that will be housed in these new facilities to go after their stay? What services is SLC - Utah - going to provide for those who struggle to make it through the day because of a variety of issues? So far, I am not impressed with how we compassionately reach out to
those who desperately need help.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
A safe environment is a necessity - for those living in the facility and for those who live or work near a facility/

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood
Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
How are services easily accessible? Do residents get a TRAX pass? Walk? Services provided at facility?

131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
How are services easily accessible? Do residents get a TRAX pass? Walk? Services provided at facility?

I work at a school that is located very close to this facility. From discussions with my coworkers, none of us have any concerns about this facility. Our students are a part of the community; and learning how to interact with members of the community is a part of their education.

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance
Large site allows for creative design

**Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.**
How are services easily accessible? Do residents get a TRAX pass? Walk? Services provided at facility?

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

**Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.**
How are services easily accessible? Do residents get a TRAX pass? Walk? Services provided at facility?

I think that this facility was the one that the planning commission really blew it on. Sugar House is barely recovering from the Granite Furniture blight - and now this. I can understand why SH residents are upset. I cannot understand why SLC overpaid for property?

**Additional Comments:**
Dear Mayor - I think you “articulate” quite well when you speak to your constituents. Your problem is that you do not communicate with them in an open forum...Kind of miss the point of living in a democracy where the voices of individuals should be heard. And, I think that this city REALLY needs to consider the availability of services to those who need them - services that will keep people off the street and not homeless before desperate options are needed, and the services needed to help them step out of that hole once they have fallen in.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
Yes

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
No response

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
Yes

What should be included in the community management plan?
No response

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.
Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
No response

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible
Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation
Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
No response

131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities
Easily accessible by public transit
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers

What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City
Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
No response

Additional Comments:
No response

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
Yes

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
No response

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
Yes

What should be included in the community management plan?
No response

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.
Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
No response

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
No response

131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers
What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City
Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
No response

Additional Comments:
No response

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

**Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?**

No

**Comments relating to capping the number of beds.**

Capping the number of beds will not prevent the scattering of homeless opportunistic thieves into the surrounding neighborhoods. It may "help" the problems seen in Rio Grand not be as pronounced, but thus far the plan has done little to alleviate my concerns of an increase of drug and crime around the sites.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

**Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?**

Yes

**What should be included in the community management plan?**

In addition to a contact, there must be a process for the city to make restitution to neighbors of the site. If the human excrement issue seen near Rio Grand and Pioneer park make it to the new sites, the city must be held accountable for bringing those issues to residential neighborhoods. Same goes for damages caused, garbage left, and other disarray that follows the homeless. Services must be provided so that tax paying homeowners are not left to deal with the burden of these issues.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
A dedicated Law Enforcement Officer for each site. Public access to surveillance videos if suspicion exists that a "resident" has committed a crime against them, for aid in identification. Accountability for all residents of the shelters, and their impact on the community vs. being integrated into a community.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
Site is conducive to a "Resource Center". Impact will lessen on the neighborhood allowing for the developers to build, and property values in the area to increase. I see many more expensive condo's being built nearby the old shelter and this one.
131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
This site is too close to residential single family housing. I am concerned of the criminal impact that will happen to an area that already has issues with opportunistic crime. More needs to be done to ensure that the impact is minimal. There has been no reassurances about the crime impact that surely will happen, and the additional burden borne by the surrounding central city neighborhood. Property values will be sure to plummet anywhere within 1/2 mile radius of this center. What will the city do about this? I expect the city to bear full responsibility for this impact, and if they are not willing to compensate homeowners for this loss. If the city is unwilling to either move this or compensate, there surely will be litigation regarding this. Property owners and taxpayers in the city were not afforded ample opportunity to voice their concerns regarding location. YWCA housing is not an accurate representation of what this shelter will be. They are very different demographics. This area is NOT close to public transit, save the buses that run city wide (Making most other locations just as ideal, if not more so than this one). Trax is over 1/2 mile away. This center would be better served on the west side of state street, in the less residential area, but still close to workforce services.

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design
Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
This is an ideal location for a resource center. It truly is close to TRAX and can integrate into the neighborhood effectively. My only concern is proximity to the Liquor store, and the vulnerable demographic that will be housed here would have such easy access to the alcohol so commonly abused. There is a large number of job opportunities available in the area that hopefully can be utilized by this population.

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
This is the least ideal location. Residents will surely have a very large impact on their lives, as well as property values. SLC needs to rethink this location. Deeply affordable housing should also not be implemented here, as this comes with its own slew of problems. SLC has been irresponsible with the purchase of this site for twice market value, after paying out damages from recent litigation with regards to the S-line installation in the area. This is complete disregard for the precious taxpayer funds.

Additional Comments:
SLC Council and Mayor Biskupski have been grossly irresponsible with the taxpayers money, and seem to be forgetting that they are employed only by taxpayers. More regard must be given to the homeowners in the areas affected. All excuses for going about this the manner it was have been reprehensible. I understand the need for homeless services, but it seems the burden has been laid squarely on the residents who already suffer the most losses due to the damaging demographic.

I have lived in another major city in Utah for the last 10 Years, and have never been a victim of property theft or assault. When I moved to Salt Lake, i chose to live in the city with the desire to be able to work and live all in the
same city, and be able to make the choice to bike to work, and walk to nearby shopping. Unfortunately SLC does nothing to curb the rampant crime in the area, as I have been a victim of both property theft and Aggravated assault by a homeless person since moving here. This city has become a haven for criminals, as there is no real repercussions even if they are caught. They are not incarcerated for any appreciable amount of time. Justice is Not served. More needs to be done to make this a safe place for residents, and not the place it currently is.

I sincerely regret my decision to purchase property in Salt Lake City, especially since the announcement of the so-called "Homeless Resource Centers" that happen to be very close to my already overpriced home.

I fear I will never be able to sell my home for what I owe on it now, should the problems become too severe for me to want to continue to live and work in this city. By then, property values would have decreased so much that I'd be stuck living with it.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?

Other - It doesn't make sense that when City Council identified "root causes" of homelessness as lack of housing and now 4 facilities at 150 beds is less than 1,100 beds at current Road Home

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.

No response

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?

Yes

What should be included in the community management plan?

My neighbors came to the open house at SLCC regarding the homeless shelter plans last Wednesday and were dismayed with some of our other community members who were opposed to the homeless shelter. I own a single family house and live with my family at 400 E. and about 1900 S. I and my neighbors believe very strongly in the power and beauty of mixed income neighborhoods. I know there are many others in our neighborhood who already do, or could, see the shelter in a more positive way too. While I would DEFINITELY support the addition of more affordable housing in our neighborhood I think it would be a cop out to do Mayor McAdam's plan of abandoning the homeless shelter here.

I was inspired by members of the High St. neighborhood who rallied to offer constructive support and questions that would help ensure the shelter is a positive influence on our community and would like to do the same here in Simpson. This is the only shelter that is proposed for the East side of Salt Lake City, the city needs to show that it cares about desegregating our neighborhoods.

Thank you,
Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility? Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered? No response

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South
Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
No response

131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities
Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
My neighbors came to the open house at SLCC regarding the homeless shelter plans last Wednesday and were dismayed with some of our other community members who were opposed to the homeless shelter. I own a house and live with my family at 400 E. and about 1900 S. I and my neighbors believe very strongly in the power and beauty of mixed income neighborhoods. I know there are many others in our neighborhood who already do, or could, see the shelter in a more positive way too. While I would DEFINITELY support the addition of more affordable housing in our neighborhood I think it would be a cop out to do Mayor McAdam's plan of abandoning the homeless shelter here.

I was inspired by members of the High St. neighborhood who rallied to offer constructive support and questions that would help ensure the shelter is a positive influence on our community and would like to do the same here in Simpson. This is the only shelter that is proposed for the East side of Salt Lake City, the city needs to show that it cares about desegregating our neighborhoods.
Thank you,

Ryan Pleune

1868 S. 400 E.

SLC UT 84115

801 633-3474

**Additional Comments:**

Four shelters at 150 beds is not enough if the current Road Home is 1,100. Is the plan for the Road Home to remain open and add the additional 600 beds?

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
No

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
I am concerned that the problem is with those who do not really want services and those who are not competent. These groups are not going to go away just because we build more facilities.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
No

What should be included in the community management plan?
There needs to be a task force of experienced professionals to help with the planning. I am talking about people who are trained in mental health and poverty issues—not city planners. There needs to be dialog across state lines, so all are sharing experiences of what is working and what is not working in their areas. This is not just a local problem.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

- Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
- Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
These standards are important, but overlook the question of whether we need the proposed facilities in the first place. I agree we need to get people to the help they need in a more expeditious manner. I disagree with the idea that these facilities are the answer. Again, I believe the biggest problem is with those who do not want help and the criminal element.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
My answer will be the same for all of the sites. People should be required to give community service in order to use any type of facility. We do not want to attract more freeloaders. We want to help those who are invested in helping themselves. How about not spending our resources on more facilities and using the money to set up a workforce wherein people can do city maintenance work for the privilege of staying in a facility.
131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
My answer will be the same for all of the sites. People should be required to give community service in order to use any type of facility. We do not want to attract more freeloaders. We want to help those who are invested in helping themselves. How about not spending our resources on more facilities and using the money to set up a workforce wherein people can do city maintenance work for the privilege of staying in a facility.

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
My answer will be the same for all of the sites. People should be required to give community service in order to use any type of facility. We do not want to attract more freeloaders. We want to help those who are invested in helping themselves. How about not spending our resources on more facilities and using the money to set up a
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers
What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

workforce wherein people can do city maintenance work for the privilege of staying in a facility.

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
My answer will be the same for all of the sites. People should be required to give community service in order to use any type of facility. We do not want to attract more freeloaders. We want to help those who are invested in helping themselves. How about not spending our resources on more facilities and using the money to set up a workforce wherein people can do city maintenance work for the privilege of staying in a facility.

Additional Comments:
No response

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
No

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
Unless the services are also capped at the same number as the beds you will be recreating the problems of rio grande across the valley.

Community Management Plan
To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
Other - likely not

What should be included in the community management plan?
Not even the Mayor has the ability to fix the complaints of the community. Unless this person is deputized they will be just as ineffective.

Designed for Safety and Security.
The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility? Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered? These standards likely will not help. How are they different from what is already available at the road home? the road home is well lit, however the open drug market still thrives. There is a clear separation of public and private space at the road home, however the open drug market still thrives. Why are we introducing issues of graffiti, broken windows and other concerns into communities. How is a 'quick response' ever going to improve the idea of keeping those problems out?

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.

No response

131 East 700 South
Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible
Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
Unless the services and beds are capped you will be inviting the open drug markets to sugarhouse. The opposite side of 700 is a single lane perfect for drug dealers to operate. Close freeway access will bring drug users in from across the valley.

South Salt Lake already supports a number of recovery service locations in the area. Do not make it South Salt Lake’s responsibility to also support Salt Lake City. Find a location that is not adjacent to a neighborhood attempting to grow and increase value. The proximity of this location to the neighborhoods of South Salt Lake is deplorable. Investigate options deeper into Sugarhouse or Salt Lake neighborhoods before putting this shelter at South Salt Lakes doorstep.

Additional Comments:
No response

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
Yes

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
There must be a total cap for the entire day and night. Do not let people in during the day then kick them out at night because they will loiter and stick around and they will have nowhere to go and will cause problems and increase crime in the adjacent areas. The way to stop this is to restrict attendance to solely the people who have a bed at night. Have social workers or AA meetings meet elsewhere, especially away from the simpson site. Capping will help reduce adjacent crime within the area of the new homeless shelters, especially in residential areas, like the Simpson site. The more beds are available, the higher likelihood of increased crime. If anything, the number of beds should be lowered.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
Yes

What should be included in the community management plan?
Numerous things will go wrong while this project is implemented. There will be a rise in crime, a depreciation of houses within the area, and an overall uneasiness within the residential areas surrounding the shelters. We need someone to hold accountable. The government needs to show us, in good faith, that they listen to our concerns, and provide us with a person to hold accountable. The community management plan must include contact information for the person to address complaints, including cell phone number. We should be able to reach this person day and night, because what they do is affecting us, day and night. There should be penalties if they don't do anything about complaints. For example, the shelter should be fined if it does not comply with zoning ordinances or other orders. The government must be transparent and accountable.

Designed for Safety and Security.
The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
These MUST be implemented. In addition, safeguards must be built into the zoning permits. For example, if crime hits a certain level (judged by 911 calls, the number of break-ins, the number of arrests, etc. or some other criteria) then the permit should be revoked and the shelter must dissolve and move to another site. The homeowners near the simpson site deserve a way to stop this increase of crime, or at least prevent the shelter from not taking accountability. The city should hire shelter police who exclusively patrol the shelter area. Also, I live 2 blocks away, but am located in south salt lake. I'm worried that south salt lake police will be spread thin because of this shelter. This shelter impacts not just salt lake but the surrounding cities.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation
Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
No response

131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design
Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
The S-line CANNOT be a free fare zone. This will encourage transients to come up to the homeless shelter and loiter. Crime will increase and home prices will depreciate. Also, the city is spending so much money on these homeless shelters, it's outrageous.

Additional Comments:
No response

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Name not shown inside Council District 7

Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
Other - Capping the beds at 150 is TOO high a number to begin with! Make it 50!

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
Placing any beds in the Sugar House community seems completely counter intuitive. You are putting a strain on the community that is finally thriving. Sugar House was run down for years and now you want to put in a resource center that will:
1. Lower the cost of housing in the Area
2. Attract people that might not have the best intentions (Drug Dealers, Criminals, Drug Users etc.)
3. Create distrust between the constituents of area the local government.
4. Spend WAY TOO much money ($7 million!?!) For something that could have been a better investment to tax payers dollars in a different area that wouldn't cost so much!
5. Displace established businesses.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
Other - Only if we get to vote who these community management members are. I.e. ACTUAL members of the community.

What should be included in the community management plan?
If this is left to outsiders, they will do a piss poor job because they will not care about the area. This concept of a community management plan MUST involve the actual community members affected, otherwise it is simply a smokescreen.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.
These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
And more needs to be done! How will you ensure drugs are not dealt in or around the area. What will happen when private property is damaged? What will you do if the facility is NOT working out in the area - Will you make the community members suffer for your lack of planning/follow-through? How will you actually rebuild trust with the community members? - Street lighting isn't going to be enough. I personally don't want more streetlights right outside my home as I like sleeping when it is dark! How will you monitor these facilities, cameras, security guards etc? Who will pay for that - if it is the taxpayers having to pay then you are essentially screwing us twice. What will be the consequences for people who don't actually stick to the resource center rules? Where will the additional housing be to place these people as these centers aren't meant to be long term stays? What about the children involved, what type of education will they receive while at these centers or will you educate them on sight? Who will be paying for that.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation
Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
No response

131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design
Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
This is an incredibly ill considered decision by the local council. You are pretty much ensuring YOU WILL NOT BE RE-ELECTED! To place something like this in an area that is finally improving after so many years of stagnation is absurd. This will negatively impact the area due to the fact that the freeway and S-line make it easy access for drug dealer. Simply stating that it is adjacent to the S-line isn't a selling point. All of SLC has access to public transport. To simply use the S-Line as a major reason seems incredibly misinformed. What about all the people that are living in the east side of SLC, why not put it closer to them? (Oh, wait that's where the rich people live and don't want this in THEIR neighborhood.) What about the businesses you are displacing? How will you replace the loss of those businesses to those people that ACTUALLY live in the neighborhood? My household WILL NOT BE VOTING FOR BISKUPSKI EVER AGAIN! You have completely broken our trust. I feels as if we have been lied to every step of the way!!!

Additional Comments:
To Whom it may concern,
I recently read the following article:http://www.sltrib.com/home/4843954-155/poll-amid-shelter-site-outcry-most. The article stated that 410 capitol city residents were polled. In the article the following is quoted, "I am pleased," Biskupski said of the results. "We spent our entire year really setting the groundwork to change many big things. I've only lost one percentage point on pushing for change. I think that's a good thing."
If we use the numbers from 2013, assuming they are accurate, that around 191,000 people live in SLC – that is less that 0.002% of the population. I think it is shocking that Biskupski is using this poll as proof that the city is on-board with her housing plan. Most people I talk to are not. Why not poll more that 410 people!

Incredibly disappointed in Biskupski and her team. My household WILL NOT BE VOTING FOR BISKUPSKI EVER AGAIN! You have completely broken our trust. I feels as if we have been lied to every step of the way!!! You have lost every single percentage point in our voting household.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
Other - Eliminate Simpson Site altogether and have 3 sites instead of 4. Cap the beds at 175 per locations to fit the legislative requirement.

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
Eliminate Simpson Site altogether and have 3 sites instead of 4. Cap the beds at 175 per locations to fit the legislative requirement.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
Other - No, because that contact person for the Simpson site would be overwhelmed with complaints. Remove the Simpson site from the list of locations.

What should be included in the community management plan?
Policemen (that is plural) on site.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger
sense of control and discouraging trespassers. Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

**Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?**
Other - Based on the lack of maintenance under the overpass especially on 600 East, I doubt maintenance would happen. It may be promised, but actual maintenance would probably not happen.

**What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?**
Housing First - in a Housing First community

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

- Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible
- Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation
- Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

**Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.**
No response

131 East 700 South
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers
What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible
Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
I am totally opposed to a Homeless Resource Center or low-income housing especially rental units on Simpson Avenue, therefore, I do not support the amendment to the Zoning Title of the Salt Lake City Code or any related provisions that will allow construction of a homeless resource center or low cost housing in our neighborhood. Why is the mayor so bent or unmovable on this site? The Simpson site is too expensive, and too controversial and needs to be eliminated from the list of locations.

Additional Comments:
Other sites to be considered:
In an Industrial area
The Sugarhouse DI Site
Temple Square (let the Mormons solve the Homeless problem, they tend to be hard working, creative people - let them put some of their excessive wealth to use)
Granite High School - why must the sites be in Salt Lake City?

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers

What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

Name not shown inside Council District 7          January 17, 2017,  9:42 AM

Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?

No

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.

150 beds multiplied by 4 facilities equals 600. With the Rio Grand facility at 1,100 plus that leaves 500 people out of a bed.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?

Other - It will only help if action is taken to amend a concern. If it is all talk and no action then no.

What should be included in the community management plan?

It says that "it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints." One person and still only recommended? There HAS to be a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs if these facilities are built.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

- Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
- Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
- Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger
sense of control and discouraging trespassers. Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
Proper signs and/or street walkways noted for an increase in pedestrian traffic.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible
Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation
Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
No response

131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities
Easily accessible by public transit
Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities
Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance
Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible
Adjacent to the S-Line station
Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site. It is too close to the Belt Route freeway entrance, businesses are being uprooted, and because 500 beds are being lost by closing the Road Home and only offering 600 with these new facilities people will be waiting and wandering in a community to get in where there are homes across the street. NO SITE ON SIMPSON.

Additional Comments:
No response

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community? No

Comments relating to capping the number of beds. This process has gone on completely in the dark. There is no reason to believe that the city would honor any resident caps. Also not know what the population would consist of 150 sounds very high. In a residential area I would think twenty or thirty souls could be accommodated.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities? No

What should be included in the community management plan? Again, the trust is not there.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.

Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.

Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

**Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?**
Yes

**What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?**
Yes, also the unfortunate presence of drug peddlers around these shelters would necessitate the facilities being of a "lock down" nature.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

**Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.**
Not familiar with site.

131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities
Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
Not familiar with site.

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
This site appears to be separated enough from residential areas to be suitable. The businesses in the area might have a different view.

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible
Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
As a home owner [ 941 East Simpson ] this looks like a terrible site. Fairmont Park is 3 blocks away, the Sugarhouse liquor store is 5 blocks away. The new beautiful "S" line tracks would become a corridor from the shelter to the park and liquor store.

Additional Comments:
Across the street from the proposed shelter two very long alley ways run perpendicular to the site to the south. The property owners abutting these alleys would undoubtedly have a large increase in criminal activity behind their homes.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
Other - No shelter on Simpson!

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
No response

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
Other - No shelter on Simpson!

What should be included in the community management plan?
No response

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.
Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Other - No shelter on Simpson

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
There is an alley straight across the street at the Simpson site. Many neighbors who own homes adjacent to this alley consider it an asset to their property (as do I). The shelter at Simpson puts access to this alley at risk - as well as security/safety

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible
Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation
Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
No comment

131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers

What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No comment

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No comment

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station
Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
No shelter on Simpson!

Additional Comments:
No shelter on Simpson!

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers
What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

Name not shown inside Council District 7  
January 13, 2017, 8:09 PM

Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
Other - It may help the folks blend in but I think there is more that needs to be done to assist the residents with utilizing the resources and mentoring them into the mainstream.

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
Not sure that 150 at each center will be sufficient to meet the needs. The figures don't add up. You can only get folks in to housing if appropriate housing exists.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
Other - Depends on what it is and how it is run. Not so sure that managing the community is so vital as much as getting the community to embrace the facilities and somehow get their participation in the process and in mentoring the residents.

What should be included in the community management plan?
See above

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers. Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility? Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered? No response

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible
Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation
Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site. Good site with access to resources and transportation.

131 East 700 South
Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
Good site with access to resources to meet residents needs.

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
Good location with shopping nearby and access to transportation

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers

What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

Adjacent to the S-Line station
Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
Location provides access to transportation but I am questioning about it being so close to 700 east if families are going to be there. Probably needs some fence to prevent kids from running into traffic.

Additional Comments:
No response

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size
The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
Other - Still large but ...

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
No response

Community Management Plan
To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
Yes

What should be included in the community management plan?
No response

Designed for Safety and Security.
The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.
Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
Since at the Rio Grande the main problem was people hanging out outside, I would suggest a CENTRAL COURT YARD within the facility so people can enjoy the sunshine without drug dealers. I would also suggest an inside waiting area for overflow. We have to get the criminal element off the street and separate from the homeless.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

- Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible
- Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation
- Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
No response

131 East 700 South

- Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities
Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers

What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
No response

Additional Comments:
No response

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
No

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
Our population is expected to double by 2050. It doesn't make sense to decrease the current number of beds and expect the homeless population *rate* to continue to decrease as the population doubles. $30 million should be able to go much, much further than services for 600 people at a time.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
No

What should be included in the community management plan?
This seems like a cop out.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

**Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?**
Yes

**What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?**
It should be a given that broken windows or graffiti would be quickly addressed, and that the shelters would be well lit especially given the proximity of ALL of these shelters (not just the Simpson location) to people's homes.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

**Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.**
It would be easy and responsible to utilize existing buildings in this area - saving taxpayer dollars and enabling those savings to go somewhere more useful than new brick and mortar that will look run down in a decade anyway.

131 East 700 South
Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
Why would you introduce more transient individuals to this community when the issues related to the run down motels on State Street have yet to be addressed? If the city is willing to spend $7 million on a parcel, please buy up some of these disgusting motels (everybody reading this knows exactly what I'm referring to); doing so would be a huge improvement for the entire community and is something we could actually support. Alternatively, putting a homeless shelter at 131 E 700 S will seriously thwart the progress promised by the Central Ninth community plan and is unfair to those who have invested their hard earned money in what they thought would be a thriving, up and coming neighborhood.

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
If the previous owner was paying property taxes in the amount of $1,006,300 (source: http://slco.org/assessor/new/valuationInfoExpanded.cfm?Parcel_id=15132130170000&nbhd=7610&PA=), the city should not have paid in excess of that amount. This site was overpaid for and thus has already proven to be the product of mismanagement of taxpayer dollars.
653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

**Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.**

Putting a location here would easily turn 2100 S, 1700 S and 1300 S into homeless highways.

**Additional Comments:**

All four of these sites are too close together to resemble anything "scattered" and some of us live within just 2 miles of three locations. Please show real world examples and literature that show similar "resource centers" and a similar approach have been successful (read: extremely successful), before putting three of these near our homes.

The responsible thing to do would be to implement the services you promise to provide at an existing shelter and prove their efficacy before introducing these shelters to the neighborhoods we live in. I am not understanding the rush here- if you are going to put something near where people live, it should be a slow process with a lot of homeowner and stakeholder input. This has been an extremely disappointing process that has left homeowners and stakeholders completely in the dark. I can't tell if those who are working on this project already figure they won't be re-elected so they're just charging ahead to get this over with, or if they simply have no regard for the public's opinion, but I can guarantee if we continue down this rushed path, many citizens will make it their mission to make sure nobody who worked on this project ever gets elected again.

It is not cool that Biskupski herself will not be living within 2 miles of three shelters. If that's not the poster child of NIMBY, I'm not sure what is. It speaks volumes that the city councilmen and women who actually own their homes do not want to live near these shelters either.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Britta Berkey inside Council District 7

January 13, 2017, 8:14 AM

Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?

No

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.

No. Especially on Simpson Avenue, the shelter will not fit into the larger community due to the fact that it is a community of families and residents.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?

No

What should be included in the community management plan?

Having a community management plan will not solve the problems that the shelters will bring.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are
quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
The requirement of these principles should have eliminated Simpson Avenue as a site consideration insofar as they make it impossible for a site to be located within a residential neighborhood.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible
Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation
Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
The proximity of this location to the existing services in the Rio Grande area make it an ideal location.

131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities
Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

**Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.**
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

**Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.**
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station
Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

**Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.**
This is a residential neighborhood full of families and children. This location should be removed from consideration. It is certainly NOT worth $7 million.

Moving forward, please consider the concerns of SLC residents regarding the Simpson Avenue shelter site. While running for office, SLC Mayor Jackie Biskupski was quoted as saying she "promised to seek the citizens' votes and opinions about future {SLC} projects."

"As mayor, I will never push for such major, costly decisions to be made without a vote of the people," SLC Mayor Jackie Biskupski promised while campaigning. "And if we ever need to completely revamp the street where you live or work, I will talk to you about it first." SLC Mayor Biskupski, please honor your campaign promises.

**Additional Comments:**
Moving forward, please consider the concerns of SLC residents regarding the Simpson Avenue shelter site. While running for office, SLC Mayor Jackie Biskupski was quoted as saying she "promised to seek the citizens’ votes and opinions about future {SLC} projects."

"As mayor, I will never push for such major, costly decisions to be made without a vote of the people," SLC Mayor Jackie Biskupski promised while campaigning. "And if we ever need to completely revamp the street where you live or work, I will talk to you about it first." SLC Mayor Biskupski, please honor your campaign promises.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
No

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
It's absurd that Mayor Biskupski and our civic leaders are spending millions of dollars to serve fewer victims of homelessness.

This is an egregious waste of money.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
No

What should be included in the community management plan?
I see this as little more than a pathetic attempt to make up for the lack of a public comment period for the proposed sites. Our civic leaders should serve us, not dictate to us.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

- Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
- Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
I feel the Simpson site clearly violates item three (separation of space). Existing family homes are nearby. The area is near an alley with private home access. The idea that high risk trespass will not be increased is absurd.
Also, item one (natural surveillance due to better lighting) carries a real risk of deteriorated quality of life for the unlucky home owners nearby.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible
Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation
Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
This is a practical location for the majority of Salt Lake's homeless population.

131 East 700 South
Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
It's near the methadone clinic, that's nice.

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
Not opposed.

653 Simpson Avenue
Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
I am opposed to the Simpson location.

Additional Comments:
Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback. You should not have gotten this far without public comment.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
Other - Yes, BUT, and this is a big BUT, only if the 150 bed rule is strictly followed and people aren't allowed to gather or loiter around the facility.

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
The city also has to realize that as SLC grows so will the number of homeless - it's a fact. The city will need work on finding ways to grow the homeless shelter resource capacity with new centers in new areas. This is NOT ONLY a SLC problem it's a problem all across the state!

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
Yes

What should be included in the community management plan?
The contact person should be contact persons and this information needs to easily and publicly available. There are also has to be a member of the community on a board that helps guide the direction of each of these centers since you are ultimately going to affect these neighborhoods - we need to have direct input too.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to
entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
The 275 High Street location MUST HAVE a fence running along the TRAX line from 1300 S. to 1700 S. to prevent people from crossing the TRAX line. They could be seriously killed or injured. Additionally, with the amount of development in the immediate area (both residential and commercial) these people to do not want to be surprised int their own backyards with people coming across the TRAX line tracks. This fence must also be maintained and inspected on a regular basis. A construction of fence would also direct these folks across appropriate areas to cross and be more visible to the general public - actually this goes for anybody.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible
Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation
Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
No response
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers
What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
A fence must run along the TRAX line from 1300 S. to 1700 S. to keep people from crossing the tracks at undesignated points. Please see my comment on the previous page.

653 Simpson Avenue
Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
DO NOT REMOVE THIS LOCATION FROM BEING A HOMELESS SHELTER!!! If all of the other neighborhoods that are getting one don't have an opportunity to change the location of theirs then neither should Sugarhouse. If you move the location of this center then you are pitting neighbor against neighbor - something you said you didn't want to do. Every low(er) income neighborhood y'all have decided to put these have to do their part.

Additional Comments:
No response

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community? Yes

Comments relating to capping the number of beds. I do think smaller numbers can assist with assimilation; however, it is not right or beneficial to displace so many homeless. It will do the opposite of what you are hoping to reform and it will be a negative impact on the homeless and the entire community.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities? Yes

What should be included in the community management plan? No response

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

**Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?**
Yes

**What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?**
No response

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

**Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.**
No response

131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers
What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

Easily accessible by public transit
Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities
Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance
Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible
Adjacent to the S-Line station
Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
I am not aware of all of the locations; however, I am aware of this one.

In regards to neighborhood safety, it is truly unacceptable to build a homeless shelter in a neighborhood with families. I am a very open-minded and compassionate person and do want the homeless community to have a high-quality place to provide them with opportunities; however, it is criminal negligence to ignore the dangers these families are being put in by having homeless shelters near their homes. What happens when a homeless person gets a child involved in drugs, abuses them, breaks into homes, and so on?

If an employer does not do a background check and the employee commits a crime that employer is criminally liable. Respectfully, are you going to accept responsibility for the dangers you are putting these families in? Whether the law will hold you accountable to it or not, you will be responsible for this negligence. Yes, we need to be a compassionate society; however, it is negligent and ignorant to ignore the facts of the crimes that come with the homeless community.

No matter where a shelter is put, it has the potential to negatively impact the local economy and that is a risk that is going to have to be taken for the potential benefits of homeless reform. A risk not to take, however, is the risk children and families get put in by bringing the homeless community (which, unfortunately, comes with crime) so directly into these neighborhoods. I passionately recommend not putting a homeless shelter by/in any residential neighborhood.

Thank you very much for your time reading these concerns.
Warmest regards.

Additional Comments:
Please see my comment in 653 E Simpson Avenue for any other sites that are by/in a residential neighborhood. Thank you very much.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Name not shown inside Council District 2

January 12, 2017, 9:45 PM

Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
Other - concerned about reduced capacity of beds overall

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
My very grave concern about the size of the facilities is that 4 150 bed facilities equal 600 beds. This is a reduction of over 500 beds from the current Road Home shelter downtown. We also know that there are people sleeping outside currently that do not regularly use the shelters. It is not feasible to reduce the number of people utilizing the shelter by over 500 without an enormous investment in subsidized (rent based on income, not affordable compared to area median income) housing. A recent study conducted by the state showed that it would take around 2700 subsidized housing units to reduce the shelter demand by 500, and as the cost of housing has only risen and will likely continue to rise I would imagine that the need for affordable/subsidized housing will do the same. Any discussion of affordable housing along with shelter changes has been cursory at best, and not well enough funded or considered to meet the need.

I do not want to be a member of a community that reduces shelter capacity, does not consider where to put these humans, and lets our homeless neighbors freeze to death due to lack of a warm sheltered space.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
Yes

What should be included in the community management plan?
Yes, as with any case of getting along with neighboring businesses and residents, it would be very helpful for neighbors to know exactly who to contact with questions, complaints, offers of help or any other needs.

A well developed community management plan and organization structure would support a well run homeless resource center that supports the needs of residents there as well as the wider community. I think these should be developed through a collaborative effort involving current and formerly homeless individuals, existing...
homeless service providers, and the neighbors in the communities.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

- Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
- Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
- Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
- Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?  
Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?  
These design principles seem like a good idea, and I think would contribute to a facility that is safer, more beautiful to look at, and more pleasant and humane for the people staying there. However, more than the principles of CPTED I want the facilities to respect the individuals staying there, and ensure that ALL homeless individuals have access to the appropriate services to meet their needs. I want to ensure that the staff working there are well trained and competent in their roles and that the services provided are evidence based and effective.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible
Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
I live and work in this neighborhood, and do not have concerns about sharing my space with other humans in need. I hope that we will all be able to work together to provide not only the best possible homeless shelter and services, but a far greater movement toward affordable housing.

131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
The cost of public transit is a large barrier, even if it is physically accessible. I encourage consideration of how individuals in scattered sites will afford public transportation in order to access various services.

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities
Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
The cost of public transit is a large barrier, even if it is physically accessible. I encourage consideration of how individuals in scattered sites will afford public transportation in order to access various services.

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
The cost of public transit is a large barrier, even if it is physically accessible. I encourage consideration of how individuals in scattered sites will afford public transportation in order to access various services.

I do think it is interesting that the site that is furthest east and in the wealthiest neighborhood is receiving the most organized opposition to location of a homeless services center there. This belief, and allowing NIMBYism to prevail seems counter to the type of forward thinking, community effort that we need to effectively solve homelessness.

Additional Comments:
No response

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers
What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
Yes

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
No response

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
No

What should be included in the community management plan?
People are largely going to do what they want to do regardless of a community management plan. If you're assigning a community member to address the complaints, then here is the first complaint: don't build it on Simpson Avenue! Assigning someone to manage complaints implies there will be complaints, and little if any resources to address those complaints.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger
sense of control and discouraging trespassers. Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

**Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?**
Yes

**What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?**
Consider that any crime that will take place will not occur under bright lights or in front of the centers. People that have a history of crime will likely continue to commit it regardless of location. If the centers are too conspicuous to commit crime, then they'll start moving to the neighborhoods and parks to do so. Criminals tend to be repeated offenders, statistical, undisputable fact. Who are you to say that simply spreading them out to smaller centers will change that. That is ludicrous; your simply taking consolidated crime and spreading it to other neighborhoods.

**The New Homeless Resource Center Sites**

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

**Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.**
No response

131 East 700 South
Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue
Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
This is 1/2 mile from our house, and walking distance to the park. My wife and I are avid runners, and lately, we will run in sugarhouse park and have to step around homeless people passed out into the middle of the trail. I moved to this area because of its cleanliness, good schools and sense of community. Within the last couple years, we have seen more homeless panhandling on the intersections, sleeping at sugarhouse park, and breakins in our neighborhood have increased. Now whether or not these are correlated is up for debate, but what I do know is that with all your preparations, all your imagined scenarios, all your safety nets, there will be those select few who will abuse easy access to thriving, vibrant neighborhoods to commit crimes, with complete disregard for the taxpayers who are paying for them to live in their community. Robbing us once by assigning this site without public knowledge is one thing, but Robbing us twice with the negative effects to our community, our property values and our sense of safety is a whole other.

Additional Comments:
I am keenly aware of a class action lawsuit occurring in Georgia some years ago. A community lawyer had this same thing happen near her home, and, as predicted her property values sank. After a few years, she had the where with all to act as her own attorney, suing the city for the original market value of her home. She won. Now I'm no lawyer, but do a demographic study of those that live in the Sugarhouse area, and you'll see just how many there are. Are you willing to gamble on the property values of thousands of residents for 150 beds? And should property values decrease, who is to say similar lawsuits won't be brought against the city of Salt Lake? I understand that your committee may feel exempt from the scrutiny of the public, and that they are entitled to make any decision regardless of public input, but I ask you to consider that this decision will result in negative impacts to a contributing community to the unsure benefit of society's derelict.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
No

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
No response

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
No

What should be included in the community management plan?
No response

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.
Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
No response

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible
Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation
Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
Not sure what this gets you that you don't have at the present shelter. Make some of the "community improvements" at the present shelter by dividing spaces into "communities", increasing police presence, restricting access and improving services. Try the new "model" at the present site.

131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities
Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
This is a very residential part of Central City---already impacted by low income housing (Edison Apartments and HUD developments on 200 East)..in addition it is close to Odyssey House and Taufer park, which since this summer, has been victimized by increased homeless activity and drug dealing (with little help from police to supervise I might add).  This is a livable, walkable, mass transit neighborhood--don't kill it. It's the kind of urban neighborhood you need to embrace, not kill.  So "no" and "hell no".

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
Probably the best of the proposed sites.

653 Simpson Avenue
Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
This will never go....the suggestion for a higher density/creative affordable housing (supported by some commercial) is a really good suggestion. Can the Barnes Bank/4th South model work here?

Additional Comments:
I have been in the Salt lake Valley for 40 years now, and this is the worst (repeat WORST) public process I have ever witnessed. Shame on anyone who thought this was a good idea. These decisions are hurting the exact kind of people (homeowners/taxpayers/families/neighborhoods) city leaders should be embracing and supporting....just plain dumb.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?

Other - Maybe

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
There may need to be different caps for different sites. Example, a cap of 50 may be more appropriate for a residential area like Simpson.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?

Yes

What should be included in the community management plan?

A plan is better than no plan.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are
quickly addressed.

**Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?**
Yes

**What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?**
Same method may be required for the area surrounding the facility. Example, back alley ways near the facilities may need the same principles applied.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

**Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.**
No response

131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities
Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station
Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
Drug trade is easy with two right hand turns away from freeway, vulnerable Fremont park is close and would need increased patrol, neighborhood would need upgrades (street lighting, repaired alley ways, etc) to combat negative impacts, police precinct would need to be next to site.

Additional Comments:
Overall approach is a vast improvement from previous efforts. Thank you. But we shouldn't move too hasty due to budgets or timelines and make poor decisions to neighborhoods as a result (Simpson location).

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers

What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
Yes

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
The cap number should not be set arbitrarily at 150. Some sites may be able to accommodate more than 150 people and still fit into the larger community. The characteristics of the community and facility being build should determine the actually capacity of the facility. Putting a shelter or resource center cap in the city code or zoning arbitrarily limits further sites and facilities which may be able to accommodate more people.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
Other - Please see comment below.

What should be included in the community management plan?
Caution needs to be applied here and insure we are not discriminating against homeless people and homeless service providers. We also should be mindful of over regulation of businesses and other entities; for example gas stations and convince stores sell low cost beer by the can. People purchase beer and drink it while they walk down the street, or worse get in their car and drive. Who is responsible the store or the individual? What is the level of community management plan that will be required on any other business, in this case the convenience store for people drinking in public or drinking and driving. Having a contact person to address complaints is a good idea, yet requirements and over regulation can go to far.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:
Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out. 
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas. 
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers. 
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility? 
Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered? 
Crime prevention through design is an element of any well designed facility.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site. 
No response

131 East 700 South
Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue
Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
No response

Additional Comments:
Specifics such as buffer zone, site capacity, queuing, etc. do not need to be codified in zoning overlays and city code to be applied to these four facilities. It has always been the intent to limit public queuing, limit capacity, etc in these facilities. In doing so why codify the desired elements of these facilities for all future facilities. The process of conditional use permits already guarantees review and approval on a site by site basis thus taking into consideration a 10 foot unusable buffer zone may be note be needed based upon specific characteristics of other sites, site usage and building design.

There is further concern that prohibiting a homeless person from utilizing a public sidewalk for queuing may be discrimination. Are we going to prevent Capital Theater, Abravanel Hall, Twilight Concert Series, local restaurants like the Red Iguana, etc. from queuing on public sidewalks? Provision can be made for queuing on property and/or within facilities without likely discriminating against a homeless persons by changing zoning laws and/or city code prohibiting a homeless persons use of a public sidewalk.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?

No

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.

No matter what services are provided, a reduction of 50% is certainly not helpful to the homeless issue.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?

No

What should be included in the community management plan?

Judging by the lack of a response I been receiving to my emails regarding these "resource centers" (why sugar coat this? They're shelters. Just be honest about what these facilities are going to be), I have ZERO faith in any sort of "contact person" you will employ to "assist with complaints." Let me guess- you'll arm him/her with a homogenized response he/she is supposed to fire off to any and all concerned citizens just as you are doing right now with the shelter emails? If you're already anticipating needing to employ someone for damage control, this is a major issue as is.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to
entrances and areas. Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers. Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility? Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered? Should you maintain and put lights around the facility? YES. Of course you should. Failure to implement the above is simply poor city planning.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site. Why the extravagant design? Why not save taxpayer dollars and go green by utilizing and repurposing one of the many existing warehouses in this area and spend the savings on the "services" we are yet to be informed about that you will be providing? This building is ostentatious and SCREAMS "waste of taxpayer dollars."

131 East 700 South
Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
It makes absolutely ZERO sense why we would put a homeless shelter in an up and coming area of SLC, thereby decreasing property values and driving away the local businesses we WANT to see brought into the community (case in point, the renters who no longer want to bring their businesses to the new beautiful Maven building at 900 S 200 E.). It's EXTREMELY disappointing to know a shelter, which could just as easily and effectively serve the homeless at the Jordan River/Fairpark area of SLC (which is NOT residential, AND has multiple transit options), is driving away community progress. This location is the result of AWFUL city planning.

Again, if you are going to put it here, why not use the existing DI building? Huge waste of taxpayer dollars to erect a new building. Disappointing city planning.

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design
Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
Why add a homeless shelter to an area that is already riddled with the issue of drug use and transient individuals passing through? Ballpark homeowners are totally getting screwed on this one. Again, putting a shelter in what would otherwise be an up and coming community.

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
This location makes ZERO sense to me and I don't even live there. Mayor Biskupski- the nearest location to your own home is 2.9 miles. CLEARLY you're not okay with putting a shelter any closer than 2.9 miles to your own two children and spouse, yet you're subjecting these people to homeless in their front and backyards. Time to do unto others as you would do to yourself and put a buffer between the homes of others just as you have done for yourself and your own family.

Additional Comments:
I thought a scattered facility model was being used? If that were the case, please explain why many of us have not one, not two, but three shelters going in within 2.0 miles of our homes, and all four within 4.0 miles. Map those out and the shelters are in a cluster, they're not scattered at all. Not even McDonald's or Starbucks has 4 locations within 4 miles. SLC is 110.4 sq miles big. Why not ask anyone in any of the other 106 sq miles to "step up to the plate?" I didn't know "not pitting neighborhoods against each other" meant choosing one neighborhood to put ALL FOUR.

Mayor Biskupski is keeping a cushioned 2.9 miles between her own family and home and the nearest shelter (even more if the Simpson location doesn't go in) and Derek Kitchen is a renter, so it would be easy for him to jump ship if this plan were to go south. This is completely unfair for those of us in the Liberty Wells community. I am disheartened that those of us who do not support the locations of these shelters are being made out as anti-homeless or NIMBY. The fact of the matter is, these shelters don't need to be, and SHOULD NOT BE in ANYBODY's backyards. There are plenty of non-residential areas to house these facilities that are near transit (e.g., the Fairpark area where the homeless encampments actually are. In fact, that would be easier access for...
this population.). I simply cannot comprehend why you would bring these closer to people's homes and families when you won't even live near them yourself.

It is unfair to compare the YWCA and the gated condo communities that surround it to the non-gated, single family homes that would be near these proposed shelters. That's a comparison of apples to oranges.

Just because you have not listened to our voices up until this point doesn't mean you have to continue to do so. You can still do the right thing and listen to our concerns. We're the ones who have to live near these shelters, which, if mismanaged, could have huge impacts on our quality of life.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community? Yes

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
While capping the number of beds would lessen the impact on the surrounding community, it seems to create a redundancy in services and appears to be a huge waste of tax-payer money. For example, the Sugarhouse location's 7$ million dollar property cost--not including $10 million for building design--drives the facility costs to around $46,000 per bed. It's outrageous. Also, the number don't add up. If you close Rio Grande, there will be a shortfall in housing because you are only creating 600 new beds. Do you expect the number of homeless to shrink over time?

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities? Yes

What should be included in the community management plan?
The clustering of these "scattered-site" facilities actually concentrates the homeless population in and around the Liberty Wells neighborhood. Some homeless prefer to camp in good weather and still be close to services. I am concerned that the nearby location of Liberty Park relative to these sites will draw transient campers during the summer. The criminals and drug dealers that hide among the homeless will soon follow. Please ensure that Liberty Park does not suffer the same tragic fate as Pioneer Park by working with local police to enforce park hours and deter camping.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.
These principles include:

- **Natural Surveillance**: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
- **Access Control**: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
- **Separation of Space**: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
- **Maintenance**: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

**Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?**

Yes

**What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?**

Your scattered-site model is actually somewhat of a clustered model; some of us in Liberty Wells live within 10 blocks of 3 sites.

**The New Homeless Resource Center Sites**

648 West 100 South

- Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible
- Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation
- Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

**Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.**

No response
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers

What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue
Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
No response

Additional Comments:
It would be beneficial to create a wiki page to provide examples of the scattered-site model's implementation in other cities and to show evidence for its effectiveness. Otherwise, residents in these nearby neighborhoods will feel like guinea pigs at the expense of local government. We feel shut out of initial steps of this process. It is up to you to show the communities you're impacting that you can back up your planned approach with facts and evidence that it works.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Mandi Hackett inside Council District 7

January 12, 2017, 3:24 PM

Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
No

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
providing beds isn’t the problem with the majority of the homeless downtown, it’s mental illness and drug addictions. The money would be better spent on mental health institutions and drug rehabilitation facilities.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
Yes

What should be included in the community management plan?
No response

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are
quickly addressed.

**Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?**
Yes

**What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?**
No response

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

- Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible
- Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation
- Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

**Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.**
Don't build it.

131 East 700 South

- Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers
What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

Easily accessible by public transit
Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
Don't build it.

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities
Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance
Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
Don't build it.

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible
Adjacent to the S-Line station
Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
Don't build it.

Additional Comments:
I don't think any of the sites should be built. The city and county should've consulted with the people of the neighborhoods that these buildings will affect and they didn't. Salt Lake City is known for their help with homeless people (this is why other states give their homeless people a one way ticket to Salt Lake). The real problem Salt Lake is facing is the drug addiction and mentally ill people that camp out downtown. The money that the officials who felt the need to do something but not get the public's opinion (probably because they knew their request would be shot down) should take that money and use it for drug rehabilitation centers and mental ill centers. The homeless people that are trying to get their lives better and their feet on the ground are being taken care of by the measures already in place. Put the money they are spending on these facilities to better use and where it will really help.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
No

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
This will just spread the problems to more areas of the city.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
No

What should be included in the community management plan?
Nothing will help.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.
Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?  
Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?  
No response

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible
Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation
Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
No response

131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities
Easily accessible by public transit
Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City
Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
This one should NOT go in. It is in a HIGHLY residential area that is up and coming. This will only detract from the area and raise the crime in the area.

Additional Comments:
No response

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
No

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
No response

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
No

What should be included in the community management plan?
No response

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.
Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
No

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
There are so many scholarly sources that dispute the efficacy of CPTED. One thing that is not reasonably disputed is geographical distance. Keeping loitering crowds away from residents is a fantastic way to keep SLC residents safe. There is a reason why the vast majority of homeless shelters in the country are in commercial/industrial areas. It hovers near the extreme of criminal negligence to use the west end of Sugar House as your social experiment.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
No response

131 East 700 South
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers
What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible
Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
This idea is a train wreck. You have offered no statistically significant evidence that incorporating the homeless population into a neighborhood of single family dwellings will be beneficial for either the homeless population or the home owners in the neighborhood. Without a plan for the bed shortages the homeless population will suffer, or any believable reason that the neighborhood won't turn into an east-side version of the Rio Grande area, it is unthinkable that the public would support this plan. If this site goes through, I will do everything in my power to ensure that neither Jackie Biskupskie nor anyone on City Council ever wins another public office.

Additional Comments:
No response

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
Yes

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
No response

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
Yes

What should be included in the community management plan?
I would love to see the homeless people get involved with the landscaping of their facilities, and maybe helping beautiful the whole neighborhood with the upkeep of sustainable, edible landscaping. They could shovel sidewalks, sweep streets, anything to make sure the neighborhood is clean and beautiful. When people have responsibility for creating and/or taking care of a place, they are more likely to take pride in what they do and want to keep it looking nice and keeping it safe.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers. Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

**Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?**
Yes

**What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?**
Please include a garden at each facility that the homeless can work in! There is currently a garden downtown SLC that employs 8 women facing homelessness. It is a beautiful and productive space! The garden is successfully teaching these women valuable skills about production, sales and marketing! Having a community garden is proven to reduce crime in neighborhoods. This short article even touches on the CPTED standards and how gardens lower crime rates.

://msue.anr.msu.edu/news/community_gardens_can_be_anti-crime_agents

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

**Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.**
There is lots of room for a sustainable, edible landscaping! Teaching homeless how to grow some of their own food can be empowering! I like the quote "Give a man a tomato, feed him for a day. Teach a man how to grow a tomato, feed the whole neighborhood!" There is a successful garden doing this with women facing
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers

What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

homelessness downtown SLC

131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
There is so much potential to create a beautiful, sustainable, edible landscape! Connecting people to the earth and teaching them how to grow their own food, instead of being given a free hand out all the time, can be incredible empowering!
653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
Please plan for some room for a beautiful, sustainable edible garden in this location! Let these have the opportunity to grow some of their own nutritious food!

Additional Comments:
Is there a way to involve the homeless population in getting involved in the preparation, construction and landscaping of these sites? When people take part in creating these spaces, they will most likely respect and appreciate it more than just being given a handout. Having pictures hanging in these facilities of the homeless and community taking part in creating these spaces would be inspiring!

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
No

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
No response

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
No

What should be included in the community management plan?
No response

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

- Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
- Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
- Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
- Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.
Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Other - There will be no way to control this even with the technology today

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
Put it next to Jackie Buskpski's house

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.

No response

131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit
Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City
Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
Paid a ridiculous amount of money for this site without anyone i the neighborhood aware of it.
This was all done in secret, with our tax dollars

Additional Comments:
No response

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers
What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

Denzel Eslinger inside Council District 5
January 11, 2017, 6:34 PM

Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
Yes

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
Dividing may seem like a good option but now you will need duplicate services to take care of the issues, you will also need more resources to serve a group that is already under served.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
No

What should be included in the community management plan?
There are no real answers for people who live or work near centers that crime and drug issues will be addressed, locations like the High Ave location already suffer from increasing crime and drug use, adding a shelter is going to do little to address those issues.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

- Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
- Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
- Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger
sense of control and discouraging trespassers. Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
But all the standards you want at the facilities will do little to impact the overall affect of the shelters on the communities, where such standards haven't and won't be enforced. One only has to see the gatherings at trax stations like Ballpark to realize 20 security cameras do little to battle drug use or sales.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
Trying to soft sell this by saying creative integration with the neighborhood is rather insulting, you are going to put 150 people who often have drug, criminal or mental health issues into a community where people have chose to raise their children.

131 East 700 South
Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
Again your catchy image and soft sell of what these locations will be like is a great disservice to the people who live near these locations, locations easily accessible by public transit will be just as easy for drug dealers and users to get to as the current location.

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
Creative design is your way of saying we will end up with more than 150 people at this location, one which already has seen increases in crime, panhandling, drug use and sales. Even local law enforcement that I have talked to expect this location to cause issues in the future.

653 Simpson Avenue
Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
Again, pushing the homeless to public transit when they look for something to do or somewhere to go when they aren't allowed in the shelters will only worsen crime and panhandling on public transportation and drive away casual users who will feel unsafe. This is a location with little access to the services the homeless need and will have a huge negative impact on the neighborhood.

Additional Comments:
New locations without radical changes in policies and services will do little good, the divide and conquer mentality sounds good on paper but the reality is there aren't enough services to meet the current needs with people in one location, how will you serve 4 locations? It is funny how each location you say is close to public transit and local services but then say they aren't locations that will attract drug users/dealers, either you are very naive or just ignorant of what is going on. I expect you are all well intentioned, but my challenge to the Mayor (and her staff) as well as all city council members is this, if these will have little impact on neighborhoods can we expect all of you to live within a mile of one of these locations? If not your are speaking volumes.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
Yes

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
While I appreciate the intent, this number seems completely arbitrary. Three facilities capped at 200 would likely fit into the larger community just as well as 150...maybe even better given the reduced amount of people that will get turned away after capacity is reached (presuming there's actually going to be enforcement of the occupancy rules).

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
Other - Maybe...you've not really defined what a "Community Management Plan" is and such a plan will only be effective if it is actually followed...which judging by the complete lack of follow through on other city plans...I doubt.

What should be included in the community management plan?
Localized neighborhood council
Discretionary community improvement budget
Neighborhood programming (There should be planned neighborhood events like dinners, block parties, clean-ups, crime watches, holiday lights, volunteering events, etc. that integrate the facility and its residents and staff into the neighborhoods that they're invading so they can try to come across as neighborhood assets rather than liabilities).
Neighborhood parking permit zones should be established to help prevent on street car camping when shelters are filled.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the
facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Other - CPTED standards should be required, but so should other standards like LEED and other high quality building standards.

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
The building designs should be discreet and timeless. No modern architecture! We do not want structures that will appear dated within 10-15 years. Once they've been around for a while it shouldn't be obvious how long ago they were built. Materials should be solid and traditional. Facilities should appear from the outside like they could be anything other than a homeless shelter...like row houses or a high end apartment building where anyone would want to live.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood
Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
No response

131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design
Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.

No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.

The S-Line requires a transfer to get downtown and usually takes about 40 minutes. 700E is a high speed highway that is very dangerous for all uses. There is a very high number of crashes at 700E at Simpson. This is not a safe street for anyone to live on no matter who they are. Given that services are located to the west of this site it will require people to cross 700 E with groceries and other items. This will be VERY dangerous.

The proximity to I-80 does not make this site at all compatible with the site selection criteria. There are already active drug dealing homes in the area because of the easy access to I-80. This facility will not help to stop that activity. Other than the S-Line, there has been almost no investment in this neighborhood by the city in decades. The sidewalks are heaving, the alleys are potholed, there's very little street lighting, there are no improved pedestrian ramps, there's not even a sidewalk on the north side of Simpson to the west of this location. Having a homeless shelter replace the Dancing Cranes/Coffee Shop/Daycare/hair studio/dance studio neighborhood gathering places is irresponsible and untenable. DO NOT BUILD THIS.

Additional Comments:
A Sugar House Homeless Resource Center should be located in the heart of Sugar House at the old DI location on highland. Ask the State to move the liquor store if you have to! That would help with traffic issues in Sugar House significantly!

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers
What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
Yes

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
No response

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
Yes

What should be included in the community management plan?
Gardens for food growing and potential volunteer interaction with clients at centers.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.
Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Other - Better lighting is lighting that doesn't shine into the sky to conserve a starry sky. More lights does not = less crime. Design principles like wall art should be incorporated to mitigate vandalism and even give clients a hand in developing the space.

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
A ton of local drought resistant pollinator plants to help save the bees and other pollinating creatures and beautify the space! Minimal grass, xeriscaping, and food gardening. ROOFTOP SOLAR PANELS please.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
Nice! Will clients have access to public transportation passes? Would the staff or UTA provide services which show clients how to use public transit?

131 East 700 South
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers

What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
Agreed. In a neighborhood that will greatly benefit from this facility. Design is great.

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
Great. Is there a long term plan to get clients into their own housing/rentals after staying employed for some time?

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible
Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

**Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.**
Nice location!

**Additional Comments:**
No response

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers
What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

Name not shown inside Council District 7 January 11, 2017, 12:23 PM

Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
Other - No number of bed are appropriate on Simpson Ave

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
The city needs to take a step back. They need to make one site nowhere near residential homes and prove their concept works.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
Other - There had been absolutely zero public input. After the way the city is treated my community I have no faith they will reach out and let the community help.

What should be included in the community management plan?
The shelter shouldn't be placed in a residential community. The city seems to think they can ask for our help now. After the complete betrayal of my community I have zero faith they will do anything right in the future.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger
sense of control and discouraging trespassers. Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Other - No shelter on Simpson Ave

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
I would propose the shelter site on Simpson Avenue be removed from the list of potential sites. I think the site by Costco on 3 West is far more appropriate

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
No response

131 East 700 South
Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible
Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
This is a terrible location choice. It is located right next to a freeway. Surrounded by nothing but single-family homes and families. Stopping the drug trade right by the S line with nothing but alleys and little yards everywhere will be next to impossible. The stigma and realities of having a shelter on the street will kill all the development that was planned for this neighborhood and scare young families away from moving here.

Additional Comments:
This site is such a terrible choice I believe it threatens the model as a whole. The city's unbelievable hubris in thinking they have found a way to fix homelessness is astounding. The city can back out of the Simpson site for $10,000. It should take the 7 million it would save by removing this site and put it towards actually helping the homeless and trying new ideas at a different location.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

**Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?**

Other - I ask that Simpson Ave be removed from site list...it's far to dangerous to have a homeless site so close to residential homes.

**Comments relating to capping the number of beds.**

I ask that Simpson Ave be removed from site list...it's far to dangerous to have a homeless site so close to residential homes. The road home is in an industrial area that has apartment buildings nearby but not a residential area where young children are currently going for daycare nearby and will be relocated. The obvious fact that s daycare is in this area shows that there are enough young children in the area to require a daycare to be needed. We have certain stipulations about schools and zoning and what people can and cannot live by schools. I understand there is to be a process of vetting for those who will live in the said facility. But we don't know fully the extent of the romantic partners who may not be vetted or other social contacts those in the shelter may bring home. I think there is a need for more shelters and to help those who desire to gain independence and improve their current situations. I am however concerned because I do not know if this is the answer that will help. I'm very torn between what is ideal and what is realistic. In an ideal world this would be such a great solution. Unfortunately we do not live in an ideal world. I am cautiously hopeful this will not become a pioneer park/road home situation. Liberty park has just recently in the last decade started to get its reputation back as being a safe park for the Salt Lake City community to enjoy. I do not want to see this progress dissolve. I'm proposong a new location to be decided for this shelter not as a voice of opposition but maybe to open an opportunity to propose an alternative.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

**Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?**

No

**What should be included in the community management plan?**

I ask that Simpson Ave be removed from site list. It is far to dangerous to have a homeless site so close to residential homes.
Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Other - I ask that Simpson Ave be removed from site list...it's far to dangerous to have a homeless site so close to residential homes...

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
I ask that Simpson Ave be removed from site list...it's far to dangerous to have a homeless site so close to residential homes...

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood
Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
No response

131 East 700 South

- Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities
- Easily accessible by public transit
- Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

- Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities
- Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance
- Large site allows for creative design
Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
I ask that Simpson Ave be removed from site list...it's far to dangerous to have a homeless site so close to residential homes...I think there is a need for more shelters and to help those who desire to gain independence and improve their current situations. I am however concerned because I do not know if this is the answer that will help. I'm very torn between what is ideal and what is realistic. In an ideal world this would be such a great solution. Unfortunately we do not live in an ideal world. I am cautiously hopeful this will not become a pioneer park/road home situation. Liberty park has just recently in the last decade started to get its reputation back as being a safe park for the Salt Lake City community to enjoy. I do not want to see this progress dissolve.

Additional Comments:
Please reconsider the location Simpson Avenue shelter

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
No

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
Capping just means at capacity individuals needing somewhere to go will end up in my yard. And also if we give an inch you take a mile and before we know it the cap will be 300.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
Yes

What should be included in the community management plan?
No response

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are
quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
Area neighborhood should also be maintained with well lit streets (which are currently neglected) and officer patrols. At the Simpson location, there are 2 alleys directly off the site that are not paved and overgrown with shrubbery. This location isn't suitable to maintain safety.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
No response

131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities
Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station
Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
This location is not suitable for a homeless shelter. There are too many outlets for crime. With 5 roads off the location north/south, 2 being dark overgrown alleys and the s-line for quick access to a liquor store. 1-80 is an easy on/off ramp that can be easily used for drug trafficking. This residential location was booming and redeveloping and it will now take a dive and discourage any new growth.

Additional Comments:
Please reassign the Simpson location. You should have had public input. My 9 year old son is showing fear of the homeless shelter in our neighborhood. He is constantly checking the door to make sure it is locked since the announcement. This is no way my child should feel in his own home. Why should my child have to suffer for the city not taking us into consideration?

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?

Other - NO

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
I do not approve of the rezoning of the Simpson Avenue site. Please remove this site from consideration. These facilities do not solve the problem of chronic homelessness. The City is wasting an egregious amount tax payer dollars on the site acquisition and architecture of these sites. There appears to be no plan for an addiction treatment facility, which I find odd because the Mayor has stated one of the goals of the new plan is to deal with the drug issues.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?

Other - NO

What should be included in the community management plan?
I do not approve of the rezoning of the Simpson Avenue site. Please remove this site from consideration. The community is opposed to the plan to locate a site in Sugar House.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to
entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Other - NO

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
I do not approve of the rezoning of the Simpson Avenue site. Please remove this site from consideration. The site does not belong in Sugar House regardless of what principles you are trying to employ to protect the neighborhood. If you are so confident in the new model, I respectfully request you place the site at the old DI building on Highland. The RDA already owns this property and the same principles can be employed there. Additionally, there is no freeway on/off ramp in that area, making it a place that fits your own criteria.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
If you are going to use a site 2 blocks from the existing site, why don’t you just revamp the existing site?

131 East 700 South
Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
The City is wasting tax payer dollars by paying above market rate for this site.

653 Simpson Avenue
Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
I DO NOT APPROVE OF THE REZONING OF THIS AREA. THE SIMPSON SITE MUST BE REMOVED FROM CONSIDERATION. You can easily pare down to three sites. THE COMMUNITY OF SUGAR HOUSE IS EMPHATICALLY OPPOSED TO THIS SITE. REMOVE IT NOW.

Additional Comments:
The design of the buildings means nothing if there is not a comprehensive, fiscally responsible plan for dealing with the many complexities of homelessness, including drug treatment and placing the chronically homeless into housing. Seattle, Los Angeles, and Washington DC all implemented homeless initiatives in 2016 with a primary of housing first paired with intensive case management. The Mayor has yet to provide a comprehensive plan and budget for public scrutiny. Designing the sites is putting the horse before the cart. Additionally, the Simpson site must be removed from consideration based on the cost and the irresponsibility of locating a shelter within a neighborhood that almost all community members are opposed to. Please listen to us Mayor Biskupski. We elected you and you must listen to what the majority of District 7 residents are saying: NO SHELTER SITE AT SIMPSON AVENUE.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
Other - Cap at 200 beds

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
Increasing the number of beds would allow the sites to be reduced to three. The Simpson avenue site is not a good choice and could then be dropped from selection.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
Yes

What should be included in the community management plan?
No response

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

- Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
- Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
- Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
- Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are
quickly addressed.

**Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?**

Yes

**What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?**

No response

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

- Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible
- Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation
- Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

**Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.**

No response

131 East 700 South

- Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers

What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station
Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
This is NOT a viable site! There are active, healthy businesses here that already serve this community. Do not risk destroying this neighborhood for the sake of an experiment. There are no assurances that there can be adequate neighborhood safety and once the damage is done, there is no going back!

Additional Comments:
Our 100 year old home in the Simpson Avenue neighborhood has been occupied for 90 of those years by our family. My wife and I have been here for the last 40 years. We looked forward to a peaceful retirement this year in this lovely area. Now we fear the coming disastrous change. Our home would be 164 yards from this site! We can walk to lunch or to shop. All that would change and not for the better.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers

What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

David Tucker inside Council District 7

Limit Facility Size

January 11, 2017, 11:40 AM

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
Yes

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
No response

Community Management Plan

January 11, 2017, 11:40 AM

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
Yes

What should be included in the community management plan?

1. The homeless shelter in Sugarhouse needs off street parking available for both visitors and those staying at the shelter. If I were building a motel or a church on that spot, how many parking spaces would Salt Lake City require?
2. There needs to be a TRAFFIC study plan of how it's going to impact the neighborhood. Do we need to widen Simpson Avenue? Do we need to change the stop light at the intersection of 600 East and 2100 South?
3. Creating open space (like what you see at Dees Restaurant) on the 700 East side of the property will allow better visibility for traffic driving eastbound on Simpson avenue to 700 East. A larger sidewalk may add a buffer zone on 700 East, protecting pedestrians from the fast moving traffic.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:
Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
1. You need to have a designated drop off and pick up area, large enough for school buses, UPS, Fedex, etc. And there should be cameras at the pick up area.
2. The pick up area must be handicapped accessible.
3. More street lights on Simpson Avenue, your drawing doesn’t show additional lights. Street lights don’t have to be super bright and annoying. You could have a row of lights all the way down the street. Use the same street lights you use on 9th and 9th and use led soft white bulbs.
4. Outdoor hang places. Within the outdoor grounds of the Simpson Shelter, you need to have tables, benches, and playground for children. Maybe even creating a community garden. People in the neighborhood have backyards to relax and play. We would hate to see people playing in the streets.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation
Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

**Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.**
No response

131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

**Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.**
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design
Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
No response

Additional Comments:
No response

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?

No

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.

We are already short beds and the population is slated to double by 2040. Where will the rest go. Likely Liberty Park, turning it into the new Pioneer park, just to appease developers and the Mormon Church. Not okay.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?

No

What should be included in the community management plan?

This does not fit into our community at all

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are
quickly addressed.

**Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?**
Yes

**What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?**
If the Police resources are already stretched, how will they combat these issues

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

- Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible
- Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation
- Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

**Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.**
No response

131 East 700 South

- Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities
Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station
Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
This does not belong in a residential area. This will also be in close proximity to homes that are already seeing high homeless related traffic and crime. It has freeway access for pimps and drug traffickers to easily access the location. This will cause a decrease in property value with the consequence of charity being reduce, since we will be giving up to $36,000 in property value

Additional Comments:
No response

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
No

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
Capping beds create lines and loitering outside. Certain locations will be more desirable than others and those will become overcrowded. After a while appeals will be made to up the number of beds and they will grow. All while the surrounding communities suffer (which are currently doing their best to pull themselves up, preserve the character of the city and make Salt Lake City proper a wonderful place to live - not a ghost town people commute to for work).

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
No

What should be included in the community management plan?
This all feels to me like the Governor and City Council saying "we are going to give you a headache you didn't have before, but don't worry because we will provide sporadic access to medicine that may or may not work." We didn't want the pain you are forcing upon us in the first place. It will cause people to leave the city and increased resentment of the homeless population by the people who can't leave. Beyond the interests of a select few developers and businesses why is the centralize model failing again?

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:
Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
A 'yes' answer for this question is in no way saying that we want this in the first place.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible
Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation
Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
No response

131 East 700 South
Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
Doesn't matter if you make it look like the home of an architecture firm and make the homeless people look like 8 friendly ghosts... we are not stupid. You are using concept imagery to try to manipulate.

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue
Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
No response

Additional Comments:
I have lived within and continue to work in the Rio Grande neighborhood. I think the current model works, it just needs more support. Centralized creates a better opportunity to provide assistance overall. I do recognize the need for some (e.g. women and children) to have separate services and locations but this plan takes it way too far. We decided to settle in Salt Lake City (rather than a suburb) because we believed in it's potential and momentum. This plan would only penalize those of us working to preserve Salt Lake City’s communities of character (people and place). I see how it's in the interest of developers and business, but not in the people who call (and want to continue to call) this city home.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
Other - Depends on which facility and location. Not overwhelming a local public school with too many kiddos is a good idea (family facility). Leaving homeless individuals wandering around with no place to go is not good for the community.

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
It all depends on the purpose of the facility. I do believe that the "family" facility (or facilities - as such may be needed) needs to be cognizant of the needs of the children it hosts. Also, what their enrollment impact may be on the local schools and/or how the homeless children will be transported to their last "home school" - as is the law in Utah for families who wish to access that option. So far as centers that house individuals, I think the size of the center is dependent upon the need (number of homeless individuals) and the area in which the facility is built. I believe that for all concerned, it would be better to provide beds, meals, and appropriate services, to all who are in need, and who want that help - And that leaving homeless people (literally) out in the cold speaks ill of our ability to have compassion for those who are less fortunate (be whatever the reason is); and that it leads to future problems if not addressed.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
Other - Maybe

What should be included in the community management plan?
I think at least two representatives from each "group" involved (e.g.: people who live/work in area, homeless people, care providers - healthcare, workforce, mental health, etc.). Without a well-rounded "community" discussions and decisions are likely to be skewed.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the
facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility? 
Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
The teaching and implementation of "social skills" for facility residents and maybe similar sessions for people living in and around the facilities.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood
Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
Looks great!

131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities
Easily accessible by public transit
Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
A short distance from the school at which I work - We are all excited to see the SLC community step-up and address this critical need. Great job!

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities
Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance
Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
Also seems to be a positive addition to its neighborhood.
653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
The Sugar House facility is the one facility that I believe needs to be especially mindful of the needs and/or fears of the home owners...The rest of SLC has had the homeless, the mentally ill, the halfway houses - I think this is a new BIG, and possibly scary step for people in Sugar House...But, I think it also presents a great opportunity for that neighborhood to stretch and learn the benefits of compassionate care.

Additional Comments:
Great job at taking steps to help our homeless community! Now, if more city and state service providers (e.g.: police, teachers, ER's, etc.) would get some training as to better meet the needs of our mentally ill - and stop making it so hard to keep their services and supports in place - we might be on a roll that could inspire cities across our nation!

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
No

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
Capping the number of beds won't break the social circles that individuals have formed over the years. So while there may only be 150 beds at the Simpson Ave location, there could still be hundreds of people loitering along the S-line. This will create an unsafe environment for people to commute up and down the S-line boardwalk.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
No

What should be included in the community management plan?
A contact person just creates another line in the bureaucracy. I don't believe this is generate an efficient flow of information and complaints.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger
sense of control and discouraging trespassers. 

Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
Of course the above standards are necessary, but they will do very little to mitigate the overall safety concerns. Can there be multiple on-duty police officers walking along the S-line boardwalk at all times? In reality, probably not. The safety measures of the shelter itself won't mitigate the problems in the public areas surrounding the shelter.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
Build it. This is not a residential neighborhood.

131 East 700 South
Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
Build it, residents near State Street will be accustom to the foot-traffic.

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
This a getting real close to being in a residential neighborhood. I feel the residents of the Enclave at 1400 South will find the shelter to welcome unwanted threats to their safety.

653 Simpson Avenue
Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
This is a horrible location from the perspective of the hundreds of residents who live nearby. I walk, run, and bike along the S-line boardwalk every day, but doing so won't be nearly as safe once a shelter is built. The correlations between homelessness, mental illness, and drug abuse are very high, so building this shelter welcomes drug abusers into the neighborhood. Also, this location does not satisfy the requirement that shelter be far from Interstate On- and Off-ramps. PLEASE DO NOT BUILD HERE!

Additional Comments:
Please remove the Simpson Avenue site from your list.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
No

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
The idea of smaller shelters, on its face, IS appealing. But there will not be enough room in these smaller shelters. Patrons waiting for a bed will wander the neighborhoods, and in the case of the Simpson Avenue shelter, will pose a threat for the surrounding residences and businesses. Many may choose to camp in the Sugarhouse or Fairmont parks, once again impacting the quality of life for these neighborhoods. The Simpson Avenue site is NOT appropriate for this use.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
No

What should be included in the community management plan?
The Simpson Avenue site should be abandoned. Will "Community Management" address the increase of crime, public littering, and decreased property values of the area? It cannot.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to
entrances and areas. Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers. Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility? Other - It won’t matter.

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered? This is a hat on a pig, in the case of the Simpson Avenue site, which clearly is inappropriate for a homeless shelter.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

- Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible
- Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation
- Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
No response

131 East 700 South
Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible
Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

**Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.**
This is a poor site selection, for all of the reasons I've listed in the previous questions. This is the only site located in a residential neighborhood. It's placement will impact neighbors, including single-family and multifamily residences and businesses, as well as the safety and suitability for families using the S line Corridor (PrattTrail) and Sugarhouse and Fairmont parks. It will discourage the use of current citizens' use of both the S-Line trolley and connecting TRAX. Businesses will be affected by vagrancy coupled with increased crime, and property values in the area will fall, prompting an exodus of current residents. I'm sure that had there been public input on the site selection -- based on its suitability for current residents, this one would not have made the cut.

**Additional Comments:**
This is not a "done deal." I am courage anyone reading this to oppose the Simpson site selection by contacting the city, attending the meetings, and signing the petitions encouraging abandonment of this particular site.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?

No

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
This is a terrible idea. Putting 150 bed shelters won't help anything. Everyone knows that with population growth, so does the growth of the homeless. Then what? The state will come back and say, we don't have anymore money to provide a new shelter so they will add beds. Just like Rio Grande.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?

No

What should be included in the community management plan?
This will also overwhelm the staff at the facility in the beginning. Then later on the conversation will be, well what do you expect you live next to a shelter.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

- Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
- Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
- Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger
sense of control and discouraging trespassers. Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

**Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?**
No

**What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?**
Give me a break better lighting? They have great lighting down by the road home and that doesn't do a thing, even so they wont be hiding around the shelter they will be on my street or in the ally. The homeless are not going to look at signs! The homeless don't graffiti the drug gangs do to mark there spot! Get real!!!!

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
No response

131 East 700 South
Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible
Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
This is a terrible spot. The city paid twice what its worth? Plus now the people that don't want it are stuck with it along with footing the bill and destroying their dreams of being a hardworking home owners. The mayor and the city counsel have really pushed this to edge of the city line right next to South Salt Lake into an area were they knew that they could get away with it or so they thought. Put it in Federal Heights!

Additional Comments:
This is the worst idea that has ever been presented to our city as far as mismanagement of money, the mayor hiding this from the public. And the real bad thing is who is lining their pockets? We all know that the new owners of the gateway probably have their dirty hands in this. Do the right thing and Jackie and City Counsel. This is a horrific idea! The money spent on this could build a central shelter in the same spot in the Rio Grande, not in my neighborhood.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
No

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
This is all a bad idea. Find a different one. Or put them next to city council member houses.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
No

What should be included in the community management plan?
The city officials have shown they have their own interests and agendas and care not about the citizens. Anything like this is window dressing.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are
quickly addressed.

**Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?**
Yes

**What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?**
Place them next to government official houses. Otherwise nothing will get fixed.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

**Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.**
Making struggling home owners worse off.

131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities
Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
Making struggling home owners worse off.

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
Making struggling home owners worse off.

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station
Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
Making struggling home owners worse off.

Additional Comments:
Put these at 15th and 15th, Federal Heights, Avenues. Otherwise it is too naked what is going on.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?

No

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
It is impossible to capping the beds. No one will turn away people in need. The 150 beds will be 200 and 250 and so on.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?

No

What should be included in the community management plan?
The proposed Homeless Resource Centers will have negative implications on the character, safety and economic development of our neighborhood. I do not support the amendment to the Zoning Title of the Salt Lake City code or any related provisions that will allow construction of homeless resource center in our neighborhood.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Other - No facility in residential neighborhoods.

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
The city cannot manage the Road Home chaos. Why could the manage 4 more sites? Does the police has the manpower to do so? Will have in 5 years? Instead of CPTED I propose DBHRCIRN (Don't Build Homeless Center in Residential Neighborhood).

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible
Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation
Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
No response

131 East 700 South
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers
What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible
Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
It is in a residential neighborhood. There are more than 250 single family homes within 1000 feet from the proposed site. It is near the exit/entry ramps of I-80 making the site and the neighborhood accessible to drug trade.

Additional Comments:
The proposed Homeless Resource Centers will have negative implications on the character, safety and economic development of our neighborhood. I do not support the amendment to the Zoning Title of the Salt Lake City code or any related provisions that will allow construction of homeless resource center in our neighborhood.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers
What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

Name not shown inside Council District 5

Limit Facility Size

January 11, 2017, 7:22 AM

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
Other - This is a false equivalency

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
The capacity of a homeless facility will negatively impact the surrounding community no matter the type of community (residential, commercial, industrial), the nature of the services offered, or the capacity of the facility. For example, a 30 bed, 24/7 church operated homeless services facility 3 blocks from my mother-in-law’s house in Tooele creates a steady stream of threatening, obviously drunk or drugged, frequently aggressive (panhandling, harassing) patrons walking past her house daily. This facility has seriously degraded the quality of life in her neighborhood - to serve only 30 people.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
Other - This is a created problem generating a created need

What should be included in the community management plan?
This question represents a classic example of a false dilemma generated by the. "problem/reaction/solution" manipulation tactic. This "need" would not exist if the homeless services center did not exist.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Other - These problems will occur in the community, not at the facility

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
Few community problems are generated by the design of the facility itself. They are generated by the patrons of the facility and spread throughout the wider community. For example, the "places to hide" will be on the private and public property of the surrounding community. The illegal, threatening, and dangerous activities will take place in a wide radius surrounding the facility. The "broken windows or graffiti," trash, build up of human feces and urine, used condoms, and empty beer and liquor bottles will be distributed generally. Very few of these problems will occur at the facility itself.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible
Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation
Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
No response
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers
What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities
Easily accessible by public transit
Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities
Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance
Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue
Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
No response

Additional Comments:
Each of these facilities will negatively impact the communities in which they are established in different ways. Some will create a steady foot traffic conduit between the facility and other public areas conducive to drug using and dealing, panhandling, loitering, and sex work through residential or mixed use neighborhoods. Some facilities will offer new gathering places directly adjacent, likely on the parking strip in front. Some will encourage external encampments in the surrounding areas. Probably all will generate a permanent increase in routine traffic from the coming and going of service workers, staff, delivery vehicles, law enforcement, and emergency medical services. As pristine as the architectural renderings appear now, the facilities will be dirty, run down, and wear-worn in a decade, as are most publicly maintained facilities serving unwanted populations. In the bigger picture, it should be plainly obvious to anyone following current civic affairs that this entire project is the direct result of the City's desire to accommodate private developers who want to cleanse the Rio Grande and Pioneer Park areas in order to profit from large scale residential developments that will be rented or sold to social classes considered more desirable than homeless people. If these expensive and very difficult to maintain projects are built it will represent a direct transfer of public money to private hands, with the City acting as both the middle man and the custodian of the long-lasting detrimental effects which will impact very wide sections of the community as a whole. This entire project represents just another looting of the public coffers in the service of private gain.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers

What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

Name not shown inside Council District 6

Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
No

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
No response

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
No

What should be included in the community management plan?
No response

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.
Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Other - Safety and security of the building is inconsequential to the safety & security of the surrounding neighborhood.

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
No response

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible
Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation
Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
No response

131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers
What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

Easily accessible by public transit
Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities
Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance
Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible
Adjacent to the S-Line station
Development Standards for New Homeless Resource Centers
What standards for design, development and operation of homeless resource centers should be implemented to make the facilities successful and fit into the larger community?

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
No response

Additional Comments:
No response

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?

Other - This plan is not going to work without keeping the Road Home open. Until there is a better plan we cannot have a shelter in the Simpson site.

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.

150 is already too many for the Simpson neighborhood. Without a better plan to facilitate the 1100+ homeless population, this same overfill is going to be camped out outside of our houses, causing a risk to the safety and wellbeing of our community.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?

Other - We can not have this shelter in the Simpson site

What should be included in the community management plan?

Our community should not be impacted by the decisions of our elected officials behind closed doors. The ask for community involvement is far too late.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers. Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

**Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?**

Other - No amount of standards will make this safe for our community

**What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?**

No matter what design factors are implemented, there is far too much risk for a single-family residential area. Please do not settle on this site.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

- Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible
- Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation
- Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

**Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.**

No response

131 East 700 South
Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible
Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

**Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.**
This site doesn't meet the criteria that the city had put in place for the selection process. It's residential, close to the freeway enabling drug trade, and is putting the community at risk. This is a poor decision for a site location.

**Additional Comments:**
No response

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
No

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
There is no way that this facility will ever fit into the Simpson Ave. Sugarhouse area. The mayor claims it will be "safe and easily patrolled because there's only the one street" referring to Simpson Ave. at the Sugarhouse community council meeting. Is she that blatantly blind. Did you fail to notice 7th E., 6th E., Green Street, not to mention the 2 alleyways and the S-line. This has been horribly planned terribly managed and destined to fail before ever being built. Move this site location mayor or you will certainly be a 1 term mayor as well as a social pariah.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
No

What should be included in the community management plan?
No response

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to
entrances and areas. Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers. Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility? 
Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered? 
No response

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site. 
No response

131 East 700 South
Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible
Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
Not the right choice. Based on your own criteria. Bordered by 7th, 6th, Green, 2 alleyways, and the S-line. This will become a criminal hotbed. I-80 is only a block away, the oddessey house is just down the way on 21st. All of the tax dollars spent improving the area, i.e.- bike trails/lights, S-line pathway, wheelchair accessible sidewalks, will all go to waste. NO ONE WILL FEEL SAFE IN THIS AREA WHEN IT BECOMES LITERED WITH HOMELESS AND THE ISSUES WHICH UNFORTUNATELY FOLLOW THEM!! Relocate this site or we will not re-elect you that is for damn sure mayor and cit council representatives!!

Additional Comments:
We need new city leadership as a whole this administration has failed.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Amanda Quinn inside Council District 7  
**Limit Facility Size**

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

**Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?**  
Yes

**Comments relating to capping the number of beds.**  
Yes and no. By increasing the number of facilities, the effective radius of impact increases - this isn't just multiplying a current perimeter by 4. This is exponentially increasing impact emanating from each location. Your radius for EACH site grows, meaning your square footage grows - these are exponential numbers, not linear. I am shocked that a city planner or civil engineer would propose an inherently exponential problem.

**Community Management Plan**

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

**Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?**  
Yes

**What should be included in the community management plan?**  
I am deeply confused why discussing a community management plan would be brought up after the fact. It's difficult to take the proposed management plan seriously if the issue of building the homeless shelter in a residential neighborhood, near beautiful parks, near a STATE LIQUOR STORE, near the highway, etc, has already been mismanaged by bypassing the community in the first place.

**Designed for Safety and Security.**

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

**These principles include:**

- Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
It won't be enough. Are you building additional police stations nearby? Are you increasing funding for SLPD? It won't be the majority of the residents of the shelters that force crime to increase - it will be the criminals attracted to it. Attracted to our once safe neighborhood. Attracted to the things that we worked hard to earn. Attracted to the area that we worked hard to be in.

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible
Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation
Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
No response

131 East 700 South
Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue
Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

**Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.**

I recently moved here from the SF bay area. I have been stabbed to the bone by a homeless man. I've even more recently been the victim of assault and attempted rape by a different homeless man. I have severe PTSD from these events and have never gone downtown at night without several protective people. I researched neighborhoods for months before I chose to move to SLC. The only reason I moved here was because Sugarhouse was safe, convenient, lively. I'm a MIT and Cal trained mechanical engineer - I may not understand everything that goes into city planning, but I can absolutely not understand how increasing the space between shelters is logical whatsoever (vs. purchasing additional buildings near the road home). The impact (crime, blight) will grow exponentially due to the surface area / radius of impact increases. I haven't heard anything about these areas receiving more funding for police to combat what will result in disasters in now multiple places. The 3 beautiful nearby parks will not be safe anymore - they'll become trashed and dangerous to walk around barefoot. The state liquor store - where I'm already getting verbally assaulted at by homeless - will become a dangerous place and a magnet for some of the homeless community. Sugarhouse is clearly one of the more expensive real estate areas in the city - it looks reckless to use funds for a costlier footprint versus buying more space for less somewhere that actually makes sense. Schools won't be safe for kids to walk to alone. I don't know which currently successful, safe, clean restaurants will be able to survive. The site is way too close to major interstate highways, which will allow crime to penetrate the community. I stepped on a used needle on 2100 S and 500 E just 4 days ago. Some furniture from my front porch on 600 E was stolen just 3 days ago. Just 2 days ago, I noticed a man's boot prints in the snow right in front of my front porch/railing. I'm already feeling unsafe here. I'm angry that I've watched the neighborhood being to change in terms of suspicious activity in the short time I've been here (5 months!) Crime isn't contained in SLC - it makes no sense to make a problem bigger before attacking root causes. I will absolutely move out of this neighborhood if this site is built. Maybe that doesn't seem like a big deal - just move to another neighborhood, right? But what's the point of trying a different neighborhood if my mayor didn't ask my community for feedback before putting them in danger and destroying their home values prior? What neighborhood am I supposed to move to where these destructive decisions can't take place? You'll be forcing me to leave SLC with my support of local businesses, my taxes, and once-glowing PR for the city that I was hoping to buy property in. I love SLC, but this is breaking my heart and scaring the everything out of me.

**Additional Comments:**

No response
Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
Other - Fitting into the larger community is not a factor of shelter size but rather the amount and quality of resources, opportunity, and skills training provided to them.

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
No response

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
Yes

What should be included in the community management plan?
A community management plan is crucial in a project like this. One of the most important aspects of these plans is that the community needs to be involved from the inception of the project to help in responsible development. Unfortunately, this is not how this project has proceeded, a steadily improving community has to force their way in to get a place at the table to have our concerns heard. We have been alienated from the process and feel like we are having our neighborhood and local business's that we frequent stripped away from us.

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
No response

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible
Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation
Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
No response

131 East 700 South
Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible
Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
This site should be immediately removed from consideration for the purposes of this project for a host of reasons. It is in direct violation to the criteria originally set forth by it proximity to both a major freeway junction and that it is in the middle of a residential area. This neighborhood is undergoing a renaissance of improvement to residential properties and interest of business to move in along the new S-Line corridor. Destroying established businesses to build this resource center will not only stifle this progress but our fear is that it will reverse it to a regressive state.

People will cut their losses and leave the community, businesses will not establish themselves anywhere near this for fear that customers will avoid the area. All data available indicates that a resource center being introduced to this community will lead directly to a stark increase in violence, theft, drug trafficking and incidences of rape.

The council moving forward with this location will undoubtedly be viewed as a disaster. Please slow down and take a look at the consequences you are subjecting an unwilling community to, before it's too late.

Additional Comments:
No response

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community? No

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
The decision to remove so many beds and somehow redistribute them and build more affordable housing is illogical. Demand for affordable housing will not remain in stead with supply. Where are the 500+ people that use the shelter now supposed to go? Walking around residential neighborhoods?

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities? Yes

What should be included in the community management plan? No response

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:

Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

**Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?**
Yes

**What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?**
No response

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
No response

131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities
Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
No response

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
No response

653 Simpson Avenue

Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station
Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
Right off the freeway. Not currently zoned for this use. Not fulfilling the purpose of this zones uses. It is a residential neighborhood, not a downtown corridor. Access to the S-Line and I-80 will increase access to regional drug dealers. If you want this to service the "east" then put it above 1300 e.

Additional Comments:
My wife and children are worried they will not be able to walk around at night.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.
Limit Facility Size

The new resource centers will be capped at 150 beds. Current capacity at The Road Home (Rio Grand facility) is 1,100-plus.

Will capping the number of beds at 150 help the facilities fit into the larger community?
Other - Depends where the sites are - 150 beds in downtown versus the suburbs are very different things. For the current sites, all but Simpson are appropriate.

Comments relating to capping the number of beds.
The capacity depends on where the sites are located - 150 beds in downtown versus the suburbs are very different things. For the current sites, all but Simpson avenue are appropriate. The area around Simpson avenue is already tight and adding that kind of influx of people would be more than the neighborhood could handle.

Community Management Plan

To assist with community relations, it has been recommended that the facilities provide neighbors with a contact person to address complaints. There is also a recommendation that we develop a community management plan and an organizational structure to support community needs.

Will a community management plan help the facilities fit better in the communities?
Other - Only if said manager is not overwhelmed.

What should be included in the community management plan?
There needs to be sufficient budget to allow for proper response times - the issues should not sit on someone's desk for months waiting to be addressed. The management plan should also have enough power to actually have a say and make a difference. This should not be a token position just to appease the community at face value while watching the neighborhood go down the toilet. How can we be assured this won't get slashed in budget cuts???

Designed for Safety and Security.

The base principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) will be considered in the facility design.

These principles include:
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Natural Surveillance: better lighting and few places to hide or hang out.
Access Control: clearly designed access, signage, landscaping and walkways to clearly guide people to entrances and areas.
Separation of Space: clearly distinguish the separation between public and private areas, giving it a stronger sense of control and discouraging trespassers.
Maintenance: ensure that facility maintenance is a priority and issues, such as a broken windows or graffiti, are quickly addressed.

Should the CPTED standards, listed above, be required in the design of each facility?
Yes

What additional site and facility design elements should be considered?
Anything is better than nothing but what good will these measures make if the neighbor's houses don't have these same elements?? The criminal element who prey on the homeless will just take up in a local house or someone's backyard where they don't have these elements. What good will that do anyone??

The New Homeless Resource Center Sites

648 West 100 South

Neighborhood and homeless services are easily accessible

Highly connected through multiple modes of public transportation

Size and location allow for creative integration with the surrounding neighborhood

Please share your insights about the 648 West 100 South site.
This site seems to be appropriately chosen and does not conflict with the criteria set out for selection. I think this center will be a good asset to an underutilized area.
131 East 700 South

Within walking distance of neighborhood services and public facilities

Easily accessible by public transit

Mid-block location supports a secure site

Please share your insights about the 131 East 700 South site.
This site seems to be appropriately chosen and does not conflict with the criteria set out for selection. I think this center will be a good asset to an underutilized area.

275 West High Avenue

Located in a mixed-use neighborhood with easily accessible services and employment opportunities

Bus and light rail connections are within walking distance

Large site allows for creative design

Please share your insights about the 275 West High Avenue site.
This site seems to be appropriately chosen and does not conflict with the criteria set out for selection. I think this center will be a good asset to an underutilized area.

653 Simpson Avenue
Neighborhood services are easily accessible

Adjacent to the S-Line station

Serves Sugar House and the east side of Salt Lake City

Please share your insights about the 653 East Simpson Avenue site.
This site is absolutely inappropriate. The site selection is in IMMEDIATE proximity to homes where the other sites are not so close to residential housing. Even though 700 E prevents drivers from driving through Simpson Ave, the site is accessible in every other way (despite what they mayor thinks). The IMMEDIATE proximity to I-80 puts this site at the MOST risk for attracting clever and cunning drug dealers who will find a way to continue to prey on the homeless population (they're making money now-they're not giving that up). Despite what the mayor's office thinks about property values, the homes in the area have already been effected by this selection. Try telling the housing market and potential buyers that this is a 'resource center’ and won't effect their families. If the mayor wants to try this scattered site model so close to residential housing, she should build the other sites which are not so close to housing, gather data and feedback from the community, and then propose building at this location using the experience from the other sites. That way property owners might be able to make a case for their home values rather than a wish and a prayer like now.

What assurance to property owners have that this site will actually be used for families as the mayor said on 1/4? We have nothing but her word since nothing is put in writing. This site is only appropriate for families and even then is only appropriate after the scattered site model has been proven to be effective at all the things it has been designed to do. When you are gambling with families homes and safety you should be absolutely sure about the outcome-not just hopeful about your half baked plan.

This site should be immediately removed or at the very least placed on hold until such time as the scattered site model has been proven effective.

Additional Comments:
The council should be absolutely ashamed at how this has been presented to the public. We feel condescended to and that we aren't able to have our comments heard in any way that can affect change. The government is asking for our trust without trusting us in turn. It's despicable. The mayor in particular has characterized all criticism of the site selection as simple NIMBY complainers (specifically on the Radio West interview). This is ABSOLUTELY not the case. There are legitimate complaints about the Simpson Avenue site. I feel like she is dismissive and not responsive to our complaints at all. She continues to defend the scattered
site model rather than addressing the specific concerns over the Simpson Avenue site which is very aggravating as a citizen she supposedly represents.

The city and mayor, having cut out proper public comment, have yet to answer the important questions--what happens if the budget is cut for these centers? What happens if the homeless population doesn't decrease and these centers are servicing more than 150 people? What assurance has the city given the residents who have the most to lose in this proposal? The city really has nothing to lose and everything to gain--residents have everything to lose and almost nothing to gain.

Rather than doing what representatives are supposed to do, that is to hear tough criticism, the city decided to ask forgiveness rather than permission. It's likely that neighborhoods would have been pitted against each other as the mayor says. That's part of living in a city. The way the city approached this has bred distrust and hatred which is no way to invite a vulnerable population to your neighborhood. Who is going to bear the brunt of this anger and hatred? It's not going to be the folks in the city, it'll be the poor homeless people who are in these neighborhoods. It'll be the homeless folks the neighbors see on a daily basis. It's absolutely reprehensible that the mayor put her own thin skin above that of the homeless population. She should be ashamed--I sure am.

Thank you for your participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.