

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
4/21/2021 13:39	Anonymous Constituent	<p>I am really disgusted with this proposal and i think it really showcases the issues in our cities planning and development. It shows no concern for the actual citizens and people living in the city or these proposed housing areas. It seems blatently obvious that the plan is a way to further cut development costs for contractors. I am completeldy opposed to our city council selling off housing and human rights to the highest bidder. By voting yes on this proposal you are agreeing that lower income citixens have less rights than other citizens. Driving up housing costs while removing basic facilities that are a basic human right. This plan is very dangerous and sets a precedent for a community to be taken advantage of. This has no benefit to anybody actually living in the city and only benefits the already uber wealthy housing developers that are already whoring out our city for profit.</p>	Affordable Housing
4/21/2021 15:00	Shauna Bona	<p>Dear Salt Lake City Council, Although I am a resident of Sandy, I'm writing to ask the leaders of Salt Lake City to support Ranked Choice Voting. Communities throughout Salt Lake County have a unique opportunity to test a form of voting that is at once revolutionary and familiar—ranking our preferences. We do this all the time in surveys as employees and consumers. If we have an opportunity to do so as voters, it will improve our sense of agency and engagement. And if forward-thinking cities like Salt Lake City lead the way, it will have a long-term benefit for all county residents. When voters are able to rank candidates in their order of preference, it tones down the rhetoric. Successful candidates must consider how to appeal to (and represent!) not just their natural bases but also the base of their close competitors. They must emphasize commonalities across constituencies when it is possible and speak respectfully when it is not. I believe that the result will be less polarization, more civility, and a greater sense that our votes count. Ranked Choice Voting is both possible and practical. It eliminates the need for a primary. The arguments I have heard against Ranked Choice Voting are from the perspective of candidates. I hope you will act on behalf of what's best for voters. Please act now to take advantage of our opportunity to test out Ranked Choice Voting. Thank you, Shauna Bona Salt Lake County Resident</p>	Ranked Choice Voting

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
4/21/2021 15:01	Jen Colby	<p>Dear Members of the City Council, I am writing to urge you to vote to implement ranked choice voting for Salt Lake City residents. I feel that this method of voting would be beneficial to both voters and candidates. I say that as both a resident and a former candidate for D4. It could work with or without a primary, depending on how the rules (and state election rules) are set. These are my personal comments and do not represent those of any group with which I may be affiliated. Ranked choice allows voters to have more freedom to vote for a candidate they most align with or support—even if that candidate may seem like a long shot. They can then have ranked choices of other candidates they also would support if their first (second, third, etc.) does not clear the threshold. It also discourages a type of strategic voting that I feel is detrimental. Voters are perfectly capable of understanding the system and ranking choices. They can simply leave off anyone they really don't support. If they truly only want to vote for only one person, fine. Without ranked choice, in a non-partisan race if there are multiple candidates it is very possible to have all candidates in a primary fail to even clear 20-25% vote share and yet go forward to a general election. It happened in my own primary race where we all had generally similar positions in many regards and ended up top-to-bottom separated by about 75 votes. As a former candidate and frequent volunteer on other campaigns, I have several other observations. First, as a woman, it is hard enough to feel confident and qualified to run. Add in any possible accusations of being a spoiler and it can be even more discouraging. Also, as a candidate or campaign volunteer, if you are trying to convince potential voters to be their second choice (or third etc.) if they say they have already picked a first choice, then in my opinion it reduces any temptation to go negative in campaigning. *Continued 1/2*</p>	Ranked Choice Voting

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
	Jen Colby	<p>*Continued 2/2* It may also encourage candidates to reach out more broadly than just to the constituents they might consider their base. Hopefully it would encourage more participation in local elections, whose % voter numbers are abysmal, frankly. You may also wish to reconsider filing requirements and increase both the filing fee and the # of signatures required as a minimum to get on the ballot as an alternative to the fee. That said, having too many candidates is a better problem for voters than too few, as we have seen in several races with no real viable other candidates. I totally understand the effort required to run and that as a candidate it is a relief to have weak or no opposition. But this is bad for our democracy, which is supposedly based on competition. I understand that Salt Lake County elections has in the past claimed our voting equipment may not be able to run ranked choice. Well, then contract with another county or entity that can. Or push back a bit and ask for it anyway. I understand that Salt Lake City got a similar message when moving to vote by mail but when it came down to it, SLCo Elections managed to provide this service. As elected officials and for some of you, candidates in 2021, I hope you will see the benefits of this system and vote to implement it for Salt Lake City. Thank you for your dedicated public service, Sincerely, Jen Colby D4 Resident Salt Lake City, UT 84102</p>	
4/22/2021 10:41	Ricardez Antonio	Hi, I'm reaching out to you to say to vote no on the shared housing amendment. The idea that an entire floor, even if that floor were for two small families be forced to share one kitchen or bathroom is ludicrous and completely undignified.	Affordable Housing
4/22/2021 10:43	Maeve Haggerty	Hi Chris, I am a social worker who lives in your district and I would like to ask you to vote "no" on the Shared Housing Amendment. Thank you for your consideration. Thanks, Maeve Haggerty	Affordable Housing
4/22/2021 11:36	Anonymous Constituent	Id like to voice some feedback against this proposal. I feel like this proposal would create potentially unsafe environments for individuals who are already at disadvantage. Bathrooms and kitchens are necessary and a basic part of human needs. Bathrooms and kitchens should be placed in individual units for safety and to meet all the needs of the individual living in that space, allowing them consistent and safe access. The only acceptable time that bathrooms and kitchens are not in units is if there is monitoring of the living facility. Please give people who need low income housing all aspects of housing, bathrooms and kitchens in individual units.	Affordable Housing

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
4/22/2021 15:04	Kimbal & carolyn Willey	I don't think ranked choice voting is necessary. Just leave it the way it is. Whoever gets the most votes wins. Whoever comes in 2nd or 3rd etc. who cares.	Ranked Choice Voting
4/22/2021 15:22	Jessellie B. Anderson	I urge you to support tonight's vote to increase funding for police and public safety infrastructure. Thanks for your consideration and service. Jessellie Anderson	
4/22/2021 15:24	Benjamin Kita	Hello Chris, This message is from Benjamin Kita (sp?) who is an Avenues constituent. Benamin is calling to express his dissatisfaction with the Shared Housing Proposal. He believes devevopers will be incentivized to develop units without either a kitchen or bathroom. He hopes you will vote "no" for Shared Housing.	Affordable Housing
4/23/2021 16:23	John Doe	Kimberly called our office, but did not leave her full name. She is concerned about the homeless encampments. She believes these encampments are out of control and are obstructing people from walking on sidewalks. Kimberly has been assaulted by people in these camps and has had her property stolen as well. The specific encampment she is refering to is right outside of the women's shelter. She would like to know what can be done about it.	Homelessness
4/23/2021 16:40	Aleyzia Grant	Good afternoon , I'm Aleyzia Grant and I've looking into fleet murals downtown I read on line that you guy's were thinking about tearing it down but I've been looking into that building for quite some time and want to bring it your guys attention and who ever else I may have to talk to about turning that into a non profit organization a boys and girls club that I would run something to give back to the community with different resources to help different people in need I truly think it would be a beautiful idea and would appreciate it if you guys took that into consideration thank you in advance!	Fleet Block

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
4/26/2021 8:41	Rachel Quist	<p>April 25 2021 Dear public servants: This project at 150 S Main St is one of the very few development projects in which SLC, as an elected government representing citizens, can actually have a say and control the output. This is public property and should result in net gain (or at a minimum, an equal swap) to the public; however, the current proposal falls far short of expectations and I believe in just a few short years will be lost to the public entirely as it is swallowed into the realm of private benefit accessible to only certain privileged people. My specific concerns are as follows: 1. The historic Utah Theater is salvageable for historic rehabilitation and a viable pathway for preservation exists. This option has not been fully explored with the current opportunities for preservation. The City's own policies encourage preservation when possible, and yet so often the City makes decisions against preservation. This preservation option should be explored before SLC releases a valuable public asset. 2. The existing historic context of the block should be respected. My first preference is for preservation, but compatible infill should be the next best option. By my count there are 15 remaining historic structures or features between this block of Main Street (see attachment 1 for a full list) with roughly a third of these being National Historic Landmarks, a third being local (and sometimes overlapping National) SLC Historic Landmarks, and the remaining third being legally unrecognized as historic landmarks but clearly eligible to be so (and most of which the Utah SHPO has already concluded meet the NRHP eligibility criteria, per their historic site files). The size and massing of this proposed project is overwhelming. I understand that this is certainly an area of the city in which density should be optimized but there must be a way to better balance the scale for compatible infill. *Continued 1/5*</p>	Utah Theater

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
	Rachel Quist	<p>*Continued 2/5* 3. It is difficult from the materials available to the public to determine how this new complex will be seen from the ground, where most of us exist. The illustrations show nice buildings and greenery from a rooftop perspective, but what is the perspective from the street? From what I can see there is very little green space or room for movement and a lot of concrete. Most of the architectural embellishments are hidden away from the street level and only viewable from afar or by drone. What I enjoy about historic buildings is their emphasis on details at the street level- a bison head or lion sculpture, elaborate entryways, varying textures of building materials, emphasis on natural stone, and other engaging and creative elements. None of this exists in the current proposal. Again, what I see here is the emphasis on cultivating interesting private spaces over the public good. 4. The midblock "plaza" is ineffective. The design cuts off a viable walkway from Main Street to 100 South via an existing alley on 100 South just west of the Kearns building. My understanding is that the RDA deal requires a midblock walkway, not a plaza. This pitiful plaza does nothing to break up the large City blocks and create midblock walkways. It is interesting to note that the "Park and Mid Block Exhibit" provided by the developer do not specifically provide a label in the key to a what a white hatched line represents, and that you need to go to the site plans in order to see that part of the proposed building blocks a connection from Main Street to 100 South.</p>	

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
	Rachel Quist	<p>*Continued 3/5* This is a deceptive tactic for the public review process. Again, by not having a public through fare this design emphasizes private spaces over the public good. It is also does not meet the basic requirements of the deal and the entire package should be rejected. 5. The public park is not a reliable public asset. It is quite amusing that in the developers own documentation (p17 Design Review Submittal) the “public park” is situation outside of the defined “public realm” and sits atop a parking structure. I enjoy green roofs, but they offer little for public engagement. This is an unacceptable fulfillment to the requirement of having a public park. Only the people who have reviewed this design submittal will even know about the park (and really, how many of SLC citizens review proposals like this?) Signage cannot mitigate this enough. If a green space is not viewable from the street level it rarely gets engagement; even on a fully public building such as the downtown SLC Library the green roof is not an asset that is widely known or used by the public. When I would take my son (then a young’n) to the library for books I always liked to visit the rooftop terrace; We were always the only people there and my son named it “the secret park” because he felt like we were the only ones who knew about it. I suspect that this green roof park will only be utilized by people who live/work in the proposed building. Again, this proposal emphasizes private spaces over public assets; in this instance, only accessible to those with certain privileged knowledge. 6. The undefined nature of affordable housing in this design is unacceptable. In a project in which the City has a vested interest in the design and the outcome of affordable housing, the lack of any details in this proposal is appalling and must be fully articulated before public review can occur.</p>	

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
	Rachel Quist	<p>*Continued 4/5* The entirety of affordable housing of Salt Lake County is a crisis. Allowing only 10% affordable units in this plan is unacceptable. This proposal is a partnership with the City and the citizens of the City need to see a benefit. The City should be investing in projects in which the average taxpaying SLC citizen can live. This proposal includes 40 affordable units at 60-80% AMI. According to APA Utah, the Low Income (80% AMI) benchmark was \$66,150 in 2019 for Salt Lake County. New teachers in the Salt Lake School District don't even make that much as annual salary. If a working professional with a college degree needs to be on a waiting list to live in the 10% affordable housing of this building, why are we even building it? Whose interests is it serving? Certainly not the majority of working people in SLC. Further, the proposal does not state what type of units will be affordable. My guess, if it is not specifically stated it will be the one that maximizes profits and underserves the people. The City should be requiring more than 10% affordable housing and should identify a certain percentage of that to be studio, 1 bedroom, and 2 bedroom. Families and children need bedrooms too. The affordable housing aspect of this proposal does not meet the needs of the City. The proposal emphasizes corporate profits over the citizens of SLC. 7. I do not understand the Tree Protection Fencing proposal. I do not see that fencing existing trees with chain link will make the street more engaging. Hopefully this is some kind of temporary construction fencing? Because otherwise, it is a terrible idea and emphasizes the separation of people from nature and how the public must not interact with public assets such as public trees.</p>	

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
	Rachel Quist	<p>*Continued 5/5* Attachment 1 Existing Historic Context of the block for Pantages Theater Information from Utah Division of State History West side Main Street, between 100-200 S:</p> <p>1. Eagle Emporium (Local Historic Landmark Site) at 104 S Main, built 1864/1912 2. Old Clock at Zions First national Bank (Local and National Historic Landmark Site) at 102 S Main, built 1870 3. Daft Block (Local and National Historic Landmark Site) at 128 S Main, built 1889 4. Kearns Building (National Historic Landmark Site) at 132 S Main, built 1909 East side Main Street, between 100-200 S: 1. Ezra Thompson Building / Neumont College (National Historic Landmark Site) at 143 S Main, built 1924 2. Tracy Loan & Trust Co (National Historic Landmark Site), 151 S Main, built 1916 3. First National Bank/Bamberger Building (Local and National Historic Landmark Site), 163 S Main, built 1871 4. Herald Building (National Historic Landmark Site) at 165 S Main, built 1905 5. Walker Bank Building (Local and National Historic Landmark Site), 171 S Main, built 1912 Legally unrecognized but clearly historic buildings on Main Street, between 100-200 South. 1. Groesbeck Building at 122 S Main, built 1892 2. Stringfellow Building at 120 S Main, built 1892 3. Pantages Theater/Utah Theater, 144 S Main, built 1919 4. The Lady Bag at 149 S Main, built 1930 5. Evas Bakery at 155 S Main, built 1915 6. Hepworth Carthey Building at 159 S Main, built 1930 *See Corresponding Attachment*</p>	
4/26/2021 8:45	Margie Mccloy	Hello, I am writing to urge your support for Ranked Choice Voting in Salt Lake City. In a state with an overwhelming Republican majority, it can feel difficult for minority party voters to express opinions or have a voice using our current voting system. RCV will minimally help every votes count, fostering better candidates and better government. Thank you, Margie McCloy	Ranked Choice Voting

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
4/26/2021 8:46	Jen Hines	<p>Hello all, I am writing because I have recently learned of the proposal to demolish the historic Utah Pantages Theatre and build luxury apartments. As a born and raised Utahn, to say I am disappointed is an understatement. One of my favorite things about Salt Lake City, and Utah as a whole, is the number of gorgeous historic buildings that we have incorporated into our growing city to continue to enjoy for centuries to come. The history of Salt Lake is what makes us unique; our city is full of character. Luxury apartments, as we all know, do not add character. They add to the growing problem of unaffordable housing in Utah. They add to the destruction and displacement of local businesses that have served the city for years. They do not benefit the community as a whole, but those who will make money off of the project itself. And, to be frank, they will be a stark and unattractive addition in the middle of such a historical city. As a native Utahn who loves Salt Lake City for being my home and because of the unique opportunities and experiences it offers, I am asking you to please preserve our home. Please help restore this incredibly beautiful theatre back to its former glory for all of us to enjoy once more. Please consider what kind of Salt Lake City you want your kids and grandkids and great grandkids to experience. The community will thank you. Thank you for your time, and I hope to hear of your decision to preserve this landmark very soon. Jen Hines</p>	Utah Theater
4/26/2021 12:34	Lindsay Bowton	<p>Dear Council Member Wharton, As a concerned constituent, I urge you to reconsider your support of the shared housing zoning proposal and put the best interests of struggling, working class citizens above the interests of property developers. There is no guarantee in this proposal that the shared housing will be cheaper or affordable and it does not go far enough to address the current housing crisis. Working class individuals and families should not be forced into a shared housing situation because they cannot afford anything else. I am very concerned that Salt Lake City is currently prioritizing real estate development over the basic needs and well-being of its people, and was very disappointed to hear that you support this proposal. Why not support an inclusionary zoning policy requiring that all new buildings with over 100 units price at least 20% of the units as affordable to working-class individuals and families? Please don't give in to the pressure of the wealthy and powerful at the expense of your constituents. Sincerely, Lindsay Bowton</p>	Affordable Housing

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
4/27/2021 8:18	Carole STRAUGHN	Hello Councilwoman Fowler, I want to thank you again for voting to run our City Council Races this year using Ranked-Choice Voting, which makes for more civility in campaigning and better representation in government, as well as saving money by eliminating the primary. I understand that the Council took some heat from Mayor Mendenhall who wants to keep the primary. Please know that you have a lot of public support for RCV, and that support will grow once folks have a chance to try it out. Thanking you in advance for standing your ground for Ranked-Choice Voting! Carole	Ranked Choice Voting
4/27/2021 11:39	Kristen Crummett	I am writing regarding the April 6 vote to approve Budget Amendment 7, specifically regarding the allocation of General Fund dollars to the SLCPD. While this vote has already approved said funds, the city council holds the power to reconsider, and I am requesting that it does so. First off, this increase to the SLCPD budget reverses any trust that was built by the choice to modestly reduce the department's budget in 2020. Worse though is the harmful activity that these funds support. \$650,000 for homeless encampment sweeps is a misuse of taxpayer money. No matter one's personal stance on police funding, this particular activity, while well-intentioned, is actively harmful. Camp sweeps are not only costly and traumatic, but they have also been proven to be ineffective. The very fact that the department expects to have to perform "500 additional reestablishments" this year confirms that these "reestablishments" fail to effect lasting and meaningful change. It's one thing to clean up trash in the name of public health, it's quite another to send in police to repeatedly displace people and their few belongings without providing necessary infrastructure to keep said communities safe and clean. Repeatedly disrupting the lives of unsheltered people, especially at the hands of the police with whom public trust is tenuous at best, is unnecessarily distressing for an already vulnerable population. Investing this \$650,000 in housing and health services would go a long way in improving the lives of our unsheltered population rather than kicking the proverbial can with sweeps; sweeps which are actively traumatizing in addition to being ineffective. I question also why these sweeps are being performed by law enforcement. *Continued 1/2*	Police Funding

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
	Kristen Crummett	<p>*Continued 2/2* The movement to defund police aims in part to shine a light on just how many issues police are forced to address, issues that could be better handled by other professionals such as social workers and public health workers. This is an unreasonable burden that could be mitigated by redirecting such work to professionals who have more specialized training in these areas. Reallocating funding and responsibility for non-violent public health issues away from the police and to other service providers has the potential to improve working conditions for the police as well, allowing police to focus on areas for which they are better suited. Bringing the police into the equation sets up an intimidating and confrontational dynamic that need not be. Homelessness represents not a failure of the individual but instead a failure of our society. Reinvesting these funds into housing and health services would reaffirm our commitment to improving our society. Additionally, I understand that Section D-3 "Social Worker Funding Back to the Police" aims to correct an accounting error, but said error need not be corrected. If the council plans on making any attempt to seriously look at defunding the police as its constituency requests, this is a way to start. This is what the people have been asking for: to redirect funding from police to social workers, etc., and such an accounting error strikes as a happy accident. Let's reduce the burden on our police department and find activities which could be better handled by social workers. Let's help both groups to better do their jobs. Nearly \$1.6 million in social worker funding could do wonders for the people of Salt Lake City. Finally, I want to express my gratitude to the council for approving Ranked Choice Voting. This is a huge step toward a more democratic electoral process, empowering all voters to be better represented. For this decision, we thank you. Kristen Crummett</p>	

TO: [REDACTED]

RE: 150 S Main Street Open House comments

April 25 2021

Dear public servants:

This project at 150 S Main St is one of the very few development projects in which SLC, as an elected government representing citizens, can actually have a say and control the output. This is public property and should result in net gain (or at a minimum, an equal swap) to the public; however, the current proposal falls far short of expectations and I believe in just a few short years will be lost to the public entirely as it is swallowed into the realm of private benefit accessible to only certain privileged people.

My specific concerns are as follows:

1. The historic Utah Theater is salvageable for historic rehabilitation and a viable pathway for preservation exists. This option has not been fully explored with the current opportunities for preservation. The City's own policies encourage preservation when possible, and yet so often the City makes decisions against preservation. This preservation option should be explored before SLC releases a valuable public asset.
2. The existing historic context of the block should be respected. My first preference is for preservation, but compatible infill should be the next best option. By my count there are 15 remaining historic structures or features between this block of Main Street (see attachment 1 for a full list) with roughly a third of these being National Historic Landmarks, a third being local (and sometimes overlapping National) SLC Historic Landmarks, and the remaining third being legally unrecognized as historic landmarks but clearly eligible to be so (and most of which the Utah SHPO has already concluded meet the NRHP eligibility criteria, per their historic site files).

The size and massing of this proposed project is overwhelming. I understand that this is certainly an area of the city in which density should be optimized but there must be a way to better balance the scale for compatible infill.

3. It is difficult from the materials available to the public to determine how this new complex will be seen from the ground, where most of us exist. The illustrations show nice buildings and greenery from a rooftop perspective, but what is the perspective from the street? From what I can see there is very little green space or room for movement and a lot of concrete. Most of the architectural embellishments are hidden away from the street level and only viewable from afar or by drone. What I enjoy about historic buildings is their emphasis on details at the street level- a bison head or lion sculpture, elaborate entryways, varying textures of building materials,

emphasis on natural stone, and other engaging and creative elements. None of this exists in the current proposal. Again, what I see here is the emphasis on cultivating interesting private spaces over the public good.

4. The midblock “plaza” is ineffective. The design cuts off a viable walkway from Main Street to 100 South via an existing alley on 100 South just west of the Kearns building. My understanding is that the RDA deal requires a midblock walkway, not a plaza. This pitiful plaza does nothing to break up the large City blocks and create midblock walkways. It is interesting to note that the “Park and Mid Block Exhibit” provided by the developer do not specifically provide a label in the key to a what a white hatched line represents, and that you need to go to the site plans in order to see that part of the proposed building blocks a connection from Main Street to 100 South. This is a deceptive tactic for the public review process. Again, by not having a public throughfare this design emphasizes private spaces over the public good. It is also does not meet the basic requirements of the deal and the entire package should be rejected.
5. The public park is not a reliable public asset. It is quite amusing that in the developers own documentation (p17 Design Review Submittal) the “public park” is situation outside of the defined “public realm” and sits atop a parking structure. I enjoy green roofs, but they offer little for public engagement. This is an unacceptable fulfillment to the requirement of having a public park. Only the people who have reviewed this design submittal will even know about the park (and really, how many of SLC citizens review proposals like this?) Signage cannot mitigate this enough. If a green space is not viewable from the street level it rarely gets engagement; even on a fully public building such as the downtown SLC Library the green roof is not an asset that is widely known or used by the public. When I would take my son (then a young’ n) to the library for books I always liked to visit the rooftop terrace; We were always the only people there and my son named it “the secret park” because he felt like we were the only ones who knew about it. I suspect that this green roof park will only be utilized by people who live/work in the proposed building. Again, this proposal emphasizes private spaces over public assets; in this instance, only accessible to those with certain privileged knowledge.
6. The undefined nature of affordable housing in this design is unacceptable. In a project in which the City has a vested interest in the design and the outcome of affordable housing, the lack of any details in this proposal is appalling and must be fully articulated before public review can occur.

The entirety of affordable housing of Salt Lake County is a crisis. Allowing only 10% affordable units in this plan is unacceptable. This proposal is a partnership with the City and the citizens of the City need to see a benefit. The City should be investing in projects in which the average taxpaying SLC citizen can live.

This proposal includes 40 affordable units at 60-80% AMI. According to APA Utah, the Low Income (80% AMI) benchmark was \$66,150 in 2019 for Salt Lake County. New teachers in the Salt Lake School District don’t even make that much as annual salary. If a working professional with a college degree needs to be on a waiting list to live in the 10% affordable housing of this

building, why are we even building it? Whose interests is it serving? Certainly not the majority of working people in SLC.

Further, the proposal does not state what type of units will be affordable. My guess, if it is not specifically stated it will be the one that maximizes profits and underserves the people. The City should be requiring more than 10% affordable housing and should identify a certain percentage of that to be studio, 1 bedroom, and 2 bedroom. Families and children need bedrooms too.

The affordable housing aspect of this proposal does not meet the needs of the City. The proposal emphasizes corporate profits over the citizens of SLC.

7. I do not understand the Tree Protection Fencing proposal. I do not see that fencing existing trees with chain link will make the street more engaging. Hopefully this is some kind of temporary construction fencing? Because otherwise, it is a terrible idea and emphasizes the separation of people from nature and how the public must not interact with public assets such as public trees.
8. There are no plans outlined for reuse of historic materials from the Utah Theater. As I understand the deal with the developer, this aspect is a requirement. There is no indication if these public assets will be viewable by the public or if they will be hidden away in private spaces. How will these artifacts be protected and maintained? Will they be public property, or can they be sold by their new owner? As there is no information about it, this proposal is incomplete and should be rejected in full.

In summary, the developer is clearly maximizing profits instead of emphasizing public benefit. And again, in the case when the outcome can, and should be, controlled to optimize public benefit the opportunity is being lost here. I hope that SLC will at the least attempt an equal partnership with the developer and not be swindled into a deal that primarily emphasizes wealth enrichment of a corporate entity.

This proposal is also incomplete and does not meet the basic requirements set out by the RDA and thus should be fully rejected.

Thank you for your consideration and time,

Rachel Quist



Attachment 1

Existing Historic Context of the block for Pantages Theater Information from Utah Division of State History

West side Main Street, between 100-200 S:

1. Eagle Emporium (Local Historic Landmark Site) at 104 S Main, built 1864/1912
2. Old Clock at Zions First national Bank (Local and National Historic Landmark Site) at 102 S Main, built 1870
3. Daft Block (Local and National Historic Landmark Site) at 128 S Main, built 1889
4. Kearns Building (National Historic Landmark Site) at 132 S Main, built 1909

East side Main Street, between 100-200 S:

1. Ezra Thompson Building / Neumont College (National Historic Landmark Site) at 143 S Main, built 1924
2. Tracy Loan & Trust Co (National Historic Landmark Site), 151 S Main, built 1916
3. First National Bank/Bamberger Building (Local and National Historic Landmark Site), 163 S Main, built 1871
4. Herald Building (National Historic Landmark Site) at 165 S Main, built 1905
5. Walker Bank Building (Local and National Historic Landmark Site), 171 S Main, built 1912

Legally unrecognized but clearly historic buildings on Main Street, between 100-200 South.

1. Groesbeck Building at 122 S Main, built 1892
2. Stringfellow Building at 120 S Main, built 1892
3. Pantages Theater/Utah Theater, 144 S Main, built 1919
4. The Lady Bag at 149 S Main, built 1930
5. Evas Bakery at 155 S Main, built 1915
6. Hepworth Carthey Building at 159 S Main, built 1930