

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
6/16/2021 7:43	Nico Priskos	<p>Dear City Council: My name is Nico Priskos, Managing Partner of InterNet Properties and I am writing to you to voice my support for the proposed FY21-22 budget for the Salt Lake City Police Department. We currently own and manage many downtown buildings and the increasing violent crime is undermining our efforts and most importantly our tenants' efforts in running their businesses, creating a safe and vibrant city and reactivating Salt Lake's economy. The vacant buildings we currently own are being broken into by vagrants and squatters and causing major issues when showing to potential tenants in the hopes of activating those buildings with great local retail and office tenants. Downtown is the face of our city and state, if we allow it to deteriorate and be rampant with crime then the entire city and state will suffer tremendously. Please fund the police staffing and programs needed to deter crime and keep Salt Lake City safe. Thank you for your consideration,</p>	Police Funding

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
6/16/2021 18:19	Kristen Crummett	<p>First off, my apologies if this has already been decided upon; I searched in recaps but couldn't find it. I'm writing regarding the Shared Housing proposal which would allow developers to build housing that has either shared kitchens or shared bathrooms. This has been talked about as an affordable housing initiative, but I have seen nothing to indicate that said shared housing would actually be required to be affordable, nor anything defining what affordable means in this context. I have a few concerns. First off, we are still in the midst of a pandemic, and likely not the last in our lifetime. To even consider a shared housing proposal after the year we've had strikes me as absurd. Second, even outside of pandemic times, shared housing poses a threat to oft marginalized groups. When a person lives with roommates they have the ability to choose their roommates and ensure that they feel safe and respected. In a shared housing situation, a person does not likely have any say in whom they must share their kitchen or bathroom. A person should be able to feel safe when at home. For many people of color, members of the LGBTQIA community, members of religious minorities, and people with disabilities, home is the only place they don't have to be hypervigilant. Placing people in situations where they must share their kitchen or bathroom with people who may not respect their identity is dangerous. Third, for anyone thinking "oh, but if this is an issue they can just choose to rent a traditional private unit", this isn't so simple. I have seen nothing that would prevent developers from only building either shared housing or luxury apartments and nothing in between. I understand that there may be a market for people who want to save money by not paying for a kitchen that they may not use.</p> <p><b>*Continued 1/2*</b></p>	Affordable Housing

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
	Kristen Crummett	<p><b>*Continued 2/2*</b> However, this is not the majority of people. People who need affordable housing often also need kitchens, kitchens in which they feel safe, because cooking at home is one of the most common ways people save money. We already see how developers tend toward building luxury apartments and only build affordable housing when required to do so. Should developers be allowed to build affordable housing with shared kitchens or bathrooms, that is all they will build unless required to do otherwise, because it allows them to cut corners. If we are to allow shared housing at all, (which I'm not sure we should) this must AT LEAST come with a requirement to build a certain number of affordable traditional private units for every shared housing block. To do otherwise would only result in developers building either luxury apartments or shared housing units with nothing in between that is accessible for the vast majority of tenants. Please consider this compromise. Thank you, Kristen Crummett</p>	
6/16/2021 18:21	Sandra Luo	<p>Hello, I'm writing today to ask you to reject this outrageous budget proposal that continues to prioritize SLCPD and policing over actual community safety. In comparing Salt Lake City to other U.S. cities of similar size, SLC has 129% more officers per capita!! We don't need police that continue to terrorize our houseless community members, especially as developers dominate SLC housing with "luxury" condos that make it so unaffordable for us! Why does the police department get the latest and greatest technology, used to terrorize people whose circumstances could have been prevented, while social services get ignored? We don't need tiny homes, which by the way, will not effectively address housing insecurity or chronic homelessness. We need actual and just action from you in this budget vote. The community did your job for you, did ALL this research for you, and it's despicable that you still believe addressing social and systemic inequities through more policing is achievable... even AFTER Police Chief Mike Brown has said that police are the most expensive and least effective solution. Do better and vote against this budget tonight. Respectfully, Sandra</p>	Police Funding

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
6/16/2021 18:27	David B. Hubbell	<p>Hi there, I am a Utah resident since the 80s. I remember the development of the plans for more trails and realignment of existing trails that started years ago. I think folks that are not happy with developments are just not accepting the reality of the new popularity of getting outdoors in the Wasatch last decade-15 years. As a long time backcountry skier, one just has to accept the present popularity of activities in the public spaces that were once very devoid of people and now a bit social with multiple types of users. I support the uphill biking only trails and keeping downhill biking away from hikers, it just makes sense. Change is here whether people want it or not, and spreading us all out will help maintain more positive outdoor experiences with less conflict. I am ardent supporter of Save Our Canyons and stopping as much commercial development in the cottonwood canyons as is possible, but they and other groups are just late to the table on this process that started years ago. These are trails for multiple users and we all need to adapt. Thank you, Dave Hubbell</p>	<p>Foothills Trail System Master Plan</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
6/16/2021 18:30	Mick Jury nec	<p>I have been running, hiking, and biking the Foothill trails for over 20 years. I think the design and implementation of the master plan is illogical and destructive. I feel the city/council bowed down to the loudest group, mountain bikers, while generally ignoring the concerns of individuals who travel on foot. There are several points that I would like to make: 1. While I agree everyone should be able to take advantage of the trails, trails should not be created or modified to fit every user. For example Van Cott (and Wire as another example) is a steep mountain – from the shoreline it is about 1000 ft gain over a mile. There is absolutely no need to create new mountain bike trail to the top of Van Cott just so all levels of ability can get to the top. If you are not skilled enough to use the current trails, go elsewhere and get better until you can. I for one am not a skilled enough biker to get to the top of Van Cott, but I don't think there needs to be an 'easy trail' constructed just so I can get to the top. Why destroy many acres of habitat? I can give an analogy from the rock climbing world. People create routes of varying difficulty using the natural features of the rock. People have been known to 'chip' routes using tools to make them easier. This is absolutely frowned upon by the entire rock climbing community. It is only done by a few selfish individuals. To me, chipping is the same as creating easier trails up a mountain where many trails already exist. It should just not be done. 2. There is a logical fallacy in creating downhill only bike trails on public land. Yes the trails are getting busier, but bikes and foot traffic have coexisted for many years. People need to be respectful of each other – this is life. I think that there is going to be a lot more serious conflict with 'user specific' trails. I for one will continue to use the trails I always have used in the past (e.g., the trail from Morris Meadows down to the City Creek gate) despite the label of bike or foot traffic only. <b>*Continued 1/2*</b></p>	Foothills Trail System Master Plan

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
	Mick Jury nec	<p><b>*Continued 2/2*</b> I can assure you that I will not be the only person who ignores these signs. This will result in conflict. Another example. I will continue to run up/down the creek bed of Dry Creek regardless if it's designated as downhill only trail. Again, users need to share the trail. Why destroy habitat just to create a parallel trail just so bikes can travel fast downhill?? If this is the case I want exclusive foot only uphill trails. I'm a fast runner and pass bikes going uphill. This slows me down. 3. I've seen all the trails that you want to build. Some of these make no sense, e.g., Wire, Van Cott, Black Mtn, given the grade of the land. And why destroy many acres of roadless/trailless habitat just to add a few extra miles of trail. A lot of the areas you propose new trails through is known deer and elk habitat. Has this been considered? 4. As I've said before, I've used these trails in multiple capacities for over 20 years and I've rarely seen any sort of maintenance occur beyond the random weed pulls, etc. Why not focus efforts on improving existing trails? How much money is being set aside for maintenance of new AND existing trails? I have seen no mention of this anywhere. I think the master plan needs to be completely revised to consider the above concerns as well as additional environmental impact issues.</p>	

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
6/16/2021 18:34	Paul Steinman	<p>Dear decision makers, I am writing to express my concern regarding recent changes to the trail system in the foothills above SLC. I took the survey already, but I did not feel I could adequately express my concern through it. I spend a large portion of time running, hiking, and biking these trails. The recent developments are problematic on many levels. My primary issue is the closure of many some of my favorite trails. They are either being ripped up, fenced off, or designated bike-only trails. The trail out of city creek that ultimately connects to the Bonneville Shoreline system is now downhill bike only. This trail used to be a straight connection for runners or hikers coming up from Memory Grove and was also used in the Wahsatch Steeplechase race every year. This race has been around for 40 years! The new shared use trail is located down the road in the opposite direction for someone coming up from Memory Grove. Flow and aesthetics of the trail systems are important characteristics. The new foot traffic only trails above the avenues also don't align well and suffer the same insult to aesthetics. I hope it is not too late to save the Dry Creek trail from a similar fate. It is a crime to take these trails away from the public at large and give them to a single user group (bikers). Any bike-only trails should be the new trails, not trails we have all used regularly over the years. It also seems like the trail crews are more actively attempting to close trails slated for passive closure with their horrible destructive trenching techniques. Please do not let them close off the steep trails we trail runners have used for years to train on. Specifically the trails going up Mt. Wire, Mt. Van Cott, and up to the ridge line above the avenues. There is an obvious underlying goal of the current trail plan to close the steeps trails and cut an excess of switchbacks to make the trails easier. I assume this is also to primarily benefit the biking community <b>*Continued 1/2*</b></p>	Foothills Trail System

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
	Paul Steinman	<p><b>*Continued 2/2*</b> However, the trail runners out there use these steep trails, a lot! I cannot overstate how important these steep trails are to us, especially in the shoulder seasons where there is too much snow higher in the mountains to allow for running. I'm also concerned about the environmental damage and overall stability these trail "upgrades" may have. The foothills right above the city have some of the most diverse wildlife in the state. I was appalled to hear no environmental impact research was done in the trail planning process. It also seems unsustainable to cut all of these switchbacks into a steep hillside and close off routes that follow ridges. These new trails are going to be unusable due to muddy conditions for significant portions of the year. I fully expect most of them to degrade quite quickly as they hasten the erosion process and will be subjected to people cutting new side trails to bypass mud puddles. Long term sustainability does not seem to have been considered by the trail designers. I suspect any environmental consultation would have recommended against the large gashes the trail builders put into our old trails in an attempt to keep us out. Please put a halt to any further trail development. I understand the need to improve and add trails to this area, but it needs to be done in a more inclusive manner. Not just as a way to benefit the recent surge in mountain bikers. I also bike these trails, but I don't think what is being done is right. Don't take away our foot trails. Start over. Consult environmental groups. Use trail builders with more experience designing and building sustainable mountain trails. Paul Steinman</p>	



Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
6/16/2021 18:35	Kyle Jensen	<p>I'm writing in regard to the new trail system—he finished as well as the proposed. I'm an avid hiker and mountain biker. I use this trail system for both activities. While the Phase I trails weren't perfect, I appreciate the fact that we're finally building purpose built trails. I know there are a lot of people complaining, but the fact of the matter is our population is growing like crazy. Every year our high school MTB teams turn out hundreds of new mountain bikers every year. I can sympathize with people being resistant to change, but the fact of the matter is, our trails are only going to get more crowded and we need more purpose built trails for safety's sake. The speed delta between hikers and bikers is the highest on downhill trails. While I wish the new MTB trails were a little steeper and faster, I appreciate the fact that hikers and bikers won't come into conflict on the new trails. No, the new trail system isn't perfect, but it's progress. To all the hikers that are complaining, as a fellow hiker, let me just remind everyone that the amount of hiking trails to biking trails that you can find in this valley is at least 10:1. Bikes aren't going away so we need to embrace change as something that's inevitable and help to create a safer more enjoyable future for everyone who wishes to use the trail system. Sincerely, Kyle Jensen</p>	Foothills Trail System

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
6/17/2021 18:15	Chris Olsen	<p>Lewis and by copy to the SLC City Council and Mayor Mendenhall, Thank you. Thank you for putting new trails in the SLC foothills. These trails are desperately needed to address growing demand, bottlenecks, a dangerous lack of signage, and they are relevant to the culture of SLC and surrounding communities. I author this from the perspective of a mountain biker long envious of the trail system that Draper City has developed and Park City has developed. SLC is sadly behind the curve and tourist and locals are routed to Draper and Park City when perfect opportunities for world class trails exist right here in SLC. Ignoring carbon footprint and air quality issues, there is a SLC population that wants to ride local and has been asking for this development for many years. I have participated in the original discussions, read the Tribune articles, and listened to Radio West. I do not fully understand why this has become a hiker verse biker issue. My experience on the ad-hoc trails today has been good and hiker/biker harmonious. I would like more dog owners to actually remove their dog's poop rather than dot trails with stinky bags but overall there is much more harmony than recent media coverage has sensationalized. There are some urgent concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dry Creek is a major bottleneck up and down and needs direction, literally. Nobody is enjoying this resource today as it requires so frequent interruption and concern for safety that at best it is a necessary commute to higher open spaces.</li> <li>• Bobsled needs to be directional or at a bare-minimum needs strong warning signs at every junction. I have had potentially disastrous interactions with protesting hikers or unaware hikers plus dogs (from out of town) hiking up this popular downhill bike trail defined by its blind corners. <b>*Continued 1/2*</b></li> </ul>	Foothills Trail System

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
	Chris Olsen	<p><b>*Continued 2/2*</b> I am puzzled why “hikers” have removed signage and continue to assert trail access when severe personal safety to themselves and innocent downhill bikers are at stake. I think this particular trail has been “owned” by the bikes for long enough to settle any contention. The rest is crowd control and making the vast acreage available to more citizens, and more citizens in a way that is managed rather than “burned in” by whoever wishes. The planning for the trails felt open and thorough. I will also lose access to some historic ad-hoc trails I enjoyed, yet I applaud the work and planning being done. I recognize that only a partial rollout has occurred and this partial rollout has attracted traffic (both hike and bike) yet to be spread into trails not yet built. More trails and trail access points will spread congestion of today. Trail “scars” will blend in – I have not forgotten the scars from the Olympic Rings yet that hillside quickly healed in a few seasons – don’t let short-term issues dissuade. Everyone is an armchair quarterback. But ANY trail management is a positive. I sense the hiking community, (represented primarily by upper avenues “not-in-my-backyard” interests) are late to this improvement and becoming unnecessarily vocal about a nonexistent rivalry to maintain a view or keep deep access to collective resources to themselves. Change is hard but these trails are needed, wanted, and help to bring SLC in-line with citizen culture, Draper City, and Park City. Do not let fictitious trumped-up rivalries at this late hour derail what is a well-thought phased plan to manage a resource the citizens of SLC deserve. Please continue!! Chris Olsen</p>	

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
6/17/2021 18:16	Ariel Elftman-Hanson	<p>Council and Mayor, I am writing this email to show my support for resuming the construction of the trail system. I am a frequent mountain biker and hiker of the area. I love the trail system and building more trails will spread out the congestion on the trails we currently have. Seeing the trail builder out there last fall and this spring has been very encouraging. It shows that Salt Lake City and the legislation cares for the outdoors and is supportive in investing in our trail system. Building more trails brings more people outdoors and many more will get to enjoy the trail systems we have right in our backyard. In addition, as more people travel to use these trails, the more they will stop into local Salt Lake City restaurants and shops for a snack or meal either before or after their hike/bike ride. Please resume the construction of the trails. There are more people enjoying the outdoors than ever before and we need the trail system to support it. I have not talked to anyone who mountain bikes or hikes in the area that disagrees with your master plan. Have a good day and hope to see you all out there! Ariel Elftman-Hanson</p>	Foothills Trail System
6/17/2021 18:19	River district Business Alliance	<p>To Whom it may concern, Please review the below and attached letter from the River District Business Alliance in regards to the Folsom Train and City Creek Daylighting Project. Thank you for your time and consideration if you have any questions please reach out to our chairs Dave Galvan at [REDACTED] and Dan Stanger at [REDACTED] Sincerely, River District Business Alliance <b>*See Corresponding Attachment*</b></p>	Foothills Trail System

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
6/21/2021 12:29	John Fife	<p>Dear Austin and Chris, I heard on KCPW this morning that the RDA has given up on the Utah Theater, and apparently this is old news from 2019...I now see. This is unfortunate. Not everything must be saved, but a browse through Seeing Salt Lake, Barnett's compilation of Shipler photos, leads one to the thought that perhaps we've torn down more interesting architecture than remains. I'll bet you have the same book on your shelves, Chris, and if you don't I will gift you my copy. At one time or another it seemed like a good idea to tear down the Lion House, the Beehive House, Hotel Utah, the ZCMI facade, and the City County Building. We're richer for their preservation. We don't need another glass tower of luxury condos -- are you kiddin' me?! They're not "infill," they're invasive species that kill city centers. What we need, and future generations will cherish, is the funky Crossroads of the West town that's hanging on by a thread. We need our Greek Town, our Japantown rebuilt, and city character cherished. We need to preserve not just the architecture but, as importantly, the wetlands of small business -- the streetscape gems like The Green Ant, Ken Sanders Rare Books, the bistros and goofy shops, the cobblers, tailors, watchmakers, and other repair folk that make the city livable and the sidewalk life lovable. Make room for more. Connect them. Cultivate them. We don't need more dead blank blocks of federal buildings and US West monoliths. Let the gaudy developers play Trump on the periphery; but zone our downtown sidewalk frontage for the historic, the unique, the homegrown, and the little guys; embrace pedestrians, cyclists, browsers, stroller pushers, and ice cream cone lickers; evict cars and serve all with good ol' streetcars every few minutes. Help enhance our downtown by making it the compelling destination it was and still can be. Rest assured that I respond without fail to the City's urban development surveys via email. Good stuff! At his moment, though, I hope you will pause with me to mourn another RDA fail and the loss of city character, and resolve to halt the trend. Respectfully, John Fife</p>	Utah Theater

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
6/21/2021 16:22	Daniel Dean	<p>Dear City Council, I am a Sandy resident who frequently visits the SLC Foothills trail system, mostly to mountain bike but also to hike and trail run. Following the recent controversy, I am writing to express my support for the Foothills Trail Master Plan. Having witnessed what a jewel the Corner Canyon trail system has become it is so disappointing to see the backlash to new trail construction in the foothills. Those opposed to the new foothills trails seem to think that the foothills are a pristine environment when in actuality they were heavily impacted by former industrial uses and are littered with old roads, mine pits, pipelines and powerlines—a few dozen acres of new trails cannot possibly degrade them to any meaningful degree. Freshly-cut trails can look unsightly but will blend right in with the landscape within just a few years. If anything is going to degrade the foothills it is more time lost doing nothing while user numbers continue to swell. SLC is very, very late to the starting gate on this and further delays will only make the process more difficult and expensive. The foothills need more purpose-built biking and hiking trails (both segregated and multi-use) and if anything the current Master Plan is inadequate. Directional mountain bike trails are critical to avoiding user conflicts, and advanced- to expert-level downhill trails need to exist or users will continue to create their own. The “Terror Ridge” trail should be grandfathered into the system for this reason, and trails such as Bobsled and Lost Lad should be robustly protected. Draper recognized this early on and “rogue” trail building is minimal in Corner Canyon thanks to trails such as Maple Hollow DH, Levitate, and Jacobs Ladder. In Park City, where trail construction has focused on cross-country/uphill routes (e.g. Armstrong, 9k) and intermediate downhill-only trails (e.g. Mojave, Silver Queen), almost every trail that provides a challenging descent for skilled riders is user-created and unsanctioned. Thanks, Daniel Dean, PG</p>	Foothills Trail System



Mayor Erin Mendenhall  
Office of the Mayor  
451 South State Street, Room 306  
P.O. Box 145474  
Salt Lake City, UT 84114

**RE: Folsom Trail and City Creek Daylighting Projects**

Dear Mayor,

As a community and business organization representing the west side of Salt Lake City, we are delighted to hear that construction will soon commence on the Folsom Trail project. This connection from Downtown to the Jordan River is a longstanding priority for our community and the River District Business Alliance. We are eager to see the positive impact that this investment in public infrastructure will bring.

However, we do wish to voice concern with both the apparent scope of this initial project phase and the limited community engagement that has taken place to date. Public input gathered by the city has confirmed the community’s priorities that the Folsom Trail includes lighting for safety, landscaping and decorative elements, native plantings, investment in placemaking, and the potential daylighting of City Creek throughout this corridor. Regrettably, it is unclear to our organization, its membership, and neighborhood stakeholders the extent to which these community priorities will be addressed by construction that will soon commence on city-owned property. Perhaps this reflects the involvement of other public organizations such as UTA in the administration of the project. Still, we find it concerning that the design and scope of the project have not been vetted with us as a representative neighborhood organization.

We respectfully request the opportunity to discuss the Folsom Corridor project with your team in more detail to understand better the scope of the first phase of this project and to engage with you to ensure that we have the opportunity to provide input and influence the full realization of the great potential of the Folsom Corridor.

We appreciate your time and energy in this matter and look forward to discussing this important community development with you and your team.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:  
*Dan Stanger*  
447F82AC65G26430...

Danuel Stanger, Co-Chair

DocuSigned by:  
*Dave Galvan*  
G20E79CB537B48E...

Dave Galvan, Co-Chair

<b>Board of Directors</b>	
Danuel Stanger, Bridge Investment Co-Chair	
Dave Galvan, Mestizo/Certified Real Estate Services (CRES) Co-Chair	
Justin Bellevue, Grid City BeerWorks Treasurer	
Lucy Cardenas, Red Iguana	
Dru Steadman, Legacy Sales and Marketing, Inc.	
Larry Mullenax, State Fairpark	
Chris Parker, Giv Group	
Dennis Faris, Poplar Grove Community Council	
NeighborWorks Salt Lake ex-officio	