

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
10/13/2021 8:37	Dallin Miller	Hi, I work in a middle school in the SLCS. The mask mandate is causing more conflict with students and teachers/staff than it is doing good. Many students have an exemption already, so we don't have 100% compliance. Please give students the choice to wear a mask or not. Thank you, Dallin	Mask Mandate in Schools
10/13/2021 9:47	Nancy McHugh	<p>TO:SALT LAKE CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS FROM: Alice McHugh, on behalf of the STPP Coalition. I do not know how carefully you read the OpEd section of the Deseret News. But one member of our Coalition just published a well-researched Op-Ed there that contains facts I doubt you knew. Kindly take a moment to read this piece by Malin Moench, who for 30 yrs was a Federal regulator of the logistics industry. You can reach him directly [REDACTED].....And yes, he is Dr.Brian Moench's "older & handsomer" brother. 😊 DESERET NEWS: October, 2021 A "transloading facility" is a freight yard that moves shipping containers between trucks and trains. The Utah Inland Port Authority (UIPA) believes that it must build a new one <https://inlandportauthority.utah.gov/proposed-transload-facility/> for its inland port project to succeed. The UIPA plans to expropriate Salt Lake City's future tax revenue, which it will hand over to buyers of UIPA's capital improvement bonds. It plans to issue bonds worth \$150 million, repaid over 35 years from future city tax revenue, at interest rates as high as 8.5%. Total cost to taxpayers could reach \$256 million. It's little wonder that UIPA may have to pay junk bond rates to finance its transloading facility. The UIPA has not made a concrete business case for it and apparently believes it doesn't need to. Former UIPA board chairman Derek Miller explained that "we're building the airplane as we fly it." In place of planning and modeling of key economic variables, UIPA offers the bond buyer only arm-waving generalities that blue financial skies for its project lie ahead. Even if the UIPA had done its homework, seeking to finance its project now is astonishingly premature for these reasons: 1. The Utah Supreme Court</p> <p>*Continued 1/3*</p>	Utah Inland Port

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
	Nancy McHugh	<p>*Continued 2/3* still pondering whether UIPA can usurp Salt Lake City’s taxing authority without violating Utah’s constitution. 2. Union Pacific already has a transloading facility in the port area ready to double its throughput if demand warrants. 3. The transloading project can’t proceed without public hearings and permits issued by the Surface Transportation Board, the Federal Highway Administration, and, likely, the Army Corps of Engineers. A thorough environmental impact statement must be prepared before these hearings are held. The analyses and approvals needed require years of advance planning. The UIPA has not shown that it is even aware of these requirements, let alone planning to meet them. Report ad 4. Salt Lake County is an EPA “nonattainment area” <https://www.deseret.com/utah/2021/2/10/22276644/2021-legislature-lawmakers-discuss-22-clean-air-proposals-pollution-energy-salt-lake-valley> for ozone and PM2.5 pollution. These air quality standards are obsolete, and likely to be tightened by the Biden administration. With full buildout, the new transloading facility could generate 70,000 new diesel truck trips per day, further fouling our airshed. The UIPA may be told to devise major pollution mitigation measures to obtain a “nonattainment new source review” permit from the EPA before building its transloading facility. 5. Currently, diesel trucks haul freight for 12 cents per ton-mile on average, compared to 4 cents for rail. Some industry analysts predict that within five years, autonomously driven electric semis will carry long-haul freight at 3 cents per ton-mile. If this happens, with a 25% cost advantage, autonomous trucks will quickly capture the market for long haul freight <https://ark-invest.com/articles/analyst-research/autonomous-trucks/> , which would end the need to transload containers to rail. 6. Transpacific shipping is dominated by three large consortiums. They keep contractual control over both the sea and land segments of their container movements.</p>	

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
	Nancy McHugh	<p>*Continued 3/3* They avoid using West Coast seaports that divert freight through dry ports that are more than 200 miles from their parent seaport. This keeps to a minimum both their costs and their container turnaround times <https://www.portofwillamette.com/wp-content/uploads/Brooks-ITF-Project-Plan-web.pdf> . Following current industry practice, these consortiums would not send containers through Utah’s port which is over 600 miles from the California seaports on which it depends. 7. Successful dry ports need a large import market, with at least 10 million consumers within a 300-mile radius <https://assets.recenter.tamu.edu/Documents/MktResearch/DFW_Houston_Industrial_InlandPortsLogistics.pdf> . Utah’s import market is barely one third that size. Successful dry ports also need substantial export volumes, such as agricultural, mineral, or industrial products. Utah has only two bulk products of potential interest to Asia — coal and alfalfa. No West Coast seaport will accept coal. Alfalfa cultivation uses half of the West’s water supply — most going to feed cattle in China. Our climate scientists predict <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/sciadv.1600873> that the mega drought gripping the American West is here for the long term. Expanding the alfalfa trade now would be as foolish as hitting ourselves in the head with a hammer. There are major legal, regulatory, and geographical obstacles to the commercial success of UIPA’s transloading facility that the UIPA has yet to address — including the chance that it will not be needed soon after it is built. If the UIPA prematurely bets hundreds of millions of future tax dollars on a soon-to-be-obsolete transloading facility, taxpayers will be left holding a very expensive bag. Malin Moench is a volunteer with the Stop the Polluting Port Coalition. -- Alice McHugh (Nancy) Salt Lake City, UT 84102</p>	

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
10/13/2021 14:37	Abbie Carter-Smith	<p>Subject: (EXTERNAL) Homeless/Transient Camping in Sugarhouse Hello, I live in Sugarhouse (District 7) and am concerned about various homeless people camping around the area...especially at the very north end of Elizabeth Street, where it turns up onto Highland Drive, underneath the I-80 overpass (just west of the Sugarhouse Liquor Store). It's HUGE! Last week, my family drove by on our way home (we live on Elizabeth Street) and saw the camp with 2 police cars there. I assumed the police would be breaking it up. Nope! The next time we drove by (a couple of days later) and the next few times...it's still there and maybe even larger?!! My husband & I have two elementary school-aged kids and we love to walk or ride scooters/bikes down the length of Elizabeth Street and over to Fairmont Park...but my kids are too scared to do that now with the camp there. I don't think I'd feel comfortable taking them without my husband there too. I realize the city is short a few hundred beds since closing the downtown homeless shelters a year or so ago, but there has to be a better solution than people camping (and doing who knows what else) in broad daylight in our quiet residential neighborhood! Please help, or direct me who I should contact instead...</p> <p>Thank you, Abbie Carter-Smith</p>	Homelessness
10/15/2021 13:48	Joe Reynolds	<p>_> Sent: Wednesday, October 13, 2021 6:25 PM To: Fowler, Amy Subject: (EXTERNAL) Homeless Camp Can you please help? I've been trying for a couple weeks to get a homeless camp at Highland and I-80 dispersed. I have serious concerns about the camp as I've heard from neighbors that they have had items stolen and seen drug use. It has now blocked the side walk to Elizabeth Sherman park and continues to grow daily. There is also a ton of trash that has been thrown on Driggs Ave from it. PLEASE HELP. Thanks, Joe Reynolds</p>	Homelessness
10/18/2021 13:28	Beverly Cooper	<p>D1 vacancy recommendation. Wharton, Chris Subject: (EXTERNAL) James Rogers Seat Chris, As you all consider filling this seat, I want to urge you to select Victoria Petro-Escher. I have been familiar with her community work for a long time. Sent from my iPhone</p>	D1 Vacancy

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
10/18/2021 15:25	Charles Rettberg	<p>Hello, Just adding some comments about the new trail system going in (or not going in) in and around the shoreline. I am both an avid mountain biker and avid trail runner and dog walker on the shoreline trail and have ridden and ran all of the new trails. My thought is that the plan is a great one, but the trail building was not well done. Rumor has it that you contracted with an out of state company from North Carolina that obviously had little to no experience building trails in the west. The Downhill biking flow trails are not well done at all and with the exception of the Memory Grove trails, the uphill hiking trails are no better. I would suggest getting out of the contract and hiring local trail builders that have done excellent jobs in the Wasatch. The trails in Draper and anything built by the Mountain Trails Foundation in Park City are excellent. You need to carefully study the Draper, Park City and Basin Recreation trail system and model the foothills after those. Hire local trail builders with experience in the Wasatch. My feeling is that the contract went to the lowest bidder and that the company was inept. We desperately need new trails for both hiking and biking in the foothills. The most important trails to finish right now are uphill and downhill only trails, up and down Dry Creek to the saddle above lime-kiln gulch. There are many conflicts on that trail between users of all different varieties. Thanks, Chuck</p>	Foothills Trail System Master Plan

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
10/19/2021 12:21	Lauren Swanson	<p>Hello, My name is Lauren Swanson and I am a resident of Salt Lake City. I reviewed the Foothills Master Plan when it was available to the community a couple years ago and was SO excited for it. I think the plan is great. I love the consideration for hikers and bikers and think that the plan will help more people enjoy the foothills responsibly! I frequently use the trails that were put in as part of Phase 1, above the Upper Avenues Neighborhood and in Popperton. I frequently hike and bike on those trails. I love them and love spending time up there. I like that the clear trailheads and signage that was added helps keep everyone on the correct trails and allows the 'unofficial' trails to regrow. Also thank you for replacing the signs that were removed over the summer. I understand there were some concerns from the public about how the trails were constructed, but I still think that the trails are a large plus for the community despite those concerns. I am so excited for the Foothills Master Plan to be completed and to see so many more people enjoying the trails :) I fully support the continuation of the Foothills Master Plan! Last I saw, construction would possibly resume in October. Do you have any update on this? Thank you for all of your time and effort in implementing this plan to better our community, Lauren</p>	Foothills Trail System Master Plan