

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
3/31/2021 16:31	Jon Ribbon	<p>My name is Jon Ribbon. I am a founding member of Wasatch Tenants United. We have some very serious concerns about the discussion around SRO expansion and redefinition, and we hope this is an unintended consequence of this move. We would like to meet with you about these concerns, but here is a summary, 1. The geographic concern. You have talked about this a lot, and I wont add more to the fire on this. But we have some possible solutions, and we are open towards helping the city 'pry open' historically wealthier districts who have been resistant to densification. 2. There are existing micro-apartments, and even some SROs under construction that cost either as much, or more than other studios in their area. Meaning in this city, with the massive affordable housing shortage that exists we have no reason to believe Shared Living buildings will be that much more affordable than existing studios. Especially true when SALT has already said they believe 1300 is a reasonable cost for their 230 square foot shared living units, as have other developers keen on this sort of building. 3. Despite the relatively comparable cost, these micro apartments fill up, despite lacking some basic amenities (greenprint has only mini fridges, for example, I am about to move into a 230 sq foot space for 820 a month because it is just the most affordable option.) This is because working people don't really have a choice in what housing they occupy, they necessarily have to choose the cheapest available housing, and are usually forced to make real compromises in terms of cleanliness, safety, exposure, and comfort in order to do so. 4. These factors together, paired with the fact that this proposal contains no binding usage specifications for these types of developments draws a pretty grim picture. <b>*Continued 1/2*</b></p>	Affordable Housing

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
	Jon Ribbon	<p><b>*Continued 2/2*</b> To us it looks like our members, the tenants we represent, and the populations we seek to advocate for are going to simply be squeezed into apartments with less space, less privacy, and less security (month to month leases only with constant surveillance of common areas) in order to acquire affordable housing. This feels like more of a mass deregulation measure than a philanthropic endeavor. This is a large step toward the sort of housing you saw at the onset of the industrial revolution, and in other poorer countries with no housing regulations. To conclude, we are already sending internal memos to our neighborhood level organizers, and running a social media campaign to oppose this measure for these reasons. However we are extremely open to seeing this measure altered in a way that clarifies it's purpose, and promises to house the unsheltered. There is a tremendous opportunity to win favor with our people and those who receive our newsletters if you are willing to meet with us and help us prevent these (I presume) unintended consequences. However, now that we have made the reasons for our opposition clear, we expect to hear from you, and hope to hear an answer for these concerns.</p>	
4/1/2021 12:03	Robert Jones	We really need to save the Utah Theatre. Please help us. Salt Lake City has a lot of open parcels. The Hines tower doesn't have to be built there. —Robert A Jones	Utah Theater
4/2/2021 9:22	Brent Marrott	<p>Hi Chris, I am in support of saving the Utah Theatre. Many of my neighbors are also. I am up on what is happening. I know that cost is very high, but it is a treasure. Please revisit this. The people want it. People will donate. Put the high-rise on another block. Thanks, Brent V. Marrott Man offers to buy historic 'Utah Theater' from Salt Lake City I watched this and there are options.  <a href="https://www.fox13now.com/news/local-news/man-offers-to-buy-historic-utah-theater-from-salt-lake-city?fbclid=IwAR3PE45iDEEAUDHhY07YG5_p9pqfw_plm7jp6DxZCx-dx3JOnHK7sq_Hroc">https://www.fox13now.com/news/local-news/man-offers-to-buy-historic-utah-theater-from-salt-lake-city?fbclid=IwAR3PE45iDEEAUDHhY07YG5_p9pqfw_plm7jp6DxZCx-dx3JOnHK7sq_Hroc</a></p>	Utah Theater

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
4/2/2021 14:04	Dana Friesen	Subject: (EXTERNAL) Defund and Reform the Police I am a resident of Salt Lake City. I am writing to demand that the City Council adopt a budget for the people, that prioritizes community wellbeing and redirects funding away from the police. We are in the midst of widespread upheaval over the systemic violence of policing, embodied by the SLCPD's well documented history of lethal force against residents of color. Empty gestures and suggestions of "reform" are unacceptable. I am demanding the voices of this movement be heard, and that real change be made to the way this city allocates its resources. Support for marginalized communities is necessary now, more than ever. But instead, the Mayor has proposed an increase in funding to the SLCPD, while social services and education--proven to better promote community safety than policing--stagnate. The SLCPD has seen a rise in overtime pay which, when too often paid out to officers responsible for harassing unhoused, Black, Indigenous, and Latinx residents, is deeply insulting. I am demanding that the City Council defund the SLCPD. I demand a budget that adequately and effectively meets the needs of impacted Utahans during this trying and uncertain time, when livelihoods are on the line. I demand a budget that supports community wellbeing, rather than empowering the police forces that tear us apart. Although City Council has thus far avoided voting or revising Mayor Mendenhall's budget proposal, the document is back in your hands. It is your duty to represent your constituents. I am urging you to completely revise the SLC budget for 2020-2021 fiscal year, and to fund care, not criminalization and incarceration. You must adopt a budget for the people. Public opinion is with me. Thank you for your time, Dana Friesen	Police Funding
4/4/2021 9:24	Brian Cole	dear sir/madam, i'm writing to ask you to support ranked choice voting at city council meeting on may 12. salt lake county has signaled that they would implement ranked choice for cities that support it. i feel that this change would improve voter literacy thus improving quality of candidates that we elect. thanx, sincerely, brian cole	Ranked Choice Voting
4/5/2021 8:10	Lynn Schwarz	I am writing concerning Ranked Choice Voting ( RCV ). Please approve using RCV for any and all elections that state law allows. RCV makes sure that ALL votes count. Once people realize that no vote will be " wasted " , I am sure they will be very enthusiastic. All fiscally responsible voters will love the fact there will one election, as run-offs will not be needed. This has been used successfully in many other countries and by some localities in the U.S. It is time for SLC to step into the 21st century. Lynn Schwarz	Ranked Choice Voting

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
4/5/2021 8:11	Judi Short	<p>I'm writing to ask you to vote to approve doing this for City Council elections. And, for other elections if you have that authority. It seems to me that this is a way to ensure a robust turnout, everyone who supports a specific candidate will have skin in the game. If that candidate loses, they might not turn around and come back to vote again. And Voter turnout is larger in the general election, rather than the primaries. More people will get a say in who represents them. I see this might encourage candidates to take the time to really learn about the issues, rather than just say "I will do a good job", They will need specific knowledge to rise to the head of the pack. I think this will lead to better, more informed candidates going forward. And they might discover along the way just how much time this job takes and how difficult it is, in our city that is growing rapidly. This would also give overseas and military voters a chance to vote in this election. There often is not enough time if there is a runoff election to vote and have their ballot returned in time to be counted. This could save money, there wouldn't be a second election, there would be one election. Many groups try to put together a Voter's Guide about the candidates. And many candidates, especially the incumbents, ignore those requests. Then the Voter's Guide is not valuable. This would put all candidates on their toes to make sure they get their positions out there, because they could be in a big long list of candidates, and if they are new to politics, fewer people will know them, or know their policies. I think this could cost less if there were one central place where all the candidates for a position could be compared,, then it would be easier for voters to decide and actually be able to rank candidates. This would perhaps cut down on candidate debates, because there wouldn't be a second round of debates for a run off. And certainly it will be less expensive, both for the entity running the election, and the candidates. I also think the little guy might have a better shot at being elected occasionally. And it would require me, as a voter, to learn enough about the candidates so that I am voting responsibly. Please vote to approve ranked choice voting. -- Judi Short</p>	Ranked Choice Voting
4/5/2021 8:13	Lavone Liddle	<p>Mayor, Councilmembers and staff, I concur with the email below that Judi Short sent to me. It is a cogent synopsis of the rationale to consider, support and vote for Rank Choice Voting. I urge you to vote for Rank Choice Voting. Thank you for the work you do for our city. Regards, La Vone Liddle</p>	Ranked Choice Voting

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
4/5/2021 13:16	Maya Brimhall	Hi, While I cannot be at the public hearing tomorrow, I wanted my voice to be heard. I strongly oppose any allocation of budget to the Salt Lake City Police Department, especially for "injuries incurred during protests". Seeing as how they have been the primary instigators of violence and rioting, I do not feel comfortable with my hard earned taxes going toward their divisive and racist actions. I hope you take this to heart and seriously consider allocating funds to sustainable community organizations that actually help Salt Lake City's marginalized and oppressed communities rather than allocating funds to the police for community support funding. Sincerely, Maya Brimhall -- Maya Brimhall (She/Hers)	

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
4/6/2021 9:05	George Chapman	<p>During discussion of the Ranked Choice Pilot Program, I urge you to remember the effect on the voters and particularly on the community councils if Ranked Choice Voting is only for the General Election. If more than two candidates for municipal offices are on the general election ballot, community councils and voters will have less time to hear the two best candidates debate. From years of hands on experience both managing campaigns and running for office, I found that the problem with more than two candidates is that the community councils, and other groups hosting debates, have to allow all of the candidates into the debate. Even the ones that may not have a chance at winning. That decreases legitimate debates and relegated voters to rely on candidate marketing materials. Several examples show the problem. Nationally, during the Presidential Primaries, the number of candidates on the debate stage was almost laughable. Locally, in 2013, there were way too many running for office in District 5 to allow a good debate that could cover more than a couple of questions. In other words, there was not enough time for the community councils to allow all to participate in debates until after the top two were chosen in the primary (I helped set up the one debate.). In the 2015 mayor's election, the 5 candidates made effective debates at the community councils almost impossible. Greater Avenues settled the issue by choosing who they felt were the top two candidates for a first debate and let the last three debate at the next month's meeting. That could have resulted in a lawsuit if any of the candidates felt slighted (we didn't). The first mayoral debate in 2015 may have seemed to stay on point and provided good points but subsequent TV debates were rushed and didn't allow a good defining of the candidates, in my opinion. I expect many to run for municipal offices this year for each opening and that will make the hosting of debates almost impossible until after a primary that chooses the top two candidates. The best example is the large number of candidates that applied for the last opening on the District 5 City Council seat.</p> <p><b>*Continued 1/2*</b></p>	Ranked Choice Voting

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
	George Chapman	<p><b>*Continued 2/2*</b> I believe many activists will apply to push the issues that were common in the last year, including defunding police, police brutality, homeless camp cleanups, affordable housing, etc. My main point is that over the years, candidates for municipal offices cannot provide a good education for voters without debates and debates with more than the top two candidates are difficult and do not really provide more than a couple of questions answered. Without debates, voters have to rely on candidate marketing materials. With more than a couple of candidates, potential debates will turn into a bunch of slogans by activists hoping to get their point across. If the City really wants to educate the voters, the City should consider hosting debates for each Council District at local schools. In 2014, the Legislature made all public schools civic centers (all charter schools were added in 2015) so that the only cost for using the school facilities is a modest rental fee (and damage deposit) since added insurance is not needed. Local schools would provide a large audience and educate voters better than candidate marketing materials. The City should host these voter education debates for the Primary and for the General Election. It would also publicize the local community councils and increase community engagement in those councils. Please consider this when you are choosing how to use ranked choice voting this year. George Chapman SLC</p>	
4/6/2021 11:05	Noelle Dunkley	<p>I have come across some wonderful solutions to our homeless situation. Please watch these 2 videos from Eugene Oregon and Austin Texas and how they have approached this problem in meaningful way to permanently help our fellowmen. <a href="https://youtu.be/yLgW-i_ZYCs">https://youtu.be/yLgW-i_ZYCs</a>  <a href="https://youtu.be/xBJxvJ5hw0c">https://youtu.be/xBJxvJ5hw0c</a> Thank you. Noelle Dunkley</p>	Homelessness

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
4/6/2021 11:39	Erica Bindas	<p>Hi all, I'm writing in today to express some concerns with budget amendment 7. I was excited to see several, community-based funding initiatives in this amendment such as Bicycle and Pedestrian safety! However, the following items are of particular concern to me and I think these aspects need to be rejected before moving forward with other funding of the SLCPD. 1. \$650k for CCP Support: these abatements of homeless camps have been brutal for our unsheltered neighbors. We as a city cannot continue to disrupt these camps, require their residents to move, but not provide services or housing to actually help these people. The police have shown little concern in previous abatements for the safety and health of these unsheltered people and should not receive any more money to displace them! 1. In my personal experience living on S. Roberta street, close to Geraldine E. King Women's Center, I've seen these abatements first hand. They are completely inhumane and more harmful than helpful. The people living on my street are not a hazard or eyesore, they are human beings who are trying to survive. We cannot stand by and allow the police to shuffle these people around without providing them the resources they need to survive. 2. \$1.5 million Social Work Funding back to Police: I understand that this is based around an accounting error where two years of funding was moved instead of the originally intended one. However, I think we should keep the 1.5 million out of the budget (regardless of the accounting mistake) as a step in the direction of defunding SLCPD. Moving the funding to social workers is a better step towards community care in the future and should be embraced! 3. \$537k in Protest Costs: Protesting is part our right to free speech as citizens, and covering these protests are part of the job of police officers. They should not be extended additional funding for just doing their job. I am aware that officers have sustained injuries, which is regrettable, but they have also caused injuries to community members during these same protests and should not be paid to do so. As trained officers, I expect better restraint and control during these situations, but having witnessed rash police action during otherwise peaceful protests I cannot condone extra funding for these efforts. Thank you for time! Best, Erica Bindas 84111</p>	