

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
1/6/2023 12:45	Brianna m. Adams	Proposed High-Density "Student housing" Emigration Canyon	<p>Hello Council Members, The proposal of a high-density zoning change requested for the mouth of Emigration Canyon has raised an alarm. There are large apartment buildings above the proposed area, that is true. But they are connected to a road system that can get to Foothill in several different ways. As a resident of Emigration Canyon I'm VERY concerned about building 550 units along the canyon road. The Emigration Canyon road has a single point of entry and exit. Emergency vehicles already have a difficult time navigating the narrow road and with so many older residents in the area I worry that this will increase over time. The canyon is also home to the traffic of cyclists, motorcycles, hunters, and constant road blocking due to marathons and various races. Adding another 550 vehicles (or MORE!) to the road is untenable. The Foothill/Sunnyside intersection is already terrible mornings and evenings with the existing University traffic. This would add to the bottleneck making the commute ridiculous for anyone not heading to the U or Research Park. In addition, there are concerns with the soil stability for such a large structure as the soils are notoriously tricky, not to mention additional potential damage to the Emigration Stream that we are trying to save. We are VERY concerned with the water usage a large structure like the one proposed will take and add to the burden of water restriction we already experience. My family and I must voice our opinion so you know that we are not okay with this. Our single access road cannot be compromised like that. I'm happy to sign something or speak to whomever I need to make them aware of the existing homeowners feelings. Please do not re-zone Emigration Canyon. And yes, we vote. Thank you for your time, Bri Adams & Todd Thueson</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
1/9/2023 15:35	Koby Elias	RE: 2100 South Options - D/7	<p>Dear 2100 South Project Team, Mayor Mendenhall, and Councilwoman Fowler, I am a resident of Sugar House, district 7, Salt Lake City. We need to become denser and less car-centric to promote pedestrian safety, as well as economic and environmental sustainability. Sugar House is well on its way to becoming denser, and we need courage from our leaders to help reduce our reliance on our cars. Option 2 with bike lanes, two traffic lanes, and a turning lane would be a useful step in that direction. There are a few objections that I have heard to a robust pedestrian/cycling-first plan for 2100 South I respond to each below: 1. Cars support businesses: For businesses on 2100 south I think this is wrong. Foot traffic supports these businesses, and option 2 would encourage this. You can look to the many empty storefronts on 400 S as proof that car throughput does not create an environment for local small business success. 2. Increased congestion: congestion may increase, but this will happen anyways with continued growth in the area. The only sustainable solution is to convert local car trips to walking and biking trips. Option 2 will support this. 3. Delays in bus service: We need more and better bus service in this city. However, if we hold ourselves to a standard that no roadway projects can increase congestion and thus impact bus service we will not transition from a car-dominated city to a pedestrian/transit oriented one. This argument prevents major swaths of the city from becoming more pedestrian friendly because we can never increase congestion to prioritize pedestrians/cyclists on our streets. If this is a primary concern keeping us from the more pedestrian oriented 3-lane option, I would suggest that we turn 2 of the 4 traffic lanes in the 4-lane option into dedicated bus lanes. Thank you for considering these points and I again strongly encourage you to choose the most pedestrian and cycling friendly option possible for 2100 South. Thank you, Koby</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
1/10/2023 8:45	Nikki Allen	2100 South Redevelopment	<p>Dear 2100 South Project Team, Mayor Mendenhall, and Councilwoman Fowler, I am a resident of Sugar House, District 7, Salt Lake City. We need to become denser and less car-centric to promote pedestrian safety, as well as economic and environmental sustainability. Sugar House is well on its way to becoming denser, and we need courage from our leaders to help reduce our reliance on our cars. Option 2 with bike lanes, two traffic lanes, and a turning lane would be a useful step in that direction. There are a few objections that I have heard to a robust pedestrian/cycling-first plan for 2100 South I respond to each below: 1. Cars support businesses: For businesses on 2100 south I think this is wrong. Foot traffic supports these businesses, and option 2 would encourage this. You can look to the many empty storefronts on 400 S as proof that car throughput does not create an environment for local small business success. 2. Increased congestion: Congestion may increase, but this will happen anyways with continued growth in the area. The only sustainable solution is to convert local car trips to walking and biking trips. Option 2 will support this. 3. Concerns that increased congestion on 2100 south will lead to delays in bus service: We need more frequent and better bus service in this city. However, if we maintain that roadway projects cannot increase congestion, and thus impact bus service, we will never transform from a car-dominated city to a pedestrian/transit-oriented one. This reasoning prevents major swaths of the city from becoming more pedestrian-friendly because we can never increase congestion to prioritize the pedestrians/cyclists on our streets. Thank you for considering these points and I again strongly encourage you to choose the most pedestrian and cycling-friendly option possible for 2100 South. Thank you, Nikole Allen</p>