

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/9/2023 8:01	Tyler Ingram	Glendale Park Subjestions	I would subject that the Glendale community center be relocated to the new site of the Glendale reginol park & be located in a building onsite of the Glendale regional park the community center would house after school programs & Summer day camp programs for kids & would include a resource center & would house classes like wasach community garden clinics & classes as well as right next the the community center would be a site for a community garden with like 20 plots that people could rent through Wasach Community Gardens. I would also subject that you build a nature center for all the wildlife & migratory birds it would include an information center that would be staffed by volunteers on a seasonal bases where people could go to ask questions or get information on the local wildlife on the Jordan River Parkway it would include an indoor musiem like exhibits about the geography & wildlife in the area. it would also include outdoor nesting for eagles & other bird species. it would include native plant species & a bird wachers area with plats witb information on local bird species as well as migratory birds.
3/9/2023 12:26	Helen Goddard	Re: News from District Seven: February Newsletter	I have been seeing on the news about cars being parked on the street during snow storms which inhibits snow plow work. Has the city considered the mixed news of homeowners building auxiliary houses to help the affordable housing crisis. The net effect is that you have more people having to park on the street overnight because there is no parking when you add on to single family residences. On my street we have multiple cars parking on the street because they have nowhere else to park. Helen Goddard
3/9/2023 15:12	Carol Steffens	Liberty Park/Homeless	Hi, I walked Liberty Park two days ago. Lots of homeless people with tents. Our city is not protecting our parks for the residents. Liberty Park is not a camp ground. I don't want my tax dollars paying people to clean up needles and poop. I want my tax dollars going to paying for flowers, Tracy Aviary and other activities to enhance the park. Maybe the city should just pick an open lot somewhere and designate it as camping area. have bathrooms, medical clinic and a small food pantry. Tell homeless people in Liberty Park that they can not camp in our parks. They must go to a designated area to live out side. Thanks,
3/9/2023 15:23	Evan Lambson	Tiny home village feedback and thoughts	Here is a comment on that new low income housing that was just built. Gov is not efficient and should not be involved in the housing market (Directly building no, but yes for build ordinances) IMO, but I don't doubt the intent and good will just some thoughts to consider and perception from Utah citizens: https://www.ksl.com/article/50595981/the-year-of-affordable-housing-salt-lake-city-celebrates-new-units-tiny-home-village-groundbreaking (Comments section) "The city bureaucrats and ideologues in leadership are happy but this is bad. Taxpayers blew millions to build it and will have to throw millions more to keep it from being run down. This is a totally flawed concept from the start. People forget that this is just a rehash of the 1960s failed "housing projects" or "the projects" for short. Homes for working families to BUY, and lift themselves out of renting, should have been built, because that is how you build stability. "Projects" apartments are how you foster dependency not dignity. This kind of project only rewards single parenthood and intergenerational repeated poverty. If modest single family homes had been built, taxpayers would have immediately gotten their money back. This will drain taxpayers perpetually."
3/9/2023 15:27	Anonymous Constituent	ADU	This is a HORRIBLE idea! ADU's should be illegal.

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/10/2023 9:06	Tom Brooks	ADU/B&B - ***IMPORTANT!***	<p>Dear Representative, Chris Wharton, I have a serious question about Non-Owner Occupied ADUs: How are they different from "Duplexes" or "Townhomes"? More importantly, what's to keep them from being turned into "Bed and Breakfast" nightly rentals? Most would say, SLC has an ordinance preventing B&Bs. However, SLC is having very little success enforcing this code (in preventing nightly rentals). Because of the tight connection of ADUs and Illegal nightly rentals, our SLC Counsel shouldn't drop the requirements for owner occupation until SLC can get control of the B&B problems they have now: Take 1544 E. Tomahawk Drive (84103) for an example. (Avid Amiri, also has a B&B in the Capitol Hill area.) SLC Enforcement has had absolutely no success at stopping Avid. Reasons: 1.Low SLC Enforcement manpower 2. Hours of B&B Operation don't coincidence with Enforcement's hours of operation. (i.e. B&B nightly renters stay during 3-Day Weekends, Friday - Sunday, and are usually only present after 4:30pm until 8 am when Enforcement is off-duty. 3. Currently, Enforcement is requiring the neighbors of B&Bs to prove that the landlords of nightly rentals are breaking the law. Provide pictures, turn in posts of advertisements, prove that the tenant has a nightly rental contract. 4. Proving that the nightly rental contract exists, is especially tricky; landlords are writing up long-term agreements which can be cut short after 3 days. There are other work-arounds too. 5. Plus, they are scared to death of Avid. He is quick to send out "Cease and Desist" letters. Avid is an absolute crook with a rap sheet at least 2 inches thick. Yet, he's calling the shots. Please don't vote for non-owner occupied ADUs. It will only make the problem of nightly rentals worse. Sincerely, Tom Brooks</p>
3/10/2023 9:19	Kurt R Ovard	PLNSUB2023-00083 COMMENTS - D/7	<p>We have dwelt at REDACTED for 46 years. We are deeply concerned over the changes being made to our quaint little bedroom community. Looking at the site, it seems they are already prepping for construction and supposedly they haven't received approval yet. You can see the trench that has already been dug. We have attempted to examine the application forms, but the print makes it difficult to read all specifications. One major issue for us is the parking for this 4-plex. We already have overflow street parking from "The Brixton". Trying to gain access to 600 East gets more and more perilous with increased street parking coupled with through traffic that does NOT conform to the 20 mph limit. [We were unable to see parking places for the 4plex on the plans] What will happen to the parking for the businesses that utilize the current space? Will they have to fight for street space with all the residents (new and existing)? We have always enjoyed the small but pretty green space at the intersection of Simpson and 600 East. Will this be destroyed by the project? We are saddened by the constant drive to make the community that was a friendly little village into "Salt Lake City II". If this was a single story complex, that would be invasive enough, but lopping off more skyline with another blocky apartment structure, creates a claustrophobic atmosphere that we cannot look forward to. The constant construction of apartments, granny houses etc. has produced over a decade of noise and dust and additional congestion. If you want to do improvements, why not start by paving the alley between 600 East and Green Street. That hasn't been touched in 30 years! As for construction , how about a hiatus of equivalent duration or better still, be generous and let us have some peace for 25 years. (By then, we will likely be gone} . Sincerely, Kurt R Ovard & Charlotte Ovard</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/10/2023 9:24	Elizabeth Williams	Street project	<p>Dan, Elizabeth Williams here. My husband Frank and I live on REDACTED. I understand there is a proposed street project for Kensington and Foothill. I heard about a meeting at the library this last Tuesday but not in time to arrange to be able to be there. Is there somewhere to submit concerns? I think some of what is suggested is a TERRIBLE idea and will make traffic on Foothill even more congested (if I understand what they are suggesting). I also think some of it is completely unnecessary and wonder WHO exactly is suggesting it. If you know where to get more information or where to send concerns, I would appreciate it. Thank you.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Elizabeth Williams</p>
3/10/2023 9:27	Matthew Carmody	Sugarhouse Park Electric Vehicle Charging - D/7	<p>Greetings, My name is Matthew Carmody, a resident within the Sugarhouse neighborhood, and given today's announcement of federal government initiatives regarding electric vehicle infrastructure, I believe it's important to point out Sugarhouse Park may be a strategically important location for the city to build out electric vehicle charging capabilities. Due to it's unique positioning along a major highway, Sugarhouse Park would be a perfect destination for people within the city (or those traveling along the I-80 corridor) to charge their vehicle as they enjoy the park's outdoor recreation, amenities, and accessibility to Sugarhouse's downtown businesses. Although charging stalls could be built out within the park's existing parking lots, the parcel of land at the SE corner of 13th E & 21st S (former Sizzler) offers a unique opportunity for: * Easy access to/from the interstate * Direct access to the park * Access to downtown Sugarhouse through the developed Hidden Hollow path * Access to multiple bus stops * Beautiful unobstructed views of the mountain range for those who wish to remain by their cars It would be ideal if the city could use funds to purchase this land from the private owner and incorporate it into the park, given the buildout of such a project may be subsidized. If not possible, perhaps the city could attempt to broker a deal between parties who may be willing to use this land for such a purpose. Thank you for your time. I have linked the initiatives that I referenced and may be relevant: FACT SHEET: Biden-Harris Administration Announces New Standards and Major Progress for a Made-in-America National Network of Electric Vehicle Chargers <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2023/02/15/fact-sheet-biden-harris-administration-announces-new-standards-and-major-progress-for-a-made-in-america-national-network-of-electric-vehicle-chargers/> whitehouse.gov <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2023/02/15/fact-sheet-biden-harris-administration-announces-new-standards-and-major-progress-for-a-made-in-america-national-network-of-electric-vehicle-chargers/> ev_charging_min_std_rule_fr <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/nevi/resources/ev_charging_min_std_rule_fr.pdf> PDF Document · 675 KB <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/nevi/resources/ev_charging_min_std_rule_fr.pdf> Sincerely,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Matthew Carmody</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/10/2023 13:21	Merrilee MORGAN	I Oppose ADU code changes	<p>Dear City Council Members, I oppose removal of owner occupancy in Salt Lake City's new ADU codes. For the first time in the city's history, this code will eliminate single family home designations. To me, this is a slap in the face to the "American Dream" of everyday working-class citizens and to my ancestors that made this community a reality. In fact, my grandfather was one of the brick masons that hand-built Rose Park. I am in favor of single family homes and stable neighborhoods with vibrant schools where working families can save and invest in their futures and in their communities. As a Realtor, I know first-hand about how the removal of owner occupancy on ADU's will negatively impact single family home ownership in Salt Lake City. Specifically, it will have detrimental consequences on homeownership affordability for the hardworking men and women in the city's service sector and those in professional fields like art, music and the trades. These are the people that brew your lattes, pour the concrete on your driveway, wash your car, show you to your seat at a concert, chop the cilantro for your tacos and haul your broken water heater to the landfill, after they replace it with a new one. Most of these people have grown up in the areas being affected by the potential change and they can't even afford to buy a home in the city where they work. They earn less than \$60,000 per household, are in their 30s or early 40s, work two jobs and shuffle children to school and daycare between shifts. Not to mention where they park their work trucks so their tools don't get stolen or where the funds will come from the buy and correctly install an ADU. When writing offers for this demographic, I am often competing with cash investors. During the pandemic, I saw and heard of investors paying up to \$200,000 more than the list price of a home because they have the resources to hold onto the property and wait to recuperate their investments, or wait to buy the house next door and so on until an investor owns the entire block and we know where that goes. Contrast this with first- or second-time home buyers who struggle to make ends meet each month but plant gardens, coach soccer and tend to aging parents. We have not recovered from the spike in home prices since 2019. In fact, we are seeing a slight dip in some higher priced properties, while lower priced properties remain very competitive. Here's an example. Let's take Glendale, one of the last affordable neighborhoods in Salt Lake. This new ADU policy – intended to spur more ADU construction in single family zones – will adversely affect nearby homes with no ADUs. Here's why: A home without an ADU will tend to be less expensive than a home with an ADU. However, market forces will impact the lower-priced non-ADU homes escalating its price. As competition heats up, especially from corporate or investment sources, our working-class residents will be shut out. Furthermore, if a home buyer can afford to purchase a property with an ADU in an area that is less expensive, (like Glendale or Ball Park) they may likely consider moving into a higher priced neighborhood where they qualify to purchase (like Sugar House or 9th and 9th) that does not have an ADU.</p> <p>Please vote no on the ADU ordinance. Merrilee Morgan</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/12/2023 19:15	Tracy Schaefer	despicable police behavior	<p>I wanted to let you know of the depicable way my young daughter was treated on Saturday, March 11th, 2023 by 3 Salt Lake City police officers. My daughter Alexandra was at Salt Lake City airport taking a 10:30 pm flight home to Philadelphia. 90 minutes before checking into her flight, she mistakening opened and drank her last beer left over from their Air B n B rental while sittting in the lobby area. She then checked into her flight, checked her two bags, went through TSA pre-check security and got a sandwich with her friend. 90 minutes later when attempting to board her flight, she was told she could not because of drinking that beer 90 minutes earlier. She was obviously upset, did not understand her mistake and began to cry. She was told to calm down. She asked to speak to a manger. Her luggage was already on the flight and she wanted to get it off to have it with her. It was \$1500 worth of 2 pairs of skiis and boots. She was told her luggage would go to Philadelphia without her. No manager ever showed but instead 3 police officers were called and escorted her out of the airport onto the street, laughed at her, waved goodbye to her telling her she would have to "figure it out." It is 10 pm and she is a 125 pound female by herself put onto the street by 3 police officers. Aren't they supposed to help people? They laughed at her and put her on the street. Is this the way Salt Lake City police treats its visitors? She and we, her parents, understand she made a mistake. But I think they should have thought of her safety for a minute. What if something had happened to her? What if she didn't have the means to find and pay for a hotel? Or get to the hotel? She had no luggage, nothing with her. What if someone saw that and took advantage of her or worse? This department should rethink how they treat people. Your officers clearly don't care about people's safety and deliberately put my daughter in danger. We, for one family, will never return to your city. I would like a response to this complaint by someone in charge at this department. Regretfully, Tracy M. Schaefer</p>
3/13/2023 12:07	Elliott Hansen	Safety first-I support the Foothill crossing	<p>Councilman Dugan — As a person who lives just a few blocks from the proposed crossing on Kensington Ave, I am writing you today to ask that you support the crossing of Foothill as proposed by UDOT. I realize that this might change the daily commute for some people living in the area, but after multiple pedestrian accidents in the neighborhood, we need to prioritize safety and non- vehicular transportation. People driving cars can simply use a handful of other nearby options. This might add one minute of drive time for some, while providing safe access across Foothill Drive for the entire city. As a representative of District 6, you know how important the Wasatch Mountains are to our city. Please support opening up access to the foothills and creating a safe crossing for the families of this city. Thank you. Elliott Hansen</p>
3/13/2023 12:09	Lynn Pershing	2 new LHD's will be presented to the City Council soon	<p>Hi Dan Just wanted to give you a heads up that 2 new Local Historic Districts will be presented to the City Council by Planning (Historic Preservation Office) soon. 1. Princeton Heights (1300-1500 E Princeton Ave (n=43 houses) 2. Laird Heights (1300-1500 E Laird Ave + 4 houses on 1300 E and 6 houses on 1500 E between Princeton and Laird Aves), n=65 houses) Planning has to have the City Council approval to commence with the City Process for the LHD Designation. Its a long laborious process, but the property owners in these areas have done an incredible job canvassing their neighbors. Both have more than 65% petition signatures! Thanks for your endeavors to insure owner occupancy in the ADU ordinance. ALSO, April 15 Saturday at 10 AM we will be dedicating he Yalecrest signage and LHD street sign toppers at the Harvard Triangle. I hope you an attend as you be mentioned amongst the team that got this project successfully completed. Thank you thank you Lynn K Pershing</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/13/2023 12:11	Paula Harline	"anticipated" Princeton Heights Local Historic District	<p>Dear Dan, I met you at Emigration Cafe when you came to our neighborhood. I live at REDACTED, and I am the applicant to create a Local Historic District from approximately 1300 to 1500 E Princeton. Four of my neighbors joined with me to collect petition signatures, and approximately 66% of our neighbors signed. I am writing to ask for your support when our application soon comes before the City Council. Please note the following: 1. All 44 homes on our block are original--there have been no tear-downs, which is rare in the Yalecrest neighborhood. We may be the last street in Yalecrest that is completely intact. 2. Our street is within 1/4 mile of a transportation artery on 13th East and is thus in danger of teardowns to make room for fourplexes. Creating a LHD would protect us from this. We feel that losing our cohesive streetscape would be a permanent mistake. 3. The street parallel to ours to the north, 1300 to 1500 E Harvard, is a LHD. The street parallel to us to the south, 1300 to 1500 E Laird, is also applying to create a LHD. The houses on these blocks of Harvard, Princeton, and Laird would form a cohesive and important historic resource for our City: this is what the neighborhood looked like 100 years ago. Our block tells a story about a Salt Lake City neighborhood between the Wars, during the Depression, when families ate dinner in dining rooms, when four bedrooms shared one small bathroom, when porches encouraged neighborly visits, when architectural detail and craftsmanship was valued, when every house on the block was different. I would love to give you a quick tour of my house at 1340 E Princeton and take you for a brisk walk up the street if you can take the time. Finally, I recently attended a City Council meeting that you conducted, and I appreciated your attention to public comments and your respect for everyone in the room. Thanks for all the work you do on my behalf. Sincerely, Paula Harline</p>
3/13/2023 12:13	Bryan Hull	I support the Foothill crossing	<p>Councilman Dugan — I am writing you today to ask that you support the enhanced pedestrian crossing at Foothill Drive and Kensington Ave as proposed by UDOT. I realize that this might change the daily commute for some people living in the area, but Kensington is a much smaller thoroughfare and not a direct artery like many of the other roads that surround it (in terms of crossing between neighborhoods over Foothill Drive.) Motorists have plenty of other nearby options for crossing and turning onto Foothill Drive. Pedestrians, cyclists, and other active methods of transport have very few options that are discretely available for such an important area of our city for active transport. Please support enhancing access to all and encouraging safe crossings for the families of this city. Thank you, Bryan Hull</p>
3/13/2023 12:14	Alan Bird	Question from a resident	<p>Dan, I'm somewhat puzzled by all the recent stories about recovering the shrinking Great Salt Lake. Here is my conundrum, if we are in such dire need to save water, why are we allowing zoning for more and more high density housing? It seems like our leaders speak with forked tongues. More people in one space are just like too many animals in a litter using all of a mother's teats and having the mammary glands dry up. Our mammary glands are already bone dry, yet we continue to promote and allow far more water consuming people per square foot than ever in history. Tax dollars and developer's lobby dollars are truly more important than the lake drying up it at least in my observation. I'd love feedback as to why this is occurring as these developments are certainly not affordable housing, they're just welcome centers for more wealthy occupants.</p> <p>Best, Alan Bird Wasatch Hollow resident</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/13/2023 12:16	Alex Chanoux	Support for the Foothill crossing	Dear Councilman, I am writing you to ask that you support the crossing at Foothill and Kensington as proposed by UDOT to provide safe access across Foothill Drive for the entire city. As a local resident with two young children, this safe passage is of the utmost importance; especially when considering the increase driving presence on the Foothills. Please support opening up access to the foothills and creating a safe crossing for the families of this city. Thank you for your consideration and support; Best regards, Alex Chanoux
3/13/2023 12:18	Kyle Deans	I support the Foothill crossing	Councilman Dugan — I am writing you today to ask that you support the crossing at Foothill and Kensington as proposed by UDOT. I realize that this might change the daily commute for some people living in the area, but people driving cars can simply use a handful of other nearby options. This might add one minute of drive time for some, while providing safe access across Foothill Drive for the entire city. As a representative of District 6, you know how important the Wasatch Mountains are to our city. Please support opening up access to the foothills and creating a safe crossing for the families of this city. Thank you. Kyle R Deans SLC Resident

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/13/2023 15:37	Rocky Anderson 1/2	ADUs and Our City's Neighborhoods	<p>Dear Members of the City Council and Mayor Mendenhall: I find very troubling the propensity of the Mayor, her City Planner, some Council members, and others to lay the groundwork for the severe deterioration of neighborhoods throughout the City, particularly after the current administration has failed to pursue available alternative measures that could (1) provide for far greater housing affordability at every level, (2) honor the interest we all have in architectural excellence and the quality of our City's built environment, and (3) preserve the character of existing neighborhoods throughout the City. When I walk around my neighborhood, it is clearly evident which houses are being rented from an absentee landlord and which ones are owner-occupied or at least owned by local residents. The houses owned by absentee landlords are often the ones with untended, or no, landscaping, beer cans all over the yard, and vehicles occasionally parked in the front yard. Those are also often the nuisance houses—with parties that disrupt the rest of the neighborhood until 2 a.m. or later (with a lack of enforcement of the laws by the City). Imagine how these problems will be exacerbated if ADUs become far more common, especially if there is no owner-occupied requirement. If that happens, people will look back for generations and point at the decision of the Council (and the failure by the Mayor to veto it) as a major turning point, leading to the undermining of the quality of life for many of our City's residents. I'm equally troubled by how this issue is being framed by some as being a battle between "wealthy homeowners" and "housing advocates" or between the east-side and the west-side. For instance, a recent article in Building Salt Lake states: "The talk of liberalization has inflamed parties on both sides of the issue: housing advocates who view ADUs as a source of homes that would likely rent for less than market-rate, and wealthy homeowners who view affordable housing as a threat to neighborhood character." That statement itself is inflammatory – and poses a false dichotomy. It is written (rather condescendingly, it seems to me) as if only "wealthy homeowners" care about the character of their neighborhoods. It's also written as if the world is divided between "housing advocates" and "wealthy homeowners"—as if "wealthy homeowners" are not or cannot also be "housing advocates." This is a really unfortunate casting of the issue, as if it's west-side vs. east-side or "housing advocates" vs. "wealthy homeowners". I doubt homeowners on the west-side would be any happier than homeowners on the east-side to have institutional investors buying nearby houses for rentals – or with the destruction of single-family residence zoning. The suggested changes bode poorly for the future of our city. The damage would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to unwind. To oppose more ADUs or to oppose the elimination of the owner-occupied requirement for ADUs does not mean that one views "affordable housing" as a threat to neighborhood character, as the writer of the above-referenced article suggests.</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/13/2023 15:37	Rocky Anderson 2/2	CONTONUUED!! ADUs and Our City's Neighborhoods	<p>There should be affordable housing in every neighborhood of the City—but it doesn't have to take the form of rental units jammed into every lot, many owned by institutional investors. The discussion in general among the Mayor, her Planning Director, the Council members, and much of the public ignores alternatives that can achieve far more affordable housing, while, at the same time, preserving neighborhood character in current neighborhoods and providing for far better design than much of what has been built in the past few years. For instance, the City should be building a LOT of mixed-income affordable social housing in areas that will not result in the destruction of any existing housing or in the adverse transformation of existing neighborhoods. See, for example, https://www.bestmswprograms.com/impressive-social-housing-projects/ Imagine something like this near the intermodal hub, for instance: Please read this: https://prospect.org/infrastructure/america-needs-social-housing/ You have a solemn duty to be responsible stewards of our neighborhoods throughout our City and achieve, through careful, innovative planning and execution of policies that serve the public interest: (1) sufficient mixed-income affordable (including "deeply affordable") housing—as is achieved in many nations around the world with social housing; (2) a standard of design excellence for a built environment in which we can all be proud; and (3) the preservation of the character of our diverse neighborhoods in all areas of our City. Respectfully, Rocky Anderson</p>
3/13/2023 15:39	Steve Starr	Northpointe Council meeting ** Attachment 1	<p>I've attached a letter in favor of the Northpointe approval that is scheduled for March 21st, 2023. I had only a few minutes to speak last Tuesday and I had more I would like to say. Thank you for your time and concern in this matter. Steve Starr</p>
3/14/2023 8:41	Scott Harris	2100 S Redesign Plan - D/7	<p>Hello, My name is Scott Harris and I live REDACTED. I am very excited about the opportunities that revitalizing 2100 S opens up for my community. As a resident, I have noticed how dangerous, frustrating, and difficult it is to use 2100 S. This is very unfortunate because of all the fantastic businesses that are located right along that street that suffer due to the poor infrastructure. I am writing to let you know that I support Option 2 (3-lanes with bikeway) for 2100 S. I am a multi-mode transportation user: I drive, cycle, walk, and use transit. I believe that the best option for all residents in our community does not cater to a single transportation mode, so we should not be prioritizing personal cars over other transit modes. Cars are the most dangerous, expensive, and inefficient transportation option that we use today. That is why I believe that large sidewalks for pedestrians and a separated bikeway for safe cycling is of paramount importance for our community. A shared-use path is dangerous for pedestrians and frustrating for cyclists, which means that it will be used far less than separated paths for each transportation type. Prioritizing people and not just their cars will also be a massive economic benefit for the city as well as the businesses along 2100 S, as they will get more pedestrian traffic that would otherwise pass them by if they were driving in cars. More pedestrian traffic means better business for local businesses, which means more tax revenue for the city. It is a win for everyone. Separated bikeways will be immensely safer for cyclists, pedestrians, and drivers. When there is a large difference in speed between moving bodies, there is a high risk for collision and injury. This risk is particularly high for those that are outside of a vehicle, so we have a duty to protect them in any way we can. That is why it is vital that we pursue Option 2 rather than Option 1, which does not solve any of these issues. I believe in this city and I think we can do the right thing to help all of our residents, so I urge you to pursue Option 2, as this would be the safest, most economically advantageous, and efficient use of our tax dollars. We need to take bold action to really make a difference in the world, we just need courageous local leaders and decision makers to do their part. Best Regards, Scott</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/14/2023 14:30	Sahil Oberoi	HOME-ARP Allocation Feedback Attachment 2	** Please see UCA's feedback regarding the HOME-ARP allocation attached. Please let me know if there are other ways we may be able to advocate for supportive services funding with the allocation. I am afraid without it, we and other providers wouldn't be able to implement this program. Best, Sahil
3/14/2023 14:33	Steven Keyser	Northpoint Plan	<p>We (Moonlake Farms) have a lease (70yr) with purchase option on 15ac of property located at 2601 N 2200 W SLC located within the Northpoint area. I just noticed the new plan significantly impacts our property - however, we have not received a single notice of any of the meetings on this redevelopment effort? The report notes we have an engineering plan in place with SLC but we have not received any notice whatsoever of zoning amendments that significantly impact our development plans, our business and the value of our property? I'm not sure who did the work on this plan, but in terms of our property, the mosquito infestation makes it unbearable to be on the property from spring to fall. Developing anything park-like on the west side of 2200W between mosquito abatement and the Swanner project will be a complete waste of money. It's not conducive to recreational use whatsoever and any installation installed for that purpose will require maintenance for an area that really can't be used. To be clear we are 100% opposed to designating any wetlands and open space or expanded setbacks for the same on our property and will vigorously oppose the same. As far as natural wetlands? There are no wetlands on the south border of our property except right at the ditch. Has anyone tested the water in rudy ditch? Pretending this is some sort of nature preserve is a stretch. The water is filthy and certainly contaminated with pesticides, chemicals and other street runoff. We develop net zero projects. A better incentive plan might be providing better density and setbacks for installing solar panels, using insulated slabs and wall systems, using heat pumps that are driven by solar power, and installing battery storage to charge off peak. You want cleaner air and water? Build better buildings on the site that use less energy and support zero emission shipping systems. Utilize the high water table for geothermal heat pumps. Use the area for the resources it provides. Encourage all electric shipping operations. Encourage all electric transportation and charging from rooftop and parking lot solar. Pretending this area is a rich viable wetlands is not what anyone who's stepped foot on the property would say. There's a very good reason nobody's lived on these properties. I'd encourage the people making these claims to visit anytime in the spring, summer or fall. Or force them to camp out for 48 hours. I guarantee they'd change their tune and importantly never come back. You would not choose to hike here unless forced. Can you please forward me the hearing information from last week? Thank you Steven Keyser Moonlake Farms</p>

Dear City Council Members,

My name is Steve Starr, I live at [REDACTED], Salt Lake City, Utah. I am a resident of the Northpointe area which is under review for development. I had the opportunity to listen to the meeting that was held on Tuesday, March 7th. I was not prepared to speak that night; however, I was given a 2-minute opportunity. I took a moment to express my opinion and I am in favor of this being approved on March 21st 2023.

I listened to everyone speaking that night, I am deeply concerned that most of the people who are opposed to this development are not residents out in this area and have no idea of what is happening currently and what has taken place over the past 7 years.

This was once a small rural area with little to no traffic on the 2-lane rural road. During the past 7 years, we have witnessed the development of large warehouses (4) with number 5 being built right now on the West side of 2200 West. The new mosquito abatement complex is now located on this road as well. Additionally, there is a start of a new construction project for the Swaner property located in the area, with all the development that has already been approved. Our small rural area and way of life are no longer an option. With all the development that has taken place surrounding us, we no longer wish to live in this location. We have been offered a fair and respectful price to sell to a developer who wants to develop this area, we have been under contract with this developer since March of 2022. During this timeframe, our life has been put on hold. Normally we spend time and money on the upkeep of our property, however, with the possibility of us being bought out by this developer we decided not to do any large-scale projects or spend any substantial amount of money last year on our property. Our lives have been in a holding pattern for over a year now, and we are getting frustrated with the delay in the decision on this project.

During the public comment period in Tuesday's meeting, I had a very difficult time believing in all the environmental enthusiast's claims about the impact that this development would have on our water quality in the valley. Not one person who spoke from the environmental point of view relating to water quality mentioned how these 60 residents who live in the area are on small septic systems for their sewer, and how the septic systems are harmful to the environment and the water aquifers. Here are statistics pertaining to septic sewer systems:

- The average person uses 60 gallons of water per day.
- The average person per household in this area is 3-4.
- Everyone in this area is using a septic tank sewer system.
- There are 60 septic sewer systems in this area.
- Average household uses 180-240 gallons a day.
- Over the course of 1 years' time that equals 3,942,000-5,256,000 gallons of sewage water being leached into our water aquifers and impacting our water quality.

I did not hear once during the public comment on how septic systems negatively impact the water quality, I understand the reason why they would choose not to mention this in their comments, as it would be counter-productive to their agenda, however, I feel that it needs to be brought to light.

Another comment I kept hearing repeatedly from people speaking that night, that once again do not live in this area, is how the “60 residents are being forced out” I am one of these 60 residents living in this area and I have never been coerced or forced by any developer to move from my home. The interactions that my wife and I have had with the developers have been professional and courteous. I would like the record to show that I am one of these 60 residents, and I am not being forced out, and I would like these comments to be removed from your process when making your decision. I find these comments to be slanderous and false. I am a resident in this area, and I can speak for myself and do not need others to falsely speak on my behalf.

To sum up everything, my wife and I have enjoyed living in this area for the past 23 years, however, with the addition of the large warehouses and other large buildings surrounding us that have been approved to build in our rural area we feel like it is time for us to move on. A developer has given us an offer that we can use to move to an area that will meet our needs and not force us to stay in an area where the city will not give permits to fix failing septic systems, or if we choose to do any substantial building on our property we will not have to fight with a city that will not issue permits for any type of building. The developments that have already been allowed out in our rural area have destroyed the rural appeal, nothing at this point can save it, at least give those that have an opportunity to leave, to leave with the offer from the developers. Don't force us to stay in an area that the city has already permitted developers to develop with buildings that will only drive down my property value.

Sincerely,

Steve Starr



Utah Community Action™

1307 South 900 West Salt Lake City, Utah 84104
(801) 359-2444 www.utahca.org

March 14, 2023

Salt Lake City Council
PO Box 145476
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-5476

Dear Salt Lake City Council,

Utah Community Action (UCA) would like to express their appreciation and support for the Salt Lake City HOME-ARP Allocation Plan. We are excited that there will be additional funding available for residents facing a housing emergency. This is especially important at a time when inflation and housing costs outpacing the earnings of the families in our community.

UCA has administered the HOME program for over 15 years and has received annual funding from Salt Lake City and Salt Lake County. Additionally, UCA has administered over \$40 million in Covid rental assistance to clients residing in Salt Lake County over the past three years. From our experience, we have seen that it is imperative to provide clients with holistic case management to ensure they are successful and become self-reliant. Our clients are facing a multitude of issues that requires in-depth case management, which connects clients to resources that can adequately address their needs.

We request that that the Salt Lake City Council reconsider and allocate a portion of this this funding for supportive services, such as case management, so clients are able to achieve long-term success. Without such flexibility in funding, providers would be limited to only offering rental payments to clients. Moreover, HOME-ARP funding allows for supportive services and has other flexibility that could enhance the case management process.

UCA also requests that the Salt Lake City Council consider expanding the boundaries of the HOME-ARP TBRA funds into Salt Lake County. We are seeing clients residing in Salt Lake City struggle to keep up with rent increases and are being priced out of the Salt Lake City rental market; most of these clients are moving South or West into Salt Lake County. By expanding the geographic scope of this funding, the Salt Lake City Council can ensure that clients receiving assistance are housed in units that meet their needs.

UCA sincerely appreciates the work of the Salt Lake City Council and the Mayor's Office to address the housing crisis within our community. We hope that these suggestions will assist in enhancing the effectiveness of the HOME-ARP program.

Sincerely,

Sahil Oberoi
Chief Operating Officer

Jennifer Godfrey
Chief Executive Officer