

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
4/12/2023 11:58	S W Benson	FW: Ranked Choice Voting	I was disappointed to read that the Council voted to use Ranked Choice Voting for the 2023 municipal elections. It is not the fairest or easiest method of voting for the general electorate to understand. In addition to a delayed outcome for elections, there are other issues to consider, not the least of which is determining a winner based on a voter's least desirable candidate based on how they were ranked. I refer you to the following article for information about the pros and cons of Ranked Choice Voting: https://greatbrook.com/ranked-choice-voting-the-good-the-opaque-the-end-game/ Unfortunately, Salt Lake City seems to be following a dangerous road on diluting the power of a single vote. Hopefully, this trend will be reversed with the next election cycle. Sincerely, Susan Benson
4/13/2023 10:49	Anonymous Constituent	Homelessness	i am charity from salt lake city utah. i care about homelessness because sometime it is out of people control. i think we should provide resources that can help these people get back on there feet. This can make homeless rates less high
4/13/2023 16:42	Davis Connor	Little Cottonwood Canyon Gondola Question	Hi City Council, Thank you in advance for the information provided. Was the LCC Gondola project passed and moving forward? I was under the impression that it was voted against but was just told by someone that the state is planning on building the gondola. Thank you again.
4/14/2023 17:54	Rachel White	Camping Ordinance	Dear Salt Lake City Council Members, if Salt Lake City doesn't have an ordinance prohibiting camping on City streets and public lands, one is sorely needed. It is unacceptable to have tent cities on city streets and on Capitol Hill. There needs to be a designated camping facility, with lockers and showers for people experiencing homelessness who aren't in shelters. It is not fair to businesses or residents in Salt Lake to let this continue. Please work to designate an area -- perhaps on the state fairgrounds, where camping can proceed in an orderly fashion. Thank you

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
4/18/2023 11:44	Steph Nagin 1/2	Yesterday's fire on A Street at 2nd Avenue	<p>Chris: I live in REDACTED. As I was returning home yesterday from a trip to Bountiful drive down from Capital Hill and turned left at 2nd Avenue. As I drove up that road, I saw that several vehicles ahead of mine had turned around and were driving back downhill. I looked up through the front window of my vehicle, and saw white smoke rising from what I presumed was a fire. A civilian in white shorts and a white top, was sort of dancing in the street — directing cars to turn around. Behind him was a fire engine. It quickly was clear that he was trying to be helpful inasmuch as “A Street” was blocked at 2nd Avenue, He evidently simply was trying to alert drivers to turn around, because the road ahead was blocked. There were no police anywhere in sight. I turned my vehicle around and inched back down 2nd Avenue, and saw a woman with a long stick with a small red cloth attached at the top, waiving her stick in a sort of uncoordinated warning. I turned right and observed to my left that vehicles were continuing to come up 2nd Avenue. Both were fire trucks. As I turned right, I observed a long line of cars and trucks, almost bumper-to-bunker stretching out to the entrance several block ahead, to City Creek! Additionally, private vehicles were continuing to drive down 3rd Avenue, apparently oblivious to and unaware of a complete traffic jam they would encounter. It took me 45 minutes of inching forward to finally get back to 2nd Avenue. There were absolutely no police anywhere in sight! The woman waiving her stick with the red handkerchief attach at the end, still was there on the sidewalk frivolously waiving her impromptu flag high in the air! When I finally exited onto North Temple, to extricate my vehicle from the huge traffic jam, private vehicles and trucks continued driving east from North Temple, and a number of them entered A Street oblivious to the traffic jam into which they were driving, which [with more vehicles still driving west, down 3rd Avenue] were contributing to an even more, and mire massive traffic jam! When I was finally able to turn north on State Street, a block away I saw a police vehicle parked on the east side of the road apparently dealing with a lady in a car parked ahead of that police car. I stopped to inform the policeman that a massive traffic jam was clogging all the roads from which I had just exited. I told him that a police officer urgently was needed to direct traffic on North Temple from entering into A Street, because fire trucks were preventing cars from traveling up A Street to 2nd Avenue. He told me he was “busy” and just walked away. [In other words he was oblivious ti and could care less about the massive traffic jam!] Clearly there was an evident failure of the fire department personnel at the scene of the fire, to advise the SLC police department that it's personnel urgently were needed to direct traffic from entering A Street from North Temple and to prevent drivers from traveling down from the North on 3rd Avenue. The police department evidently was unaware that a massive traffic has been caused by the fire department's trucks on A Street blocking Second Avenue.</p>
4/18/2023 11:44	Steph Nagin 2/2	CONTINUED!! Yesterday's fire on A Street at 2nd Avenue	<p>Yesterday's completely avoidable traffic jam indicated to me that there must have been a complete failure of prompt coordination between the fire department and the SLC police department. Common sense should have alerted both there essential departments to their respective needs to coordinate or communicate much more effectively. Chris, I do not know to whom in either the SLC fire or police departments I could explain this clearly avoidable snafu! Consequently, I am communicating to you with the hope you might be able to advise both these two government agencies or departments that they had botched or ignored communicating the situation promptly, which could have easily avoided the scenario I mentioned, above. We definitely need much more alacrity and much better contemporaneous communications between these two essential local governmental departments so that immediate efforts could have been undertaken to avoid what I described, above. I hope you will communicate my above-stated concerns to the appropriate agencies so that in the future, they expeditiously will communicate better in any future emergency situation. Steph Nagin</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
4/18/2023 14:46	Cindy Cromer	Loss of Housing/D3	<p>g Members of the City Council-I will be fortunate if one of you has time to read this message before your decision on the rezoning of 865 S 500 E tonight. There are so many reasons to deny the request: -Death by a Thousand Cuts as this neighborhood loses family-oriented housing, long-term residents, its elementary school, and the working-class occupants historically associated with it. -The analysis in the negative staff report written following an in-depth consideration of all of the relevant plans. -The introduction of an ADU which would displace the current commercial parking behind the housing, would fail to replace the type of housing lost, and ensure that the property remains a mixed use rental forever. -The positive recommendation from the Planning Commission was by TWO votes and led by the same Commissioner who brought you the recommendation for distribution uses in Northpoint. -The multiple shortcomings of public process which include the proposal of the ADU in a Work Session many months after the public hearing at the Planning Commission, contrary to State statute. (I am not an attorney, as you all know.) I have no idea what 6 of you are thinking about this proposal which captures the challenges that the Thriving team has documented for the Central City neighborhood....It turns the clock back to the 1980's when commercial zoning was the Holy Grail. It is the kind of thinking which got us where we are regarding housing, Death by a Thousand Cuts. That you are even considering this proposed loss of the housing we need is profoundly discouraging to me. Relentlessly,</p> <p>cindy c.</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
4/18/2023 14:50	Jan Hemming	Will you support the community of the U?	<p>Dan: Six years ago in 2017, the U of U announced plans to build a baseball stadium along Guardsman Way. The Yalecrest Neighborhood Council and Yalecrest residents opposed it. Thanks to Mayor Jackie Biskupski and Councilman Charlie Luke, the city stood tall and supported the community. (See attached news article.)</p> <p>Ballpark Plans Hit a Snag as City Refuses to Sell Land athleticbusiness.com Now in 2023, The U has once again proposed plans to build a \$35 million ballpark. Unless there is something new in the design or its impacts on Sunnyside Park as well as the neighborhood, Yalecrest remains opposed. It seems evident that the U will need city-owned property on Sunnyside Park from the existing soccer/lacrosse field, the baseball field and/or the soccer field on the corner of Sunnyside and Guardsman Way for the stadium. (See map below). Will you support a land give-away to the U or will you support those residents who supported and elected you? I believe you are aware that the eastside has the lowest amount of open space anywhere in the city. Ceding more land to the U is not in the city's interests nor the neighborhood's. See this map below. Most homes in Yalecrest are within one-half mile of Sunnyside Park and the neighborhood has the greatest vested interest in what's there. In 2017 the City Council adopted the East Bench Master Plan which is regarded as "the official plan of the city." It is a vision for how the community should look and feel. It supposed to guide land use policies. The plan recommended 6 guiding principles or initiatives, one of which was to "Support Expansion of the Salt Lake Sports Complex. (Page 106) If the new ballpark is built, those plans will be crushed.</p> <p>http://www.slcdocs.com/Planning/MasterPlansMaps/EBMP.pdf This Master Plan represents the collective work of 7 community councils, the mayor, the City Council, the planning department, the Planning Commission, Parks and Public Lands, Engineering, Community and Economic Development, the VA, and even the U. It's not an insignificant document, but it's being treated like one now. If the city sides with the U it will be further evidence that the city doesn't take it seriously and that community opinions are secondary or tertiary; essentially, that the U comes first. Look at this map and grasp the enormous physical impact the U has on District 6. With the ballpark, there are also issues associated with noise, parking and lights. You are keenly aware of how Yalecrest is impacted during football season by U of U fans. While baseball will attract far fewer crowds (1,200 seating) fans are very likely to park as close as they can to the stadium — which would be Yalecrest. Rice- Eccles Stadium already brings crowd noise, lights and hundreds of cars into our neighborhood.</p> <p>I would like to have a conversation at your earliest convenience. Best, Jan</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
4/18/2023 15:40	Doug Dansie	Additional height in the downtown zoning districts	<p>Comments from Doug Dansie Issue: Additional height and design controls in the Downtown zoning districts Position: I generally support the changes, particularly moving toward more design-based zoning, although in keeping with long-term policies of growing downtown south along State and Main Streets I would advocate additional height in D-2 more than GMU or D-3 zoning districts. (I enthusiastically support the IHC rezone proposal). Concern: There has long been a policy of protecting the views of the LDS temple when seen from I-15 and I-80 (there is similar policies for the Cathedral of the Madeline and the City/County Building, but they are not affected by this proposal and are not under economic pressure to be blocked). This proposal basically abandons this long-standing policy (The policy is why, in part, the height limits of GMU are what they presently are). In the long term, abandoning this policy seems rather short sighted since the LDS temple is the building most identified with SLC and is most commonly featured on the post card skyline photo (abandoning the policy is similar to proposing to surround Notre Dame with high-rises) While views of the temple should not necessarily be guaranteed from everywhere, the spires are still clearly visible when approaching downtown from the west on I-80 (and from the proposed MLB stadium) and can be seen from locations on I-15 when approaching from the north. Potential resolution: Leave GMU height as is, or at a minimum, include a criterion within the D-3 and GMU design controls that requires a finding that any additional height granted through the design review process will not block the general visibility of the LDS temple spires when viewed from I-15 or I-80. (A wall of buildings along I-15 blocking the view of downtown or the mountains in general should not be encouraged) Additional comment: The item that would affect downtown development the most, particularly the Rio Grande area, would be extending the University light rail line from Main Street to the intermodal hub. This action would effectively complete the downtown loop as envisioned in the original LRT feasibility studies of the 1990's. The central station area will continue to stagnate until more trains actually go there.</p>
4/18/2023 15:41	Darby Johnson	Fairpark meet	<p>Live in Fairpark..third generation..tired of construction..not one affordable single family home built..too much dust mud..increased truck traffic on 900 west shakes these homes greatly..thanx for 20 mph on 800 west..but noone cares..traffic off 600 north offramp is hvy and fast..the police 20mph lited sign does little to nothing..are drains under 900 west and north temple been cleaned out?..and then theres the druggie homeless...never ending...Darby Johnson</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
4/18/2023 15:41	John Phillip Davis 1/2	Downtown Building Heights Text Amendments- Comments Re Changes to FB-UN2	<p>Dear Councilmembers, I am writing in connection with the proposed downtown building height text amendments you are considering, specifically in reference to proposed changes to the FB-UN2 zone which I believe will result in the FB-UN2 zone being far less flexible for use in connection with infill projects. By way of background, certain building forms under the FB-UN2 form based zone require massing setbacks when used adjacent to other lower scaled zones. The intent here is to provide transitional scale and massing when FB-UN2 is used adjacent to lower scaled parcels. This allows for FB-UN2 to be used in areas where such transitional scale is desired, increasing the flexibility of the zone and its applicability in more locations and neighborhoods throughout the city. When FB-UN2 was originally enacted in connection with the comprehensive rezoning of the Central 9th area, these setbacks only came into effect when FB-UN2 was placed adjacent to FB-UN1, reflecting the contiguous form base zoning of this area, and providing transitional scale between FB-UN2 and FB-UN1. For reference, the setbacks required under FB-UN2 provide that for any height greater than 30', a 10' setback is required for every 10' in additional height, up to 50'. These setbacks provide transitional scale that is "baked into" the base zone. When FB-UN2 was proposed in connection with the rezone of the Trolley Square parking lot several years ago - notably the first use of the zone outside of Central 9th - a number of involved parties noted that the setbacks at the time were only triggered when zoned adjacent to FB-UN1, and not other similarly scaled zones. To address this, a text amendment to FB-UN2 was proposed and adopted that triggered setbacks when FB-UN2 is placed adjacent to any residential zone with a maximum standard height of 35' or less (which notably would include RMF-35 zoned properties - many of which bordered the Trolley Square south site). In view of these changes to setback requirements of FB-UN2, the rezone of the Trolley Square south lot to FB-UN2 was approved. As other parcels in the city have been rezoned to FB-UN2 in the past few years - including sites which border RMF-35 properties such as the Western Gardens parcel - the transitional scale associated with required setbacks of FB-UN2 has been a key point used to support its appropriateness by Planning and other land use decision makers. In reviewing the current building heights proposal, which include changes to FB-UN2, this setback trigger has been changed to only occur when FB-UN2 is adjacent to residential zoned parcels with a 30' maximum height. This will notably exclude setbacks from being triggered from many parcels where FB-UN2 has been applied recently that border parcels with a 35' maximum height such as RMF-35, which is used throughout East Central and Central City, areas where transitional scale is appropriate. With the above in mind, I strongly urge you to revise the proposed amendment to FB-UN2 to maintain the adjacent zone height trigger for setbacks as it currently standards - that is 35' -</p>
4/18/2023 15:41	John Phillip Davis 2/2	CONTINUED!! Downtown Building Heights Text Amendments- Comments Re Changes to FB-UN2	<p>rather than changing this trigger to 30'. Doing so increases the flexibility of FB-UN2 in terms of providing more effective transitional scale in more contexts, and preserves the intent of decision makers in multiple other prior rezonings involving FB-UN2 where the zone was placed adjacent to RMF-35 properties and approved in consideration of the associated setbacks. Thank you, Jack Davis</p>