

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
7/19/2023 10:39	Anonymous Constituent	Homeless in Liberty Park	<p>Why are the homeless allowed to camp and set up residence in Liberty Park? Allen Park is gated with security. Sugarhouse Park has police presence. However, the Liberty/Wells neighborhood along with the Ballpark neighborhood are neglected. Maybe you can close down another street. It's interesting that the City/County building is quickly cleared of homeless. I have tried contacting the mayors office and individual city council members. All of them assure me they are not in control or have the ability to resolve issues. Some try to blame the state legislatures for failure to enforce the laws within the city. But we have a police chief and district attorney and city government that have worked to defund the police, apologize to criminals and seek to tax those of us that actually contribute to the city. Rebranding the homeless as "housing adverse" or "unsheltered neighbors" doesn't really change the fact of the situation. The solution is very simple. You can't camp on the streets. Compassion is not allowing the homeless to camp in the hills, parks, sidewalks, in their cars and so forth. Enforce that law. The resources are available. They can choose to use the resources that we have more than abundantly offer. Or they will need to move along to a place that allows people to live a third world lifestyle. There is no reason to encourage or allow this behavior when the resources are there. It would be nice to be able to use the park and neighborhood without stepping over needles, fecal matter, have people screaming at the air or urinating on playground toys. The city picks and chooses the neighborhoods that get to host their friends. Why not move all of our unsheltered friends to the city/county building lot? This may serve as a reminder to the city and encourage leaders to solve the issue rather than redirect attention.</p>
7/19/2023 12:23	Susan Knight	Phone Call Request	<p>Susan Knight lives in the lower Aves and she would like to chat with Chris about a variety of things. She has a historic home and was thinking about making some changes to the use of the home and some of the challenges with that. She would also love to just talk with him and get to know him. She understands he is busy and is in no rush at all. She also does events and wants to let him know some of the things she is working on, business developments, and some of the challenges she faces.</p>
7/19/2023 16:23	Jeff Larsen	PLNPCM2022-01138 and PLNPCM2022-01139	<p>I have reviewed the request for the zoning map amendment and master plan amendment. I have read transcripts from the planning commission meeting where the plan was presented, and spoken to people who have opposed the plan, and also spoken to the applicant at length. I support the proposals for both items. Bottom line, Salt Lake City needs to add housing stock, and the potential to allow an unused parcel, in one of the most desirable areas of the city, to become a single family home makes this proposal both practical and desirable, and fits with objectives established in Plan Salt Lake and Growing SLC. There are challenges with this particular property that the owner will have to address as a development plan is created, but making this a buildable, legitimate "flag lot" will ultimately add to the neighborhood. The space is used primarily as a parking area now, and so the increase in traffic to access another single family home is not likely to be significant enough to outweigh the benefits. There is a flag lot, with a home on it, behind my own home in the nearby area (approximately 1300 E, 1400 S) that hasn't created negative impacts for my home or the surrounding properties, so the same can be achieved here, with the right development plan, and this is not our character for the neighborhood. Jeff Larsen - SLC Resident</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
7/19/2023 16:25	Andrew Magee	Public Utilities	<p>Hello, I am writing out of concern about my Water and Sewer bill. This may seem like a small issue to you, but to me it reflects an additional ~\$400 per year in unanticipated utility costs. Please allow me to briefly explain: I was a homeowner in Salt Lake City from 2017-2020. At the time my monthly Sewer bill was ~\$30/month. Now, after recently purchasing a home in May and talking to a customer service rep at Public Utilities, it appears that my monthly sewer bill will be approximately \$54/month through at least July 1st of 2024, until, apparently, the city can establish that my winter month water usage is low enough to justify a lower rate. And, the supposed over spend that I am signed up for over the next 12 months is non-refundable. Throw on top of that a substantial increase in garbage, storm water, and street light fees and suddenly I am paying approximately \$400/year more than just 3 years ago for "basic" services. Currently, without having used any water for any landscaping, my bill sits at \$109 for the month of July, compared to an average of \$67/month in 2017 when I was probably over watering a large yard and had multiple roommates. That's a 62% increase in costs over five years to service fewer people and do no landscaping compared to the same time 5 years ago. Could you please help me understand why costs have gone up so much and what we are doing to try and keep these costs under control? How do these cost increases reflect the city council's efforts to bolster affordable housing in Salt Lake City? Thank you kindly for your response. Best, Andrew</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
7/19/2023 16:26	Hal Crimmel	Opposed to Proposed Rezone of 1782 S 1600 E Zoning (PLNPCM2022-01138 & PLNPCM2022-01139)	<p>Dear City Council Members, My wife and I are writing to express our strong opposition to the proposed rezone of 1782 S 1600 E (PLNPCM2022-01138 & PLNPCM2022-01139). The current property owner is requesting amendments to the Sugar House Master Plan Future Land Use Map and the Zoning Map for the property at 1782 S 1600 E. We live at REDACTED, and have attended meetings, and have reviewed the 61 page Staff Report prepared by Kelsey Lindquist dated April 20, 2023. We have lived here in the neighborhood for 22 years and on this street for close to a decade. We are extremely opposed to changing the zoning from R1/7000 Single Family Residential to SR-3 (Special Development Pattern Residential) Zoning District with a corresponding Master Plan change, because if the zoning amendment is approved then there could be at least four--and up to six rental units on a property the city currently considers to be one lot: 1572 E. Blaine Avenue in Salt Lake City. Currently, there is a duplex on the property. New rules allow for an ADU to be built on that property. Then, if the rezone is approved, creating a new lot, that property could also house a duplex and an ADU or a single-family home and an ADU. The potential for this much higher density development on what currently is one lot is completely out of character for the neighborhood. Further, it's possible there could be as many as 18 different people living on this current lot (3+3 in one duplex; 3+3 in a new duplex; 3 in a new ADU and 3 in a second, new ADU. Per SLC parking regulations, each occupant could park one vehicle on the street--that would mean a potential total of 18 trucks or cars attached to the one existing lot. That is going to negatively impact the existing neighbors. We support neighborhoods that are not 100% single family homes, but our block already has several duplexes on it and on the next block to the east, the three dwellings closest to us are all duplexes. Adding yet more units to an already densely part of the neighborhood only benefits the property owner--not any of the neighbors. Further, were this rezone to be approved, it sets a dangerous precedent. What if the other neighbors on the street, who have large lots, sell and the new owner(s) claim that two lots could be created out of one R-1 lot because, well, why not? The current owner of 1572 E Blaine seems intent on negatively impacting the quality of life for the seven neighbors whose property abuts the lot in question. No one wants the rezone. Zoning exists to preserve the stability of neighborhoods. The city council should consider whether the desire of one property owner, who lives in Olympus Cove, to rezone a lot historically zoned as one lot should be should receive special privileges, as it will open the door to potentially create a small rental village at the expense of those living in owner-occupied homes, who are united in their opposition to the rezone. The subject property is an illegal lot created through a non-approved subdivision. The proposed master plan amendment is not consistent with adopted City policies, and the proposed zoning amendment does not meet the applicable factors for consideration. We request that the city council follow the recommendations of the Salt Lake City planning staff and not approve the proposed amendments to the Sugar House Master Plan. Sincerely, Hal Crimmel Ingrid Weinbauer</p>
7/19/2023 17:01	Harris Sondak	Frustrations With Construction Closing Roads	<p>"Hello, Councilman. My name is Sondak. I live at REDACTED. I've never lived anywhere where developers get to disrupt traffic as much as they do in Salt Lake City. It would seem to me that they ought to keep their machines on their own ground and not encroach on the public right-of-way on the streets. And I'm wondering if this is a legislative issue, an executive issue, or maybe one preemptive by the state. But, I'd like to call to your attention that I find it really frustrating how often lanes are narrowed to accommodate private developers' construction projects. Anyway, that's my message. And, uh, I look forward to being informed about how this has come to be and if there's anything that the city can offer to change the situation. Thank you.</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
7/20/2023 9:53	Steve McCutchan	Proposal to Expedite Completion of Northpoint Small Area Plan and Permit Development by XCEL Development	<p>I reviewed the Northpoint Small Area Plan (the Plan) and found that it should be revised. This is based upon the Plan's reliance on old data from Salt Lake City International Airport (SLCIA) and the City's Airport Flight Path Protection Overlay District (AFPP), the part of the City's Zoning Ordinance that restricts development in proximity to the Airport. I also believe the AFPP should be revised as it is also out of date. The reason I believe they are out of date is the information included in SLCIA's Master Plan 2022 and SLCIA's agreement with XCEL Development in February 2021 to not contest our efforts to annex to North Salt Lake and develop a residential community. SLCIA received an Avigation Easement over XCEL Development's property. I prepared a detailed letter (Attached) that outlines my concerns and makes recommendations for a quick resolution. The draft letter is addressed to Nick Norris and Krissy Gilmore (City Planning Staff) but can be revised to be addressed to whomever you believe is the best person to consider the letter's contents. Dave and I are looking for your advice as to how to proceed. In the letter, I propose to prepare a Draft Addendum to the Plan that will solely revise the sections where I have concerns leaving most of the Plan as is. Also, I propose to prepare a revised Draft AFPP that follows FAA Part 150 airport land use compatibility guidelines. There are examples at major airports near metropolitan areas around the West. XCEL Development would pay my expenses. I would revise the drafts under City Planning Staff's direction. Let me know if there is anything else you need. My letter is attached. Steve</p>
7/20/2023 12:45	Keiko Jones	general comment on July 18	<p>At the July 18 city council formal meeting, there was a speaker who spoke during the "general comment" period. He didn't feel confident about speaking in English and saying what he wanted to say in 2 minutes, so he used AI to convey his opinion. After he finished, one of the city council members stated that the comment was about CIP therefore it should have been made during the "public hearing" period specifically for the topic and that the general comment period was not the right place. The council member was right. But I just want to say I didn't get the point of such a comment. If the councilman was telling that to the city staff, he should know it doesn't have anything to do with the staff. Nobody assigns speakers to a certain slot. If he was telling that to the speaker, the speaker had simply made a mistake when he registered online to speak. Was it worth pointing it out in public? (Or maybe the staff moved the speaker to the general comment period due to the technical difficulty at the end of the CIP public hearing? No big deal, especially since it was considered, right?) I can imagine someone shy, maybe it was his first time to speak in such a setting, yet had felt strongly enough about something to speak up. If I were in his shoes, I would have felt mortified being told publicly that I spoke at the wrong place. I hope the incident won't discourage that person from ever speaking again. Council members, please create an environment where residents feel comfortable expressing themselves instead of making them feel ashamed that they made a mistake. Thank you for reading. Keiko Jones</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
7/21/2023 15:44	Rae Duckworth	900 south 300 west	<p>Dear SLC City Council, We hope this email finds you well. I am an active community member and CAG (Community Activist Group) member in Salt Lake City. Recently, proposals were shared to the city council regarding "Fleet Block". Fleet Block is better known as The Salt Lake City Police Brutality Murals and it is of historical value in our neighborhood. The discussions surrounding police violence are vital to our community and our neighborhood's growth. Demolishing these murals will not erase police violence or the conversations needed around police reform, police violence and police murder. It is concerning that there was not a mention of a community center, resource center or a permanent gathering center as this space is currently operating that way. We feel it to be a priority when discussing the future and development of this area. Salt Lake City currently has a high demand for resources that stretch from; shelter, food, water, harm reduction, mental and physical health. These types of resources should be required in this block now that this intersection is equally accessible from the East and West sides of the valley. We encourage you to support your community and their current successful efforts at keeping this space safe for mourning and grieving, outreach, collecting and sharing ideas, but most importantly getting to know our neighbors. Below are some reference ideas for your next discussion. COUNTY HEALTH RANKINGS - TAKE ACTION</p> <p>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3709358/ street civics - reducing crime CJC healthcare.utah.edu https://www.safetyreimagined.org/community-of-practice/when-not-to-send-the-police-a-conversation-with-los-angeles-police-chief-michel-moore CAHOOTS COMMUNITY JUSTICE CENTER hammer & hope magazine Sincerely, Your Constituent -- Rae Duckworth Operating Chairperson of Black Lives Matter Utah Chapter</p>
7/21/2023 15:46	Sean McDermot	Fleet Block	<p>Dear SLC City Council, We hope this email finds you well. I am an active community member and CAG (Community Activist Group) member in Salt Lake City. Recently, proposals were shared to the city council regarding "Fleet Block". Fleet Block is better known as The Salt Lake City Police Brutality Murals and it is of historical value in our neighborhood. The discussions surrounding police violence are vital to our community and our neighborhood's growth. Demolishing these murals will not erase police violence or the conversations needed around police reform, police violence and police murder. It is concerning that there was not a mention of a community center, resource center or a permanent gathering center as this space is currently operating that way. We feel it to be a priority when discussing the future and development of this area. Salt Lake City currently has a high demand for resources that stretch from; shelter, food, water, harm reduction, mental and physical health. These types of resources should be required in this block now that this intersection is equally accessible from the East and West sides of the valley. We encourage you to support your community and their current successful efforts at keeping this space safe for mourning and grieving, outreach, collecting and sharing ideas, but most importantly getting to know our neighbors. Below are some reference ideas for your next discussion. COUNTY HEALTH RANKINGS - TAKE ACTION</p> <p>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3709358/ street civics - reducing crime CJC healthcare.utah.edu https://www.safetyreimagined.org/community-of-practice/when-not-to-send-the-police-a-conversation-with-los-angeles-police-chief-michel-moore CAHOOTS COMMUNITY JUSTICE CENTER hammer & hope magazine Sincerely, Sean McDermott</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
7/21/2023 15:50	Jackie Daniels-Brown	Murals	<p>Dear SLC City Council, We hope this email finds you well. I am an active community member and CAG (Community Activist Group) member in Salt Lake City. Recently, proposals were shared to the city council regarding "Fleet Block". Fleet Block is better known as The Salt Lake City Police Brutality Murals and it is of historical value in our neighborhood. The discussions surrounding police violence are vital to our community and our neighborhood's growth. Demolishing these murals will not erase police violence or the conversations needed around police reform, police violence and police murder. It is concerning that there was not a mention of a community center, resource center or a permanent gathering center as this space is currently operating that way. We feel it to be a priority when discussing the future and development of this area. Salt Lake City currently has a high demand for resources that stretch from; shelter, food, water, harm reduction, mental and physical health. These types of resources should be required in this block now that this intersection is equally accessible from the East and West sides of the valley. We encourage you to support your community and their current successful efforts at keeping this space safe for mourning and grieving, outreach, collecting and sharing ideas, but most importantly getting to know our neighbors. Below are some reference ideas for your next discussion. COUNTY HEALTH RANKINGS - TAKE ACTION</p> <p>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3709358/ street civics - reducing crime CJC healthcare.utah.edu https://www.safetyreimagined.org/community-of-practice/when-not-to-send-the-police-a-conversation-with-los-angeles-police-chief-michel-moore CAHOOTS COMMUNITY JUSTICE CENTER hammer & hope magazine Sincerely, Your Constituent</p>
7/21/2023 15:52	Jennifer Jackson	Community Space Needed	<p>Dear SLC City Council, We hope this email finds you well. I am an active community member and CAG (Community Activist Group) member in Salt Lake City. Recently, proposals were shared to the city council regarding "Fleet Block". Fleet Block is better known as The Salt Lake City Police Brutality Murals and it is of historical value in our neighborhood. The discussions surrounding police violence are vital to our community and our neighborhood's growth. Demolishing these murals will not erase police violence or the conversations needed around police reform, police violence and police murder. It is concerning that there was not a mention of a community center, resource center or a permanent gathering center as this space is currently operating that way. We feel it to be a priority when discussing the future and development of this area. Salt Lake City currently has a high demand for resources that stretch from; shelter, food, water, harm reduction, mental and physical health. These types of resources should be required in this block now that this intersection is equally accessible from the East and West sides of the valley. We encourage you to support your community and their current successful efforts at keeping this space safe for mourning and grieving, outreach, collecting and sharing ideas, but most importantly getting to know our neighbors. Below are some reference ideas for your next discussion. COUNTY HEALTH RANKINGS - TAKE ACTION</p> <p>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3709358/ street civics - reducing crime CJC healthcare.utah.edu https://www.safetyreimagined.org/community-of-practice/when-not-to-send-the-police-a-conversation-with-los-angeles-police-chief-michel-moore CAHOOTS COMMUNITY JUSTICE CENTER hammer & hope magazine Sincerely, Your Constituent, Jennifer Jackson</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
7/25/2023 9:48	Matthew Morriss	Firework ban in Glendale - D2	<p>Councilman Puy, After the fourth of July and now Pioneer Day, I wanted to contact you regarding the use of fireworks in Glendale. I've noticed that other neighborhoods have "fireworks banned" signs. The avenues. 9th and 9th and yalecrest. Notably, the wealthier neighborhoods in town. Given the fact that Glendale already has some of the worst air quality in the city and state, restricting fireworks seems like a natural fit to reduce smoke during these summer holidays, reduce noise pollution, and reduce the chance of a fire breaking out. This last point is what I worry about most as we have such hot and dry weather every summer. I hope you'll please consider options to make Glendale firework free. Matthew -- - Matthew Morriss, PhD</p>
7/25/2023 10:14	Bernie Hart	When something is working embrace it	<p>Wayne, Your observations may be correct in that much of what I do is centered around pointing out what I see as flaws in our efforts to help the homeless. Nothing seems to ever change and when I offer alternatives, no one seems to listen and I get upset and start throwing rocks...in hopes of creating ripples and waves that might be the precursor to real change. Is it throwing rocks when I remind service providers and elected officials that the only time they can be assured that a large number of the struggling and troubled homeless in our community are not causing problems for local business, off selling or buying drugs and away from their tents is when.... they are engaged in a productive and healing activity. You are all invited to join the troubled and struggling homeless who are not causing problems between 9:45 - 1045 on Mon. Wed. Thur and Sat in front of (ironically) SLCPD. Bernie</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
7/26/2023 15:44	Vicki Gorman	PLNPCM 2022-01083 and PLNPCM 2022-01139	<p>Dear Council Member Mano, I am writing again to share my strong opposition to changing the R 1/7000 (Single Family Residential) to SR-3 zoning (Special Development Pattern Residential) for the 1782 South 1600 East parcel. My husband and I have resided on our property for 16 years. Our property line to west diagonally overlooks Mr. Arrasi's planned development site. I attended and spoke at the April 26, 2023 Planning Commission meeting and was extremely thankful when they voted to deny the applicant's request for rezoning. This vote was in solidarity with the Sugarhouse Community Council recommendation to uphold the existing R 1/7000 zoning for this property. I also watched the Salt Lake City Council working session and attended the July 18th meeting. I appreciated the thoughtful comments shared by the members. However, there was a comment made by Ana Valdemoros (District 4) regarding the applicant's stated desire to build a family home on this property which is a tradition shared by many cultures wherein multiple family homes exist on a single property. To be clear, there is no evidence that this is Mr. Arrasi's primary motive considering he currently lives in Olympus Cove. Furthermore, the property owners choose not to live on site but instead to rent out the entire duplex. If owning a family home and residing in this neighborhood were the primary objectives, it seems the applicant, his mother, sister and other relatives could simply reside in the existing duplex and no rezoning would be necessary. I also feel very strongly that granting this rezoning application sets a wholly undesirable precedent of rezoning based on a single property owner who does not reside in the neighborhood to possibly build multiple structures on a lot that does not have a driveway or setbacks that meet the requirements of SR-3. As noted in several other neighbors' comments, the dimensions of the existing alley make fire department access to the property questionable/unfeasible and conflicts with the surrounding neighbors' privacy and existing character of the neighborhood. In conjunction with my neighbors who have submitted comments and attended the April 26th Planning Commission Meeting and the Salt Lake City Council Meeting on July 18, 2023, I oppose the application for rezoning based on lot access that does not meet fire safety codes, defiance of existing standards that support the character and historic nature of the neighborhood as well as overcrowded land use concerns. I urge you to reject the SR-3 rezoning application and to please support the existing R 1/7000 designation based on the information you have received here and from the surrounding single family home residents as well as the Sugarhouse and Planning Committee Councils' votes to deny this rezoning application. Thank you in advance for your time and attention to my comment. Sincerely, Victoria Gorman 1798 South 1600 East</p>
7/28/2023 19:06	Julia Reid	Against sanctioned camping	<p>I object to the idea of supporting sanctioned camping with \$50,000 grants. I feel this is a waste of money and simply delays a good solution to the homeless problem. I have not seen anything to indicate that there would be sufficient resources to deal with the sanitation and safety issues, considering that the city fails to care adequately for the homeless presently strewn about our streets. A camp of homeless people, many with mental health and drug problems, would likely have violence and crime problems simply due to crowding. Introducing a camp into any neighborhood is in my opinion a mistake. I feel strongly about this issue as I have relatives in San Francisco and have witnessed how homelessness has literally destroyed that city. Sincerely, Julia Reid</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
7/31/2023 16:55	Eddie Quijano	Traffic Control in Rose Park	Victoria, I love what the city did for 500 North in Fair Park! The speed bumps and the small roundabout is perfect. This was a great example of managing the traffic in this area. Please do what you can to improve the traffic on American Beauty between 600 -1000 North and on 12th west between 600 and 1000. Please don't wait for someone to get hurt or worse. Please! Sent from my iPad Eddie Quijano
7/31/2023 16:56	Sharla Humphrey	999 Cyclists	July 29, 2023 Good Morning, What is being done to monitor the conduct of irresponsible citizens in the weekly 999 bicycle rides through SLC? Our granddaughter is a nursing student and was caught in the horrific mob of cyclists on her return home on the night of July 27, 2023. She waited 15 minutes to get through an intersection. The lights turned for her to proceed and she was restrained by the mob of cyclists. They banged on her car, called her names, video taped her, and were unruly. If this is the norm, it needs to be controlled. She was terrorized and traumatized by this mob of cyclists. This group is doing unlawful acts and harming innocent, vulnerable citizens. There have been complaints since the inception of 999 and lives lost. This cannot be ignored. What is the SLC police department doing to protect the citizens? It has mushroomed out of control. For the record, the concern has been voiced. Our family is very concerned about our granddaughter's safety. We are concerned about how this has affected the safety of the citizens. Please respond. Sincerely, Sharla Humphrey
7/31/2023 17:00	Claudia Rasmussen	Let's preserve the SLC Police Brutality Murals - Fleet Block	Dear SLC City Council, We hope this email finds you well. I am an active community member and CAG (Community Activist Group) member in Salt Lake City. Recently, proposals were shared to the city council regarding "Fleet Block". Fleet Block is better known as The Salt Lake City Police Brutality Murals and it is of historical value in our neighborhood. The discussions surrounding police violence are vital to our community and our neighborhood's growth. Demolishing these murals will not erase police violence or the conversations needed around police reform, police violence and police murder. It is concerning that there was not a mention of a community center, resource center or a permanent gathering center as this space is currently operating that way. We feel it to be a priority when discussing the future and development of this area. Salt Lake City currently has a high demand for resources that stretch from; shelter, food, water, harm reduction, mental and physical health. These types of resources should be required in this block now that this intersection is equally accessible from the East and West sides of the valley. We encourage you to support your community and their current successful efforts at keeping this space safe for mourning and grieving, outreach, collecting and sharing ideas, but most importantly getting to know our neighbors. Sincerely, Claudia Rasmussen
8/1/2023 8:59	Craig N Schriber	Concerns with Zoning and Plan Amendments 1782 S. 1600 E. Voting AUG 8	Dear Salt Lake City Council Members, As a homeowner, living in District 7, and in proximity to the parcel located at 1782 S 1600 E, I urge the Council to deny the property owner's request. This request for amendments to the Sugar House Master Plan Future Land Use Map and the Zoning Map for the property at 1782 S 1600 E has already been reviewed and denied by zoning and staff. Please follow the recommendation of the staff and do not allow this change! Thank you, Craig Craig Schriber

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
8/1/2023 9:06	Dean Thomas	Upcoming Hearing on the Rezone Requests for 1782 S 1600 E at the July 18, 2023 Sugar House City Council Meeting	<p>We very strongly oppose the proposed rezone from R1-7000 to SR-3 for the property located at 1782 S 1600 E. We live east of this property at REDACTED. I have lived in this home about 50 years, I bought from my mother over 24 years ago. When Mr. Cates remodeled the house back in 80's there were issues on the west side of our house. I recall that was resolved by Mr. Cates promising my mom that he was going to build a beautiful garage in his back yard. He stated nothing but cars would be in the garage, and it would be just for the renters of the duplex. He also said he would remove the snow on the alley way, and this would stop the amount of cars parking on the street. I agree with the staff report from April 20,2023 on many points. I believe this project is under the spot zoning if any. Under the Existing Land Use Designation The majority of the residential land uses in Sugar House consist of single-family dwellings on lots typically between 5,000 and 8,000 square feet. These low-density residential areas are interspersed with duplexes and a few multiple-family dwellings. It is desirable to preserve and protect the dominant, single-family character of these neighborhoods by holding the density between five and ten (5-10) dwelling units per acre. Examples of zoning districts that support this density range are R-1/7000, R- 1/5000, R-2 and RMF-30. Sugar House Plan Policies Support and enhance the dominant, single-family character of the existing low-density residential neighborhoods. Maintain the unique character of older, predominantly low-density neighborhoods. Prohibit the expansion of non-residential land uses into areas of primarily low-density dwelling units. Plan Salt Lake includes initiatives and goals to increase housing units. With that said, the proposed amendments include developing an illegally subdivided parcel in an existing neighborhood. The increase in density will promote a dwelling unit on the property that functions as a rear yard with challenging access. Generally, these initiatives and goals do not support the proposed amendments. This lot is so very small with a very challenging access, and per the goals and policy statement, we agree that this should be denied. While part of the goals of Salt Lake City, is to increase AFFORDABLE housing, we feel it is not in the best interest of the community. For one property owner's request to amend all sorts of zoning plans, licensing, city policies and county rulings to squeeze a housing project which will add, per the request housing for one single family. Also, this block has 5 duplex units existing. And 3 more duplex units on the block east of this block. Thank you Council members for all the work you do for our city. Jan & Dean Thomas</p>
8/1/2023 9:09	Peter DeWeerd	1600 E 1782 S - Please do not approve plan amendments - D/7	<p>Dear Sarah, We live at REDACTED and have attended meetings, and have reviewed the 61 page Staff Report prepared by Kelsey Lindquist dated April 20, 2023. We have lived here since 2009. We are proud members of the greater SLC community, we work hard, and we pay our taxes. In regards to: PLNPCM2022-01138 &PLNPCM2022-01139 Map and Plan Amendment for 1782 S 1600 E: The subject property is an illegal lot created through a non-approved subdivision . The proposed master plan amendment is not consistent with adopted City policies, and the proposed zoning amendment does not meet the applicable factors for consideration. I request that the city council follow the recommendations of the planning staff and not approve the above mentioned amendments. Sincerely, Pete DeWeerd , Dina DeWeerd,</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
8/1/2023 9:12	William Brass	Welcome	<p>Good morning, Welcome and congratulations. As 43 year residents of Salt Lake City and 34 year residents of Sugar House, We look forward to your representation of the Sugar House area. You have inherited challenging issues to the area and we appreciate your concern for the home owners of the area while we experience exponential growth and traffic in our established neighborhoods and thoroughfares. We look forward to meeting you at the community council meeting in August. Regards, Bill and Susan Brass</p>
8/1/2023 9:26	Vicki Gorman	1872 S 1600 E - PLNCPM 2022-01083 and PLNPCM 2022-01139 - D/7	<p>Dear Council Member Young, Thank you very much for recently visiting the property in question. Your commitment to listen to Mr. Simon Harrison and tour the proposed property development site are greatly appreciated! I hope your firsthand experience will be able to further convey and support the concerns of our neighborhood's shared goals to oppose the rezoning application. I am writing to share my strong opposition to changing the R 1/7000 (Single Family Residential) to SR-3 zoning (Special Development Pattern Residential) for the 1782 South 1600 East parcel. My husband and I have resided on our property for 16 years. Our property line to west diagonally overlooks Mr. Arrasi's planned development site. I attended and spoke at the April 26, 2023 Planning Commission meeting and was extremely thankful when they voted to deny the applicant's request for rezoning. This vote was in solidarity with the Sugarhouse Community Council recommendation to uphold the existing R 1/7000 zoning for this property. I also watched the Salt Lake City Council working session and attended the July 18th meeting. I appreciated the thoughtful comments shared by the members. However, there was a comment made by Ana Valdemoros (District 4) regarding the applicant's stated desire to build a family home on this property which is a tradition shared by many cultures wherein multiple family homes exist on a single property. To be clear, there is no evidence that this is Mr. Arrasi's primary motive considering he currently lives in Olympus Cove. Furthermore, the property owners choose not to live on site but instead to rent out the entire duplex. If owning a family home and residing in this neighborhood were the primary objectives, it seems the applicant, his mother, sister and other relatives could simply reside in the existing duplex and no rezoning would be necessary. I also feel very strongly that granting this rezoning application sets a wholly undesirable precedent of rezoning based on a single property owner who does not reside in the neighborhood to possibly build multiple structures on a lot that does not have a driveway or setbacks that meet the requirements of SR-3. As noted in several other neighbors' comments, the dimensions of the existing alley make fire department access to the property questionable/unfeasible and conflicts with the surrounding neighbors' privacy and existing character of the neighborhood. In conjunction with my neighbors who have submitted comments and attended the April 26th Planning Commission Meeting and the Salt Lake City Council Meeting on July 18, 2023, I oppose the application for rezoning based on lot access that does not meet fire safety codes, defiance of existing standards that support the character and historic nature of the neighborhood as well as overcrowded land use concerns. I urge you to reject the SR-3 rezoning application and to please support the existing R 1/7000 designation based on the information you have received here and from the surrounding single family home residents as well as the Sugarhouse and Planning Committee Councils' votes to deny this rezoning application. Thank you in advance for your time and attention to my comment. Sincerely, Victoria Gorman</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
8/2/2023 14:04	Rachel Allen	Concerns about bikes at Sugarhouse Park	<p>Hello! My name is Rachel Allen. My husband and I live at REDACTED. My husband is a Fire Captain for Salt Lake City. We have a concern. We walk Sugarhouse park almost every day. In the summer and winter. Year round. We have for years! We know the friendly faces who go at the same time as us, morning or evening. We love this park. But this summer, it seems we are about to be run over by bikes every day! We walk on the trail down from 1700 South along the park and 1-80 freeway and then we walk under the street and through the Hallow. It seems there are many new bike owners who have discovered electric bikes. This is great, and I encourage all exercise, but it has become a problem. These bike riders don't know bike etiquette or rules. Most often they act like we are in the wrong for walking on the path. Maybe we are? I'm not sure. Just this summer alone I have been bumped by a bike at least 5 times. I try to walk to the extreme side. But this doesn't seem to help. The experienced bikers have no problem going around us, or ringing their bell, or shouting "to the left." But the majority of bike riders at the park seem inexperienced. Once we walk around the actual park, there are clearly designated lanes for cars, walking and bikes. May I suggest either dividing the lanes on the outside of the park to have one for walking, and one for bikes. This is what is often found on boardwalks along the beach. I would like to share the path, but I think all the new people with electric bikes need some direction. Please, walk these paths for yourselves, you will see what I am taking about. Thank you. Rachel Allen</p>
8/2/2023 14:33	Andra Ghent	FW: (EXTERNAL) Homelessness in Liberty Park	<p>Hi Darin and Andrew, Just read the piece on homelessness in Liberty Park in the SLtrib after coming back from a run in Liberty Park. I appreciate you engaging on this issue. FWIW, I think the city's response strikes the right balance between making sure we have safe outdoor recreation opportunities and helping our unsheltered residents find longer term solutions. Indeed, more citations on a person's record ends up making it harder to find housing down the road and seems unlikely to be a deterrent to camping. As you are surely aware, the rise in unsheltered homelessness seems to be a nationwide problem (see Figure 5 on page 7 of attached), not a Salt Lake City problem. I'm not sure our citizens know this though and there might be some unfair attribution bias to SLC. I use the park almost daily. I've never had any issues with my safety there, even in the early hours of the morning when I sometimes have to run alone. The cars on the way to the park are always the bigger threat to me. A couple times I left belongings on the side of the track and they disappeared quickly but that's obviously on me – someone clearly needed that wind breaker more than I needed it 😊 I'm *thrilled* that the public restrooms in Liberty Park are open once again. For sure, we could use more resources to keep them clean but I'd rather have access to something and the hygiene issues spill out to the rest of the park when we don't have public bathrooms. I know a lot of older runners that have to run on treadmills just because of lack of open public bathrooms so having open bathrooms really expands who can use the parks. I'm happy people are aware that it is much better to camp off the bike lanes on 9th. Blocked bike lanes are a safety issue. I've never encountered an issue with camping on the track inside the park. Thanks again for your important work on this issue. -- Andra Ghent Professor of Finance and Ivory-Boyer Chair in Real Estate Academic Director, Ivory-Boyer Real Estate Center University of Utah</p>
8/3/2023 13:35	Suzanne Stensaas	Proposed limit on drive thrus	<p>Because of air quality and CO2 emissions and trying to cut back on fossil fuels I support NO drive thrus. Those grandfathered in should not be transferred with the sale of property or business. No new ones. Pharmacies can bring the drugs out to the car as was done during covid for everything from groceries to library books. I would only support drive thrus for banks.</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
8/4/2023 9:41	Peter Wright	Ivory Homes Application for a Planned Development at 675 North F Street	<p>Hi Rachel, In March of 2023 you were kind enough to meet with us to review Avenues residents' concerns with Ivory's proposals for 675 North F Street. At that time you stated a willingness to meet with us again once Ivory had submitted new plans. They have now done so with an application for a planned development that grossly overbuilds this property with zero public benefit. Sentiment in the Avenues is extremely strong on this issue where residents feel they are not being listened to and that this project is being railroaded through. It did not help that last night both Ivory and the Planning Division, at the last minute, pulled out of a scheduled Greater Avenues Community Council meeting, leaving the many residents that turned up angry and frustrated. It is our belief that this is something the mayor would want to be aware of. The level of emotion is such that this issue will likely cost Mayor Mendenhall thousands of votes from Avenues residents, particularly as her opponent has openly declared his opposition to Ivory's overly aggressive proposals. I would like to ask if you would be so kind as to grant us a further meeting to discuss this with you, it would be in everyone's best interests to not allow this to fester. Council Member Wharton has indicated that he remains opposed to Ivory's plans and would appreciate being involved in the meeting. We can be available to meet anytime at your convenience. Best Regards, Peter Wright</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
8/4/2023 9:48	Larry Perkins	PLNPCM2023-00656 675 North F Street	<p>As the Treasurer of the Capitol Park HOA and as a person who has lived in close proximity to 675 North F Street for nearly 20 years, I beg of you to Please, Please, Please honor and exercise the "Planner" portion of your own Job Title as well as of the Department of our City Government that you are part of! Because a central purpose of "Planning" is (1) to ensure that infrastructure is scaled to a certain level of use and anticipated use and then (2) to permit only the intensity of use that is compatible with what has been planned -- And Built. Ivory's proposed project on the above mentioned parcel has not dropped out of the sky into a vacuum. Rather, one of the two "frontages" of their parcel/project is located on Capitol Park Avenue. And Capitol Park Avenue is a privately owned and privately maintained street that was purposely built for Foothill Zoning and not for high density zoning. Capitol Park Avenue (which is 30 feet wide from curb to curb) is MUCH narrower than typical Salt Lake City Streets. It was built to accommodate either a church building and its (not daily used) associated parking lot or else up to 11 residences (that was before ADU's became a prominent part of our City's evolving housing policy but even considering that change, the street would need to handle no more than 22 households at the maximum). Ivory's Project asks for MULTIPLE variances targeted to place the vehicles of over 40 households onto that narrow, private street. However, vehicles are only one aspect of the problems Ivory seems to want to create and then walk away from. Ivory has allowed Nearly no space for guest parking associated with their 40+ households. And their 24 foot wide "double driveway" that is the sole vehicular access for all of their residential structures save one certainly provides no place to receive or store the piles of snow that will be generated by plowing that L-shaped access drive in the wintertime. IT IS AN EXTREMELY SAFE BET to say that whoever plows Ivory's private roadway will want to place their snow onto Capitol Park Drive. I know that Salt Lake City has a housing shortage and it is fair for all City residents and neighborhoods to cooperate in addressing that issue. The Re-zoning that the City Council approved a few months ago is a Major change for our neighborhood -- and for our infrastructure. Please do not go overboard on that burden by allowing Ivory's proposed design with its Obvious Problems referenced above (wwaay more vehicles than anticipated; guest parking forced to attempt to use our private roadway; and piles of plowed snow to be argued about or sued over). Ivory's requested variances create actual on-the-ground problems for us neighbors ON TOP OF those we must accept as a result of the Newly Approved Zoning. Thank you, Larry Perkins</p>
8/4/2023 9:52	Jen Oscarson	Wasatch School Closing	<p>Hello Representative Wharton, My name is Jen Oscarson and I live at 1104 3rd Ave. Our children have gone and do go to Wasatch Elementary and as of last night it is officially going to be on the further study list for closures with a vote as early as November. The School Board mentioned that the City may be dictating some of these closures and not working with the School District to development and maintain the schools. That said I am very worried about this closure. That said can a few of us from Wasatch meet with you to discuss the City plans for the Avenues-walk through the school closure guideline G-5 and see what can be done to preserve this important school in our community? Thank you for your representation and hopefully support. Kindest regards, Jen Oscarson</p>
8/7/2023 8:12	James Ogilvie	Capital improvements	<p>Willl any of the proposed improvements require recurring financial support? How will this affect following annual budgets?</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
8/7/2023 16:20	Maha Barrani	CIP	My name is Maha. I'm calling because I'm interested in the CIP proposal in the green house in liberty park and jordan park. I think it is a good idea and should keep continue funding them. Thank you and I do not need a call back. bye
8/7/2023 16:43	Lynne Olson	Support for Sugar House Drive-Through Text Amendment	SLC Council Members: I support the proposal to prohibit inclusion of drive-through access to future developments in the CSHBD zoning districts. The existing drive-through facilities confuse drivers and contribute to traffic congestion in the district. The drive-through at Chick-Fil-A near 1300 East and the two near 900 East/2100 South —Walgreen's and McDonalds—make both walking and driving in their vicinity dangerous. Both of these locations attract their heaviest business during busy traffic periods, causing cars to back up across adjacent driveways and sidewalks leading to other businesses. I think Sugar House's reputation has suffered as a result. I urge you to approve the Drive-Through Text Amendment. Respectfully,
8/8/2023 9:15	Cathy King	Liberty-Jordan Park Greenhouse Grants Application ID: 418194	To the Honorable Salt Lake City Council Members, We would like to comment on the CIP grant proposal for greenhouses at Liberty Park and Jordan Park. As community members and longtime active members and officers of the Utah Native Plant Society, the Wasatch Rock Garden Society, the North American Rock Garden Society and Save Our Canyons, we are committed to the use of native, drought tolerant and water-wise plants in Salt Lake City gardens. The greenhouses are the perfect opportunity for Salt Lake City to grow and use these water-wise plants in the city plantings, to be the leader and example to its citizens. In our continually warming climate, change needs to be made quickly. You, as the decision-makers, need to be forward thinking. Many species of drought tolerant and water-wise plants are difficult for gardeners to find to purchase but the city could distribute these plants and help make them more available, especially to low income homeowners. There are, of course, many other benefits. The historic greenhouse at Liberty Park should be restored to show how important this historic park is. Now is the time to take control of Liberty Park, to invest in this most important central park of Salt Lake City. Those workers who are currently working in the greenhouse deserve decent and safe working conditions. The greenhouse at Jordan Park will serve the community on the west side of the city which is only fair. That requires no explanation. And it would increase the capacity to grow more water-wise plants to be used in the city gardens. This is an opportunity for the Salt Lake City Council to make a decision that has a long term positive effect for the benefit of its citizens. Please choose to vote in favor of the Liberty-Jordan Park Greenhouse Grants Application. We support revitalization of the Liberty Park historic greenhouse. Respectfully, Cathy and Bill King

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
8/8/2023 9:18	Steve Starr 1/2	Northpoint Small Area Plan	<p>Dear Members of the City Council, I hope this letter finds you in good health and high spirits. I am writing as a concerned resident of the Northpoint Small Area Plan to express my growing worries about the direction our community is taking due to the unrestrained development that has taken place over the past few years. As a member of this neighborhood for 20 years, I have seen firsthand how this uncontrolled expansion is negatively impacting our way of life and safety. Firstly, I must highlight the significant consequences that have arisen due to the rampant growth in our area. With the continuous influx of construction projects and new developments, we have witnessed the erosion of the unique charm that once defined our neighborhood. Green spaces and local landmarks have disappeared, replaced by faceless structures that do not harmonize with the existing character of our community. This degradation of our environment has led to a loss of identity, lower property values, the safety of ourselves and our families, and leaving many of us feeling disconnected from the place we once proudly called home. Moreover, the burden of increased traffic congestion has taken a toll on our daily lives. The influx of commercial establishments has overwhelmed our infrastructure, leaving us residents facing difficulties commuting to work, accessing essential services, and even jeopardizing the safety of pedestrians and cyclists. Our streets have become hazardous due to speeding oversized construction vehicles and inadequate road maintenance, putting the lives of our small community residents at risk. Furthermore, it is disheartening to witness how our concerns have been overlooked by the City Council's decisions to halt any further growth and development in our area. While we understand the importance of controlled growth, this decision has left us in a precarious situation. The sudden halt in the decision for future development has led to stagnation. The residents who wanted to leave and that were under contract to sell their property, which would have given them an opportunity to have a better life, are left out here dealing with the chaos that you, the City Council approved. We now get to live with being burdened with all the construction and development, the large construction vehicles that race down our rural two-lane road exceeding the posted speed limit, at times forcing us to swerve to miss being hit by them. The past decisions that were made to allow the current development have negatively impacted our property values and decreased any potential for us to sell in the future. I implore the City Council to reevaluate their stance on development in our area and consider adopting a more balanced approach that incorporates the well-being and interests of the existing residents. We are the ones left living out here with the mess you have already created.</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
8/8/2023 9:18	Steve Starr 2/2	CONTINUED! Northpoint Small Area Plan	<p>The City Council wants to hold up progress in an area that is already being developed with buildings I have personally heard them say vocal and in text messages that they want to see developers build something other than huge warehouses. How can you tell one developer that they can't build warehouse-type buildings, while a 300+ acre development is currently underway for the exact same building type that you are refusing? I encourage all of you on the City Council to visit our area for a few days and see for yourselves the headache and struggle that we the residents have to deal with on a daily basis, then ask yourselves, if you were given an opportunity to sell your property to a developer and move somewhere else and not have to deal with what is happening in our area for foreseeable future. I can almost guarantee that if you were in fact dealing with what we are dealing with you would want out as well. You are not protecting anyone out here from developers ruining our way of life, in fact, you are doing the exact opposite of this, you are forcing us to stay and deal with your poor decisions regarding the development already approved. Stop standing in the way of an area that is clearly going to be developed and let us move on with our lives and not have to suffer in our area that is already ruined. There is nothing you can do to preserve what we once had out here and there is no saving it.</p> <p>As a concerned citizen of this area, I stand ready to work alongside the City Council and other relevant stakeholders to find a viable solution that will benefit all members of our community. Town hall meetings and open dialogues will foster trust and understanding between residents and decision-makers, ultimately leading to more informed and equitable decisions. In conclusion, I urge the City Council to recognize the urgency of our concerns and take swift action to rectify the detrimental effects of development in our area. I also urge City Council members to reach out to the actual residents living in the area for their thoughts and wishes regarding the changes happening, instead of calling on volunteers and other spokespersons to speak on behalf of this matter to meet City Council members' agendas. We are the ones living out here and our opinions and thoughts should have more weight than the anti-development citizen living in the avenues of Salt Lake City! Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to witnessing positive changes that will serve us in our small community. Sincerely, Steve L. Starr</p>
8/8/2023 13:36	Bill Davis	CIP application Liberty Wells greenhouses	<p>Dear City Council members I would like to submit a personal note in favor of this proposal. The Liberty Wells CC has also submitted a letter in support but would like to emphasize that I am speaking not in any official capacity. Best regards Bill Davis SLC, Utah</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
8/8/2023 13:44	Wade Olsen	Sugar House Drive-Through Text Amendment	<p>After review of the proposed text amendment, Dee's disagrees with staff's recommendations to prohibit future drive-through uses. Dee's has been doing business in Sugar House for many years. From my grandfather's restaurants to our new offices on Wilmington Avenue, Dee's is glad to be associated with other businesses that currently call Sugar House their trade area. Over the years, Sugar House has been built and rebuilt, but among other contributors, Interstate 80 and the I-15 connection, make Sugar House become one of the most sought-after neighborhoods in the city. Dee's supports better public transit and has pushed for the S-Line expansion, however, Sugar House is attractive to many due to easy vehicular freeway access. Sugar House attracts employers, locals and world visitors due to shopping, hospitality, recreation and restaurants. While the CSHBD Purpose Statement says, "the purpose of the CSHBD Sugar House Business District is to provide a walkable community with a transit orient, mixed use town center that can support a twenty-four (24) hour population," residents and visitors to Sugar House are still overwhelmingly dependent on vehicular use. Staff's Memorandum, dated November 9, 2022 has good insights and Dee's agrees with the majority of the content, however, Dee's provides the following for consideration and discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keeping drive-throughs and the CSHBD Purpose Statement are not wholly opposing views. • In the absence of drive-through options, businesses will look to drive-up or quick-serve options. These options increase the parking requirements for the area and can cause issues similar to stacking. • COVID showed the need for businesses to have alternate sales options. • The stacking for Sugar House Chick-fil-a is not indicative of most drive-throughs. A single data point should not lead to an, "all or nothing" policy that is difficult to reverse in the future. • As land prices increase, drive-throughs tend to disappear. Prohibiting drive-throughs is an artificial market change that may lead to unintended consequences. • If drive-throughs are prohibited, tax revenue may be delayed in perpetuity for the current drive-through parcels. The current locations will become more valuable, postponing natural redevelopment. While not the easiest process, drive-through operators, city officials, developers and residents can create new and upgraded requirements for new high and low demand drive-through sites. Dee's encourages the Sugar House Chamber and the Sugar House Community Council to oppose staff recommendations and keep drive-through options available. Thank you, Wade Olsen President, Dee's, Inc.
8/8/2023 13:45	David Alkire	Sugar House Drive-Throughs	<p>This amendment would require developers to get a variance to have a drive-through in CSHBD1 and CSHBD2. We do want banks in the neighborhood, and they seem to require drive-through serv ice these days. But there are good and bad places for these facilities, and good and bad ways to organize them. So I agree that it should not be a permitted use in CSHBD1 and CSHBD2. David Alkire</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
8/8/2023 12:55	Jan Hemming 1/2	Concern and Opposition to CIP Grant	<p>City Council representatives: Tonight you will hold a second public hearing on CIP grants and I wanted to comment on an "unfinished project" number 8318048 — Miller Park ADA Access. I would like to be there in person, but am currently out of state on vacation with limited Internet access, so I hope this message reaches you. The Yalecrest Neighborhood Council has been keenly engaged in this grant since 2016 when it was originally submitted by constituent applicant James Webster and funded in 2017. We favor the grant, but we do not favor the current intended uses for the grant money for the following reasons: 1. The original and primary purpose for the grant — as stated by applicant James Webster — was to make the lower creekside trail safe (see photo). Originally Parks (as it was then called) supported that purpose and increased the grant allocation substantially to cover the upgrade. Since that early approval, any work on the lower creekside trail has been eliminated from grant consideration. 2. In violation of your CIP grant process, Jim has never had a meaningful discussion with Public Lands about the intent and purpose of his grant or why the request to improve the lower creekside trail was subsequently removed. Here is Jim's official statement: "I was never consulted on the scope or the cost estimate of the CIP grant application I originally submitted. Between appearing before the CIP board before the end of the year to present my original modest plan - which was required in those days - and a letter I received in the mail the following year saying the grant had been awarded \$425,000, I had no discussions with anyone about increasing the funding or the scope. This was all done without my knowledge by what was then called Parks & Public Lands." 3. Over the years, hundreds of Yalecrest residents have signed petitions organized by attorney Brad Parker asking for reinstatement of the lower creekside trail. We ask the Council to listen and respect the opinions of those who live next to this urban gem. There is widespread support for Jim's original CIP grant purpose of making the lower creekside trail safer. 4. In 2014 the city dismantled all the railings and structure that protected the trail from the stream and made it safe. Now the city claims the trail is unsafe but refuses to acknowledge that it contributed to this condition. 5. When Minnie Miller donated the 9 acre property to the city on behalf of her late husband Charles to create the Miller Bird Refuge and Nature Park she specifically asked that the park be a preserve for birds and used for the enjoyment of all, but especially children — which included access to the creek from adjacent trails. In reality, the creek is primarily accessed on the east side — because the west side slopes — artificially created in 2014 from a mammoth reconstruction project — are too steep. 6. Through careful word-smithing and misinformation, PL has never accurately represented Jim's proposal including a public survey conducted in February-March, 2023 which never mentioned his project. As such, the survey is invalid. This error —</p>
8/8/2023 12:55	Jan Hemming 2/2	CONTINUED!! Concern and Opposition to CIP Grant	<p>"In FY 2018-2019, a constituent submitted a Capital Improvement Project" — which introduces PL's public survey results — is just one of many that can be found in their official documents. 7. Another exaggeration and falsehood in PL's summary of Miller Park: It was recently reconstructed to bring a section of degraded riparian habitat back to a healthy ecosystem with natural function. In truth: The variety and size of the bird population has severely declined, the irrigation system doesn't work, the park's beautiful natural canopy that was home to owls has been removed and destroyed, the trails are not maintained, the eastside trail installed in 2014 has a steep, 20%+ grade slope. 8. PL has cited engineering studies to validate their decisions but the city never discussed the real reasons with those firms behind why the historic 1930's walls might be in jeopardy: It was due to the city's own mismanagement of a new trail system installed in 2014 on the east side that was poorly constructed and failed to support the walls at their base. We know this to be true because we spoke directly with those engineering firms. They acknowledged they were never told about this. Rather, they were instructed to concentrate on "load management" from trees above the wall that are actually older than the walls themselves, as well as improvements residents made to their backyards. The footings in the walls are failing. (See photo below) 9. The title of this grant application "Miller Park ADA access" is a complete misnomer. Yes, Jim Webster added some ADA elements to his application but admitted there were tertiary goals and almost an after thought. The only practical place they could be applied is the western entryway to the park on Bonneview Drive. That's a simple fix. A conversation with another city department has already confirmed that they are installing ADA access so money from this grant is not needed for that. 10. The park is in sad decline and neglect. 1,000 trees were removed in 2014 to supposedly improve the park's health after the Chevron oil spill in 2010— despite the fact that soil and water samples showed NO oil contamination at that time. Bulldozers blew open the streambed from 5 feet to 20 creating steep slopes on the westside resulting in severe soil erosion. 80% of the so-called "pool and drop" system installed on the streambed has failed. New trees were just planted in October and this past spring, but lack of proper watering oversight by PL, has rendered most of them dead. In summary, the park does need improvements, but not the ones proposed by PL. The public survey included responses from 48 people who did not list their zip code — even though that information was requested. The respondents could have been from anywhere. Considering that 41 residents from the 84108 zip code in Yalecrest responded — that effectively means these unknown survey-takers have a greater say in the future of the park than the residents who live there. Please take these problems and concerns into consideration when evaluating this CIP grant. Respectfully, Janet (Jan) Hemming Chair Yalecrest Neighborhood Council On behalf of the Council</p>