ENVIRONMENTAL RE-EVALUATION DOCUMENTATION

PROJECT TITLE
Sugar House Streetcar Project Environmental Assessment Re-Evaluation for Station Changes

CURRENT, APPROVED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS:
Title: Finding of No Significant Impact for the Sugar House Environmental Assessment Date: February 14, 2011

Type and Date of Last Federal Action: FONSI, February 2011

Title: Sugar House Streetcar Project Environmental Assessment Date: November 2010

IS THE PROJECT CURRENTLY UNDER DESIGN OR CONSTRUCTION?

REASON FOR RE-EVALUATION
The station platform locations are changing from the locations proposed in the Environmental Assessment (EA). The changes are shown in Attachment A, Sugar House Streetcar Project Proposed Station Plan Changes, dated 12/16/11. The reason for the platform changes is to accommodate the results of a community visioning process that included UTA, the Redevelopment Agency of Salt Lake City (SLC RDA), Salt Lake City, South Salt Lake City, the Parley’s Rails Trails and Tunnels Coalition (PRATT), community members, developers, and a consultant team (CitiVenture Associates and Ronald A. Straka). The community visioning was conducted to support future land use plans and create a mixed-use corridor that integrates transit and various modes of pedestrian circulation with urban design and redevelopment to encourage transit ridership and economic development in the Sugar House Streetcar corridor. The results of the community visioning are shown in Attachment B, Sugar House Corridor Recommendations. In total, there will be one or more changes to seven stations. The changes include moving one station to avoid the acquisition of a building; utilizing a wider area of the UTA right-of-way (ROW) at one station; incorporating side platforms at five stations, rather than center platforms; and placing platforms closer to areas of redevelopment along the ROW at two stations. The specific station changes are discussed further under the Description of Project Changes heading.

COMMUNITY INPUT
Three community visioning workshops, conducted by CitiVenture, Ronald A. Straka, SLC RDA, Salt Lake City, South Salt Lake City, and UTA, were held on May 12, 2011, August 25, 2011, and July 20, 2011. The first two workshops were community open houses, and the third workshop was a developers’ forum. Invitations for the community open houses were sent to all property owners located within one block of the project ROW. In addition, a neighborhood meeting between UTA; Salt Lake City; and local residents and business owners who anticipate a platform on the east side of 700 East was held on November 4, 2011 to discuss the location of the station platform adjacent to 700 East. Additional information on the community visioning and public involvement is contained in Attachment C, Sugar House Streetcar Community Visioning. The Project design changes have been presented to both the Salt Lake City Council and the South Salt Lake City Council.

Sugar House Station Change Re-evaluation
Completed by UTA
The SLC RDA, Salt Lake City, South Salt Lake City, and UTA also maintain the Sugar House Streetcar website (http://shstreetcar.com/). This website includes an Open City Hall Forum in which anyone can post comments regarding the Project. The Re-Evaluation will be posted on the Streetcar website and also on UTA’s website (www.rideuta.com) for public review. Readers can post comments on either website. UTA will review and address comments, as applicable, in a timely manner. In addition to the website postings, UTA will be sending letters giving notification to all property owners located directly adjacent to the ROW of the upcoming project and on how to review and comment on the design changes and the Re-Evaluation using the Streetcar website or UTA’s website. Mass e-mails containing similar information will be sent to all those on the project mailing list, as well as those who have commented or attended an open house or workshop regarding the Project and the EA and have provided an e-mail address.

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT CHANGES OR NEW INFORMATION
The station changes are shown in Attachment A, Sugar House Streetcar Project Proposed Station Plan Changes, dated 12/16/11. The station changes are as follows:

1) The Central Pointe Station, shown on drawing SH01 of Attachment A, is moving approximately 105 feet to the south from the location proposed in the EA to avoid impacting the building at 193 West 2100 South.

2) The State Street Station, shown on drawing SH03 of Attachment A, is moving approximately 400 feet to the west, which moves the station away from directly abutting State Street to the western half of the block, adjacent to South Salt Lake’s planned Market Station Redevelopment parcel. The City of South Salt Lake has purchased the property since the completion of the EA. The concept for the site has undergone a redesign which includes transit access at a point more centrally located on the block. The name of the development is most often referred to as Central Pointe Place; however, Market Station is still used for the redevelopment area shown in Figure 3-2 in the EA. The Market Station development is discussed in the EA on page 3-5.

3) The 300 East Station, shown on drawing SH04 of Attachment A, is moving 135 feet to the east, placing the station on the east side of 300 East. This location is more centrally located within the mixed use future land use of the redevelopment area that extends from 300 East to 500 East, as described in the EA on page 3-5, and is closer to properties with greater development potential. The platform was formerly located on the west side of 300 East. In addition, the new platform will be a side platform rather than a center platform, as shown in the EA. The side platform helps to keep the track alignment relatively straight and allows for integration of the platform into the adjacent uses.

4) The 500 East Station, shown on drawing SH04 of Attachment A, is changing from one center platform to two side platforms. The side platforms help to keep the track alignment relatively straight and allow for integration of the platforms into adjacent uses.

5) The 700 East Station, shown on drawing SH05 of Attachment A, is moving approximately 200 feet to the west, placing the station on the west side of 700 East. The platform was formerly located on the east side of 700 East. The west side of 700 East provides greater corridor width and, therefore, more room for the station than is available on the east side of 700 East. The original location of the platform in the EA was in a 50 foot wide section of the ROW; the new ROW location on the west side of 700 East is over 60 feet wide. Sugarhouse Barbeque Company is also located adjacent to the north side of the ROW in the original location of the 700 East platform. Moving the station to
the west side of 700 East reduces, but does not eliminate, the encroachment conflict adjacent to Sugar House Barbeque Company. In addition, the new platform will be a side platform rather than a center platform, as shown in the EA. The side platform helps to keep the track alignment relatively straight and allows for integration of the platform into the adjacent uses.

6) The 900 East Station, shown on drawing SH06 of Attachment A, is changing from one center platform to one side platform. The side platform helps to keep the track alignment relatively straight and allows for integration of the platform into adjacent uses.

7) The McClelland Station, shown on drawing SH07 of Attachment A, is changing from one center platform to two side platforms. The side platforms help to keep the track alignment relatively straight and allow for integration of the platforms into adjacent uses.

**HAVE ANY NEW OR REVISED LAWS OR REGULATIONS BEEN ISSUED SINCE APPROVAL OF THE LAST ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT THAT AFFECTS THIS PROJECT?** If yes, please explain.

☑ NO  ☐ YES
WILL THE NEW INFORMATION HAVE THE POTENTIAL TO CAUSE A CHANGE IN THE DETERMINATION OF IMPACTS FROM WHAT WAS DESCRIBED IN THE ORIGINAL ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT FOR ANY OF THE AREAS LISTED BELOW? For each impact category, please indicate whether there will be a change in impacts. For all categories with a change, continue to the table at the end of this worksheet and provide detailed descriptions of the impacts as initially disclosed, new impacts and a discussion of the changes. The change in impact may be beneficial or adverse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Economics</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Effects: Acquisitions, Displacements, &amp; Relocations</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Environment</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Resources &amp; Aesthetics</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise &amp; Vibration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystems (Vegetation &amp; Wildlife)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources and Floodplains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy &amp; Natural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology &amp; Soils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Properties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parklands &amp; Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary and Cumulative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Will the changed conditions or new information result in revised documentation or determination under the following federal regulations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Endangered Species Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnuson-Stevens Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmland Preservation Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 404-Clean Water Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain Management Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 106 National Historic Preservation Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Relocation Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4(f) Lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6(f) Lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild &amp; Scenic Rivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Barriers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sole Source Aquifer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Scenic Byways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you checked yes to any of these, describe how the changes impact compliance and any actions needed to ensure compliance of the new project:

Will these changes or new information likely result in substantial public controversy?

☐ Yes  ☒ No

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS: The proposed project modification of moving the station platforms of the Sugar House Streetcar for the Central Pointe Station, the State Street Station, the 300 East Station, and the 700 East Station, and of changing platform configurations at 500 East, 900 East, and McClelland Street, will not result in any significant environmental impacts. The Finding of No Significant Impact for the project remains valid.

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A: Sugar House Streetcar Project Proposed Station Plan Changes
Attachment B: Sugar House Corridor Recommendations
Attachment C: Sugar House Streetcar Community Visioning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Category</th>
<th>Impacts as Initially Disclosed in the EA and FONSI</th>
<th>New Impacts from Project Changes</th>
<th>Impact Assessment and Changes to Mitigation Commitments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Pointe Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Economics</td>
<td>No change in this category associated with the Central Pointe Station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Effects: Acquisitions,</td>
<td>The property impacts of the Project are discussed in Section 3.3.3.3 on page 3-30 of the EA. The initial design of the Central Pointe Station platform required the acquisition of one building at 193 West 2100 South.</td>
<td>The modified design avoids the building at 193 West 2100 South. A strip of the property at 193 West 2100 South may still need to be acquired.</td>
<td>The new design of Central Pointe Station avoids acquisition of one building at 193 West 2100 South; a strip take of property may still be required at the same address. Mitigation commitments to affected landowners, as specified in the EA, will not change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacements, &amp; Relocations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Environment</td>
<td>The social environment impacts of the Project are discussed in Section 3.2.3.3 on page 3-23 of the EA. The station construction at the western terminus, as described in the EA, could affect one building at 193 West 2100 South, which is part of the K2 Church.</td>
<td>Moving the Central Pointe Station to the south avoids the building at 193 West 2100 South. A strip of the property at 193 West 2100 South may still need to be acquired.</td>
<td>The new design will not adversely impact the building associated with the K2 Church. As specified in the EA, UTA would work closely with the property owner to ensure that any impacts are compensated consistent with applicable regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Category</td>
<td>Impacts as Initially Disclosed in the EA and FONSI</td>
<td>New Impacts from Project Changes</td>
<td>Impact Assessment and Changes to Mitigation Commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Resources &amp; Aesthetics</td>
<td>No change in this category associated with the Central Pointe Station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Street Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Economics</td>
<td>The land use impacts of the Project are discussed in Section 3.1.3.3 on page 3-12 of the EA. As stated in the EA, the Project is consistent with the City’s future land-use plan and with plans for the Market Station. The State Street station would support the Market Station development.</td>
<td>The modified design places the State Street platform in the western half of the block between State Street and Main Street. Placing the station platform closer to the Market Station will provide riders easier access to available amenities.</td>
<td>The new design provides transit riders focused access to the planned redevelopment area at Market Station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Effects: Acquisitions, Displacements, &amp; Relocations</td>
<td>No change in this category associated with the State Street Station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Environment</td>
<td>No change in this category associated with the State Street Station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Resources &amp; Aesthetics</td>
<td>No change in this category associated with the State Street Station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Category</td>
<td>Impacts as Initially Disclosed in the EA and FONSI</td>
<td>New Impacts from Project Changes</td>
<td>Impact Assessment and Changes to Mitigation Commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>300 East Station</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Economics</td>
<td>The land use impacts of the Project are discussed in Section 3.1.3.3 on page 3-12 of the EA. A streetcar is consistent with the planned use near 300 East.</td>
<td>The modified design places the 300 East platform on the east side of 300 East. This location, the block between 300 East and 400 East, contains no residential uses adjacent to the ROW. As described in the EA, South Salt Lake has redevelopment plans along the ROW between 300 East and 500 East. The new location offers greater transit oriented development opportunities with large single ownership properties adjacent to the ROW.</td>
<td>The new design provides transit riders closer access to the planned redevelopment area east of 300 East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Effects: Acquisitions, Displacement, &amp; Relocations</td>
<td>No change in this category associated with the 300 East Station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Environment</td>
<td>No change in this category associated with the 300 East Station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Category</td>
<td>Impacts as Initially Disclosed in the EA and FONSI</td>
<td>New Impacts from Project Changes</td>
<td>Impact Assessment and Changes to Mitigation Commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Resources &amp; Aesthetics</strong></td>
<td>Visual impacts of the Project are discussed in Section 3.10.3.3 on page 3-124 of the EA. This station is located in Unit 2 of the Visual Assessment Units in the EA. As specified in the EA, some residents might feel that the addition of the streetcar and related elements adversely affects long-range views from their properties.</td>
<td>The modified design places the 300 East platform on the east side of 300 East away from residents that may have found the station elements intrusive.</td>
<td>The new design reduces the visual impacts from lighting at the station for residents in Unit 2 of the Visual Assessment Units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>500 East Station</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use and Economics</strong></td>
<td>The land use impacts of the Project are discussed in Section 3.1.3.3 on page 3-12 of the EA. A streetcar line is consistent with the planned uses near 500 East and would benefit development around the station.</td>
<td>The side platform allows for incorporation of the platform into adjacent uses, such as the PRATT trail on the north side of the ROW and the planned redevelopment area.</td>
<td>The new design places the 500 East platform closer to the trail and a planned redevelopment area adjacent to the ROW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Effects: Acquisitions, Displacement, &amp; Relocations</strong></td>
<td>No change in this category associated with the 500 East Station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Category</td>
<td>Impacts as Initially Disclosed in the EA and FONSI</td>
<td>New Impacts from Project Changes</td>
<td>Impact Assessment and Changes to Mitigation Commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Environment</td>
<td>No change in this category associated with the 500 East Station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Resources &amp; Aesthetics</td>
<td>No change in this category associated with the 500 East Station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 East Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Economics</td>
<td>The land use impacts of the Project are discussed in Section 3.1.3.3 of the EA. As stated on page 3-13, the ROW east of 700 East is planned for residential development. Construction of the streetcar would not adversely affect the land-use pattern.</td>
<td>The modified design places the 700 East platform on the west side of 700 East in a section of the ROW greater than 60-feet wide, providing more room for activities associated with the platform than a 50-foot section would provide. The block to the west of 700 East contains no single-family or multi-family units adjacent to the ROW. This area is zoned commercial and planned for mixed uses. The platform move supports the zoning and planned land use for the area. Some residents and property owners adjacent to the ROW east of 700 East would prefer to have the station in the original location on the east side of 700 East for easier access from their homes and businesses.</td>
<td>The new design provides a greater space for the platform and associated future redevelopment activities. The new location also provides transit riders easier access to the commercial businesses on the west side of 700 East. Some affected property owners prefer the original east side station platform for easier access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Category</td>
<td>Impacts as Initially Disclosed in the EA and FONSI</td>
<td>New Impacts from Project Changes</td>
<td>Impact Assessment and Changes to Mitigation Commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Effects: Acquisitions, Displacements, &amp; Relocations</td>
<td>The property effects of the Project are discussed in Section 3.3.3.3 on page 3-30 of the EA, which states the access into Sugarhouse Barbeque would be limited to its current northern driveway. Other uses of the ROW in this area, such as parking and access, would be reduced or removed.</td>
<td>The modified design places the 700 East platform on the west side of 700 East in a section of the ROW greater than 60-feet wide away from the Sugarhouse Barbeque Company.</td>
<td>The new design alleviates but does not remove the encroachment conflict adjacent to Sugarhouse Barbeque Company. Access to Sugarhouse Barbeque Company via the ROW in this location would still be reduced or eliminated, as specified in the EA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Environment</td>
<td>No change in this category associated with the 700 East Station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Resources &amp; Aesthetics</td>
<td>Visual impacts of the Project are discussed in Section 3.10.3.3 on page 3-125 of the EA. This station is located in Unit 3 of the Visual Assessment Units in the EA. As specified in the EA, some residents adjacent to the ROW in Unit 3 may feel that the project is intrusive, especially if they can see elements such as station lighting and amenities.</td>
<td>The modified design places the 700 East platform on the west side of 700 East away from residents that may have found station accessories intrusive.</td>
<td>The new design reduces the visual impacts from station lighting for residents in Unit 3 of the Visual Assessment Units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Category</td>
<td>Impacts as Initially Disclosed in the EA and FONSI</td>
<td>New Impacts from Project Changes</td>
<td>Impact Assessment and Changes to Mitigation Commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900 East Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use and Economics</strong></td>
<td>The land use impacts of the Project are discussed in Section 3.1.3.3 on page 3-12 of the EA. Construction of a streetcar line would not adversely affect the commercial and mixed-uses in this land-use pattern.</td>
<td>The side platform allows for incorporation of the platform into adjacent uses, such as the PRATT trail on the north side of the ROW and the planned redevelopment area.</td>
<td>The new design places the 900 East platform closer to the trail and the planned redevelopment area and Business District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Effects: Acquisitions, Displacement, &amp; Relocations</strong></td>
<td>No change in this category associated with the 900 East Station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Environment</strong></td>
<td>No change in this category associated with the 900 East Station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Resources &amp; Aesthetics</strong></td>
<td>No change in this category associated with the 900 East Station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Category</td>
<td>Impacts as Initially Disclosed in the EA and FONSI</td>
<td>New Impacts from Project Changes</td>
<td>Impact Assessment and Changes to Mitigation Commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McClelland Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use and Economics</strong></td>
<td>The land use impacts of the Project are discussed in Section 3.1.3.3 on page 3-12 of the EA. Construction of a streetcar line would not adversely affect the commercial and mixed-uses in this land-use pattern.</td>
<td>The side platform allows for incorporation of the platform into adjacent uses, such as the PRATT trail on the north side of the ROW and the planned redevelopment area.</td>
<td>The new design places the McClelland platform closer to the trail and the planned redevelopment area and Business District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Effects: Acquisitions, Displacement, &amp; Relocations</strong></td>
<td>No change in this category associated with the McClelland Station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Environment</strong></td>
<td>No change in this category associated with the McClelland Station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Resources &amp; Aesthetics</strong></td>
<td>No change in this category associated with the McClelland Station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Sugar House Streetcar Project Proposed Station Plan Changes
ATTACHMENT B
Sugar House Corridor Recommendations
TRANSIT CORRIDOR RECOMMENDATIONS
SUGARHOUSE STREETCAR STUDY

Presented to UTA by:
SALT LAKE CITY
CITY of SOUTH SALT LAKE

Prepared by:
CitiVenture Associates, LLC
Ronald A. Straka, FAIA, Urban Design Consultant
MEMORANDUM

TO: UTA, K. Doane, J. Webb, R. Jackson, M. Sibul
CC: SSL S. Hauri, D. Pay/ SLC E. Butterfield, DJ Baxter
FROM: Ronald A. Straka, FAIA
RE: Sugar House Streetcar: Recommendations to UTA
DATE: 15 September, 2011

The objective of this memo and accompanying drawings is to establish consensus between the consultant team, city staffs of South Salt Lake City and Salt Lake City, PRATT, and community outreach efforts. This memo is intended to be used by UTA to direct consultant teams as they prepare construction documents for the Sugar House Streetcar line.

The recommendations within this memo are deeply rooted in the vision and urban design principles which help define and implement the vision.

The overarching vision is to leverage “the streetcar” as the catalyst that will transform the corridor into a memorable place for all of the various users--an inviting safe, multi-use, sustainable, green, linear open space that advances regional and local goals. The vision integrates transit and various modes of pedestrian circulation with urban design and development objectives that encourage ridership of the streetcar line and economic development activities in the corridor.

These Urban Design principles integrate transit and development to:
  • activate the corridor
  • promote accessibility and connectivity
  • foster diversity and character of districts/ places
  • support sustainability
  • create a quality public realm
  • recommend phasing for cost effectiveness

Due to the physical constraints of the corridor and the budget, it is paramount that all parties involved work in a cooperative and collaborative manner to make the vision a reality. Functionality, efficiency, and safety are of prime importance. Efficient use of space matters with every square foot having a potential development value.
As noted, some issues have not been resolved due to a galaxy of factors that will require further investigation and testing.

We greatly appreciate the time, effort, and comments that have given to this endeavor. The hope is that this project will move forward with a “how can we” attitude. This project can be successful for everyone involved and something to build on for the future as this corridor reinvents itself.
SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

The following outlines our recommendations to UTA for Phase I of the Sugar House Streetcar Study. Explanation of the logic or reasons for these recommendations follows in the main document and accompanying graphics.

I. THE CORRIDOR:
   Recommendations encompass property line to property line, including the UTA-owned corridor, additional easements adjacent to the corridor and permitted and unauthorized property uses in the corridor.

II. TRANSIT ALIGNMENT
   Build grant-outlined Baseline Design, with the following changes:
   A. South Salt Lake (SSL): Change alignment to a on-street alignment from State to Main, and Utopia to Central Pointe TRAX Station
   B. Salt Lake City (SLC): Extension to Highland Drive and a station at Highland

III. STATION LOCATIONS
   Build grant-funded Baseline Design, with the following changes:
   A. Relocate two stations:
      i. Move the 700 E station from the east side of the street to the west side
      ii. Move the 300 E station from the west side of the street to the east side
   B. Reorient end of line at Central Pointe TRAX Station to be east/west on Utopia St.
   C. Locate State St. Station location to integrate into new Market Station development
   D. Add a new station at Main & Utopia
   E. Plan to accommodate future station locations (as needed)

IV. STATION PLATFORMS
   Build grant-funded Baseline Design, with the following changes:
   A. Side platforms except at the 500 E and McClelland stations, which require center platforms to accommodate siding track for passing streetcars
   B. Embedded track at all stations (concrete, paver, or rubberized)
   C. Station platforms designed as distinctive places for many uses, not only transit
   D. Add light fixtures to Overhead Catenary System (OCS) pole at height of +/-30'

V. THE CORRIDOR
   Corridor width varies, but is typically 66’ wide, including:
   A. North edge open space is +/-23’-24’ and includes Parley’s Trail
B. Central transit corridor is +/- 26’-27’ with double track streetcar line
C. South Edge Open Space is +/- 16’ with neighborhood Park Blocks and utility poles

VI. CORRIDOR ELEMENTS
A. Overhead Catenary System (OCS) and Utility Poles should be integrated into the design
B. TPPS location selected to be unobtrusive on corridor design
C. Lighting to enhance safety and character without impacting neighbors
D. Intersection Improvements to accommodate multimodal travel

VII. PHASING & UPGRADES
A. Corridor Edge Treatments and improvements
B. Station Improvements
C. Intersection Improvements
D. Underground utility poles
E. Parley’s Trail and Pathway Improvements
F. Branding, Signage and Wayfinding to define the place and provide essential information are a recommended addition.
G. Artistic and Historic Interpretive Elements to enhance the character and experience of the corridor are a recommended addition.
H. Bikeshare Program as added travel mode is a recommended addition.
SUGAR HOUSE STREETCAR CORRIDOR RECOMMENDATIONS

ASSUMPTIONS:

UTA TRANSIT:
- Streetcar envelope for double track is 26-27’ W x 15’ H (contained ballast both sides)
- Streetcar envelope for single track is 13’-6”W x 15’ H (contained ballast, one side) and/or
  17’ W x 15’ H with sloped grade on outside (no curb to contain ballast)
- Station Platforms are 8’ W x 66’ L for side platform and 11’ W x 66’ L for center platform
- Overhead Catenary System (OCS Poles) are spaced at +/-100 – 150’ apart

Parley’s TRAIL: Class I trail 10’ wide with asphalt paving and gravel shoulder

I. THE CORRIDOR:
- The former Union Pacific railroad corridor that UTA purchased varies in width from 45’ – 50’ – 66’
- Additional easements exist adjacent to the UTA corridor in various locations, thereby increasing the physical and usable width of the corridor.
- The width, ownership, and restrictions on these easements need to be verified to implement recommendations in these adjacent areas.

CORRIDOR BOUNDARIES
- The corridor is defined by its physical edges which determine the shape, size, scale, and the physical volume of space in the corridor.
- The usable street car corridor width shall extend from the private property line on the north to the private property line on the south.
- The entire width of the corridor should be cleared, grubbed, rough graded, and treated in Phase I while providing for future improvements/upgrades to occur when resources are available.

II. TRANSIT ALIGNMENT
- As the start of a new mode of transit, it is paramount that the streetcar track alignment begins in the right location to promote ridership, capitalize on the public investment in transit to provide the best opportunity for development/redevelopment, and to be a model for future transit funding and success.
The proposed vision for the Sugar House streetcar corridor consists of a combination of on-street and existing rail corridor alignments. This outline details existing rail.

A. **STATE – MAIN STREET**
   As planned development proceeds, this segment would be an in-street alignment in the UTA corridor ROW.

B. **MAIN TO CENTRAL POINTE TRAX STATION**
   1. **BASELINE:** The baseline proposal calls for the streetcar to run in the east-west UTA corridor until reaching the north-south TRAX line, after which the streetcar line will turn north and parallel the north-south TRAX line. This alignment presents a number of issues and concerns:
      - Location between functioning warehouses presents a negative, uninviting experience for transit uses and pedestrians including blank walls and no eyes on the corridor, which is a safety concern.
      - Functionally impacts existing business and their access to the building.
      - Need to acquire land for the alignment, which may lead to possible legal action and/or delays.
      - Limited opportunity for redevelopment in Phase I.

   **PROPOSED:** Realign the streetcar corridor to an on-street alignment on Main Street and Utopia from Main St. to Central Pointe TRAX station. *SSL and adjacent property owners and developers support this realignment.* Advantages include:
      - Same amount of track with minimum property acquisition and no impact on existing businesses.
      - Opportunity to increase ridership proximity to existing businesses, restaurant, entertainment and residential use, the Market Station development, and 2100S.
      - Improves access from 2100 S to station via existing and proposed streets.
      - More immediate opportunity for transit oriented development on a variety of parcel sizes with good pedestrian and street access and street frontage.

C. **STATE STREET – 900 EAST**
   - Locate as originally proposed in the UTA corridor

D. **900 EAST - MCCLELLAND**
   - Investigate options for putting streetcar in the street on Sugarmont, and reserve UTA corridor for greenway or future track.
E. FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS

1. STREETCAR ACCESSIBILITY TO MAINTENANCE FACILITY
   - Future 2nd track - Option 1: implement loop system utilizing UTA corridor.
   - Option 2: acquire a strip of land (17’ – 33’) along Utopia from 200 W to Main St for a double track line.

2. SUGAR HOUSE END OF LINE EXTENSION TO HIGHLAND DRIVE
   - Although this proposed extension is not part of the federal grant-authorized Baseline Design, the current end of line station is a sub-optimal location, as it only touches the western edge of the Sugar House District, hidden behind future development, not directly adjacent to bus service, and a bit farther from the majority of the potential ridership in the District.
   - We feel that it is extremely critical to the success of the Sugar House Streetcar that the end of line be extended in an on-street alignment to Highland Drive with an end of line station somewhere along Highland Drive between Wilmington and Simpson. There is overwhelming support by both the public and private sectors and the community for this extension.
   - This extension needs to be designed concurrently with the completion of the federal grant-authorized Phase I. Currently an Alternatives Analysis Study is reviewing options for identifying an appropriate alignment and station location at the terminus of Phase I at McClelland.
   - Benefits of an extension of the end-of-line:
     - Closer to the heart of the Sugar House District and provides destination ridership potential.
     - Serves existing and proposed infill development/redevelopment projects.
     - Connections to existing bus service on 2100 S and Highland Drive.

III. STATION LOCATIONS:

The originally proposed station locations are acceptable with the following changes recommended:

A. 700 E STATION:
   - The original proposed location is within a 50’ section of the corridor
   - Original station location would impact existing businesses (BBQ).
   - Potential parking and circulation impacts on historic neighborhood.
   - Drop-off concerns on 700 E
PROPOSED NEW 700 E STATION LOCATION: Relocate to west side, +/- 200’ west of 700 East

- Greater corridor width (varies) and configuration offer greater flexibility for station location and integration with adjacent development/redevelopment.
- Immediate redevelopment opportunities may be combined with existing interested businesses and property owners and new players.
- Opportunity to create a unique neighborhood activity center. 700 E is in the middle of corridor. 700 East is a main arterial street with Interstate access. With a planned extension to 2100 S to include existing and new redevelopment opportunities combination local and chain businesses, this creates a significant node of activity.
- Secondary access and drop off from existing adjacent east and west streets Wilmington and Simpson.
- City, community members, and adjacent property owners and neighbors support change in location.

B. 300 E STATION
- Original station location has fewer opportunities for redevelopment.

PROPOSED NEW 300 E STATION LOCATION-Relocate to east side of 300 E

- New location offers greater development/redevelopment opportunities with large single ownership properties adjacent to the station location.
- Opportunity to create new mixed use/employment center by developing a parcel to the south (which is for sale) and building upon an existing stable business on the north as an anchor that can expand and has a willing land owner.
- Station can be integrated in to adjacent properties and businesses.

C. STATE STREET STATION
- Station location needs to be resolved with adjacent development plans as per timing, traffic circulation, and bus transfer issues.
- Traffic analysis and coordination with Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) is requested.

D. NEW MAIN/UTOPIA STATION
- It is important that this new station be an integral part of the Phase I project as it serves a variety of transit users, not originally served and fills the transit gap between State St. and Central Point TRAX station transfer.
This new station location would serve and energize the SSL Market Station redevelopment area, new residential development, 2100 S businesses, and nearby Salt Lake County complex. It is an area that is not in the baseline design.

The exact location of the station needs to be determined by transit and development needs.

E. CENTRAL POINTE TRAX STATION
- The station would be in the same general location as originally proposed, but oriented east to west on Utopia Street. Visibility to the Central Pointe station is critical.
- Provides greater visibility and pedestrian and auto access to the transfer station from 2100 S.
- Serves existing destination businesses and redevelopment opportunities in the area.
- Local property owners and businesses support this station configuration.

F. FUTURE STATION LOCATIONS
Provide the flexibility and ability to have future stations at the following locations:
- 800 E/ East side of 800 E/ flag stop (user initiated)
- 200 E/ West side of 200 E/ flag stop or on east side of State Street, depending on location of State Street station to the west.
- West Temple (East side) on a future loop scenario.

OPTION TO CONSIDER:
Due to funding constraints, it may be desirable to consider delaying the implementation of some initially low ridership stations until redevelopment occurs in place of a new station location that has existing ridership potential. (Example: New main/Utopia Station in lieu of 300 E or 500 E stations)

IV. STATION PLATFORMS
A. SIDE PLATFORMS
Preference is for side platforms at the stations, either in the dedicated transit corridor or with an on-street alignment. This is possible at most stations. Keeping the track alignment relatively straight and compact allows more land for public use.

B. CENTER PLATFORMS
Due to functional transit requirements, center platforms should be utilized at the 500 E station (siding track for trains to cross) and for Phase I at the McClelland station (end of line) and others as required for transit functions.
C. STATION PLATFORMS
   PHASE I:
   Provide embedded track at all station platforms with concrete, pavers, rubberized panels, or other suitable material. Embed from the far end of the station platform to the street ROW line.

   PHASE II: ENHANCE STATION PLATFORM AREAS:
   • Station platform areas that are adjacent to the track should be an extension of station and together create a “place” in the corridor that serves and integrates the needs of the transit and trail users.
   • Since the transit stop is in an open space corridor, it should celebrate its location and take on a park like character by including, for example, a pavilion type shelter, rather than a bus shelter.
   • Add special landscape treatment at stations, such as a row of columnar trees to acknowledge the area from across the corridor.
   • Add rest areas, simple benches, informal bike racks, and wayfinding and interpretive signage. Private donors, property owners or sponsors could potentially fund these items.

V. THE CORRIDOR
   o The Corridor needs to accommodate and integrate three functional elements:
     A. Transit - recommended 26-27' wide double track streetcar corridor
     B. Greenway and Trail – recommend 23-24’ open space corridor with 10’ Parley’s Trail north of the streetcar
     C. Neighborhood Open space; -recommend 16’ +/- area neighborhood park strip and overhead utility poles south of the streetcar
   o The physical envelope of the corridor varies due to physical constraints and conditions.
   o The implementation of the Parley’s Trail and various upgrades will occur over time as needs and resources demand within the corridor. Therefore, the placement and width of these elements is critical to maintain flexibility and adaptability.

A. STREETCAR TRANSIT CORRIDOR (26'-27’)

1. PHASE I: (Baseline Transit corridor)
   • +/- 13’ wide single track transit corridor with contained curb edge on south side and uncurbed sloped edge on north side. The edge of Phase 1 track would be located 16’ +/- from the south boundary of the 66’ corridor, or as far south as feasible considering utilities.
• Treatment: Ballast track except at stations where track would be embedded.
• Exposed dirt is not acceptable to anyone. Some type of low maintenance natural looking plant materials that provide ground cover is necessary.

2. PHASE II:
• 26’ – 27’ wide double track envelope with 2nd track located on the north side of the Phase I track with contained edge. Minimize the width of the ballasted track to allow for other corridor elements. Maximum 26’ if possible.
• Treatment: Same as Phase I with upgrades available at certain stations and corridor locations.
• Embedding all of the majority of the track is preferred as resources are available to allow greater pedestrian circulation cross-corridor and use of the corridor as a whole.

B. NORTH EDGE OPEN SPACE (23’ – 24’)

- Accommodate a regional trail corridor Parley’s Trail and open space connection between regional destinations. This is an active pass-through type open space with various open spaces and pocket parks along the way.
- The north edge of the open space corridor is 24’ +/- from the north edge of the 66’ corridor boundary.
- This area accommodates Parley’s Trail, a Class I, 10’ wide asphalt trail. Station platforms should integrate with trail and open space amenities.
- This open space corridor is larger than the south open space corridor due to the location of the regional trail and to allow sun access to the trail. It also allows adjacent open space plazas to adjacent development/redevelopment opportunities, as the majority of these opportunities exist on the north side of the corridor.
- The width of this open space allows some meaning of the trail and flexibility in open space location and activities.

1. PHASE I:
• Within the 66’ corridor, this open space increases to 33’ – 37’ (area for future 2nd track). No permanent improvements or landscaping (such as trees) should be planted in the area of the future second track.
• Provide natural, sustainable planting materials such as groundcovers, wildflowers, and native grass mix between the north boundary of the corridor and the streetcar tracks.
• At key blocks, provide a 6’ meandering gravel trail to activate the open space and the corridor on an interim basis.

2. PHASE II
• Landscape and corridor upgrades to develop a sustainable informal natural landscape.
• Deciduous trees on the south side of track to allow sunshine through in winter and shade in summer.
• Trees on the north side as appropriate, evergreen trees for windbreak if needed.
• Encourage residents to plant their own landscape buffer/ screening.
• PARLEY’S TRAIL: Provide space for trail and regional open space link with various corridor and trail amenities such as pedestrian bollard pathway lighting, rest areas, picnic areas, pavilions and shelters. This is a future phase / upgrade.

C. SOUTH EDGE OPEN SPACE (16’ +/-)

- This open space edge of the corridor buffers the streetcar from adjacent utilities and serves the needs of adjacent neighborhood property owners and development interest.
- It consists of a series of park blocks with more informal pocket parks, passive recreation opportunities, bocce courts, horse shoes, community gardens, chess, places to sit, people watch, picnic, children’s play area etc. This is determined by local jurisdictions and adjacent local interest and as available space dictates.
- The open space should have a sense of community ownership and responsibility.
- Accommodate existing utility poles in this area of the corridor adjacent to the south boundary of the open space.
- The open space accommodates station platforms.
- The south edge of the corridor is +/- 16’ from the south edge of the transit corridor.
  1. PHASE I: Similar treatment as north edge
  2. PHASE II: Landscape and corridor upgrades as per local needs and desires.
- **PRATT, South Salt Lake, Salt Lake City and citizens at community meetings support the location of these various corridor elements.**
VI. CORRIDOR ELEMENTS

These elements may vary due to specific corridor and station conditions.

A. OVERHEAD CATENARY SYSTEM (OCS) POLES
   - The location and placement of these poles should become a line of vertical elements within the corridor. System and urban design considerations need to be balanced.
   - These should not be placed at the ends of streets or alleys or where they could interrupt important views. They should be placed to integrate into adjacent landscape and development.
   - OCS poles should be round and painted a standard color (TBD).
   - Special, taller OCS poles should be located at street and station locations to signal the presence of transit in the corridor and provide station area platform lighting. One per station.

B. UTILITY POLES
   - The majority of the utility poles occur in the south side of the corridor from McClelland to 300 East and on the north from 300 E to TRAX corridor.
   - Existing utility power poles to remain. Replace, straighten and realign as needed.
   - Underground utilities as required for transit or for private development on a block by block basis. This is an upgrade.
   - From 900 E to McClelland, resolve the placement of OCS poles and existing power poles. Consider undergrounding in this area.

C. TPPS
   - Location of the three TPPS equipment facilities shall be jointly determined by system design and urban design considerations. They should not interfere with transit or pedestrian circulation.
   - Prefer location out of the 66' corridor or at its exterior edges.
   - Facilities should be screened with either landscape or architectural treatments as objects in space.

D. LIGHTING
   - At stations, provide a taller fixture (round, +/- 30' high-) on the OCS pole lighting the street and platform (one pole only). Provide adjustable light fixtures between the street ROW and the station platform. Shield light sources from adjacent development and don’t over-light the area.
   - Use pedestrian scaled bollard lighting for additional station area lighting or pathway lighting.

E. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS
All street crossings should be at grade. Provide improved pedestrian crossings at 700 East and State Street with pedestrian-activated traffic signals, curb bulb-outs, and pedestrian refuge islands as deemed feasible. Pedestrian/bike flyover ramps or tunnels are not recommended due to cost and their impact on the corridor and adjacent development.

- Establish a presence of transit and pedestrian trails, with special treatment where they cross streets.
- Establish a hierarchy of street intersection treatment that combines grade crossing controls, intersection lighting, crosswalks, signage, and etc. State Street and 700 E are a priority.

1. PHASE I:
   - Provide special pavement treatment, such as color, texture or materials that define the transit and pedestrian crossings at the street.
   - Intersections adjacent to a transit stop should be designed as an extension of the station to create a sense of place. This includes sidewalks and bus stops on adjacent streets.

VII. UPGRADES AND PHASING
A preliminary list of potential upgrades has been developed for the corridor. Improvements are to be determined jointly by UTA and local jurisdictions, and paid for as betterments and enhancements:
- Track corridor treatments
- Station area upgrades/ plazas
- Parley's Trail treatment
- Pedestrian and plaza lighting
- Corridor streetscape furnishings, such as benches and bike racks
- Intersection treatments/ improvements
- Open space treatments/ screening & buffering, pocket parks/ found space amenities
- Landscaping
- Interpretive signage
- Underground utilities to eliminate overhead wires
- Public art

A. PARLEY’S TRAIL
- Location: Provide for a future Class I 10’ wide asphalt track and greenway to help create a regional open space link.
  - Class 1 10’ wide asphalt trail from McClelland to State Street.
Designated on-street trail from McClelland via Sugarmont and Wilmington to Hidden Hollow.
Designated on-street trail street from State Street west to West Temple and Haven. May be in UTA transit corridor until development takes place.
Continue beyond 200 West to Jordan River as master planned.

B. STREET CROSSING
Street crossings can be enhanced with special paving, lighting, etc.

C. SIGNAGE AND WAYFINDING
- Due to the hidden location and former use of the corridor there is a need to reorient people to and from it with wayfinding signage.
- As the first streetcar line in the region, there is an opportunity to brand the UTA streetcar system with a new graphic and a unique signage system, which combines transit and wayfinding signage needs.
- Create a family of transit and wayfinding elements that are simple, direct and from a bold color palette to reinforce the character of the corridor as a place. Doing so will provide the various uses a sense of orientation and direction, express the character of the corridor, and create a sense of place.

D. ARTISTIC AND HISTORIC INTERPRETIVE ELEMENTS
Public art and history markers add to the character of the corridor and help establish a sense of place and unique character for different stations/areas.

E. BIKE-SHARE PROGRAM:
This corridor likely could support a bike share program, and Salt Lake City, South Salt Lake, and UTA should consider jointly implementing one. The location of the corridor and its close proximity to user destinations that are beyond a reasonable walking distance, the co-location of a transit and bike trail and its intersection with various regional bikeways make it a candidate. Bike stations should be at key streetcar stops including McClelland St., 700 E, State Street, and Central Pointe TRAX Station.
ATTACHMENT C
Sugar House Streetcar Community Visioning
Sugar House Streetcar Phase I Community Visioning

The Sugar House Streetcar Community Visioning project has been a collaboration of the RDA, City of South Salt Lake, Citiventure (Consultant), and UTA.

Community Open Houses May 12 & August 25:
Community open houses were held on May 12 and August 25 to provide information and collect public comments on the Sugar House Streetcar Line. The RDA staff sent postcards to residents and businesses located within one-block on each side of the Sugarmont Rail Corridor, notifying them about the open houses. Over 3,000 postcards were mailed for both meetings. The meetings were also posted on the Salt Lake City Meeting Calendar, City Council, and Sugar House Streetcar websites. In addition, email blasts about the open houses were sent to community members and groups, businesses, and other stakeholders by the Sugar House Community Council, Westminster College, East Central Community Council, Liberty Wells Community Council, Salt Lake City Planning Division, and the RDA. Also, flyers were distributed throughout the Sugar House community by members of the Sugar House Community Council about the open houses.

May 12 Community Open House:
The purpose of the open house was to educate the public about how this streetcar system will work, the public space and potential amenities in the corridor, including Parley’s Trail, and what new development is planned nearby. The public shared their ideas and thoughts on what they would like to see and potential changes in the corridor potential changes and how they think they will use the corridor in the future. Over 150 members of the public attended the open house.

August 25 Community Open House:
The open house was a follow up to the May 28 meeting. Design concepts of the Sugarmont Corridor and Streetcar Line were presented for the community to review and provide input. Over 75 members of the public attended the open house.

July 20 Developers’ Forum:
The RDA, Urban Land Institute, and the City of South Salt Lake partnered to host a developers’ forum on July 20 to offer an early look at the designs and opportunities of the upcoming Sugar House Streetcar. Developers were brought up to speed on the project, met other key property owners and developers, and explored specific station area development opportunities. At the forum it was also discussed that the public sector has taken the lead on planning the infrastructure element, but capitalizing on the investment and building the community will need to come from the private sector. Developers were encouraged to construct new residential, commercial, retail and entertainment projects and plan to invest in civic projects to complement the streetcar line. Thirty-five developers and stakeholders attended the forum, which included walking tours of several station areas.

Community Events:
The RDA and the City of Salt Lake hosted booths at the Freedom Festival on July 2 and the Sugar House Street Fair on July 4. Posters showing renderings and other information on the
streetcar were presented at the booth. Members of the public were encouraged to provide comments. An estimated 500 people passed through the booths and received information during the two events.

Sugar House Community Council Meetings:
The RDA staff has attended the Sugar House Community Council meetings since May to present information on the Sugar House Streetcar Line, provide updates on upcoming open houses and outreach events, and collect public comment.

Salt Lake City Open City Hall Website:
The Sugar House Streetcar has been listed and maintained as a topic on Salt Lake City’s Open City Hall website since May 2011, with an emphasis on gathering input about what people would like to see in the corridor. The forum has attracted 279 participants, and generated 25 written comments.
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**SUGAR HOUSE STREETCAR CORRIDOR**  
**MEETING SCHEDULE**  
**March 22, 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Corridor Tour/preliminary meetings</td>
<td>Mar 24</td>
<td>Ron, Marilee, Ed, Sharen, Kelly</td>
<td>Corridor Analysis, Team Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Corridor Tour—City Leaders; Meetings afterward (trail people)</td>
<td>Apr 1 (am)</td>
<td>SSL and SLC RDAs, etc.</td>
<td>Corridor Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. All Sugar House Corridor Consultant Teams meeting (Sharen to arrange)</td>
<td>Apr 19-20</td>
<td>Consultants, UTA, RDA, SLC, SSL</td>
<td>Team Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Individual city staffs and UTA meetings</td>
<td>Apr 19-20</td>
<td>SLC, RDA, SSL, UTA</td>
<td>Corridor Analysis, Team Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Community Outreach Meeting 1 + stakeholder meetings/outreach</td>
<td>May 12</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Corridor Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Staff debrief meeting (am)+ stakeholder meetings (pm)</td>
<td>May 13</td>
<td>SSL, SLC, RDA, UTA</td>
<td>Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Straka design day</td>
<td>June 8</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Corridor Design Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. UTA department meetings</td>
<td>June 9</td>
<td>UTA departments</td>
<td>Corridor Design Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ULI Developer Forum (8-11am) + walking tours (pm)</td>
<td>June 10</td>
<td>ULI, public, SLC, SSL, RDA, UTA</td>
<td>Corridor Design Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Straka design day</td>
<td>July 25</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Corridor Design Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Salt Lake, South Salt Lake, RDA Board Briefings</td>
<td>July 26-27</td>
<td>SSL, SLC, RDA</td>
<td>Corridor Design Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. UTA sign-off workshop</td>
<td>Aug 23</td>
<td>UTA, SSL, SLC</td>
<td>Corridor Design Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Salt Lake City, South Salt Lake Board Briefings, SLC Planning</td>
<td>Aug. 23-24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Station Area Concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Community Outreach Meeting 2</td>
<td>Aug. 25</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Station Area Concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Staff debrief meeting</td>
<td>Aug. 26</td>
<td>SSL, SLC, RDA, UTA</td>
<td>Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Final presentation; SLC/SSL/RDA (combined meeting)</td>
<td>Nov. 15</td>
<td>SSL, SLC, RDA, UTA</td>
<td>Implementation Action Plan focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Final Report submitted</td>
<td>Nov. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Final Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SLC City Council / RDA – Tuesdays
SSL City Council / RDA – Wednesday
SLC Planning Commission – 2nd and 4th Wednesday
SSL Planning Commission – 1st and 3rd Thursday

Best night for public meetings – 2nd and 4th Thursday

Project Team meetings:
Weekly with team and subconsultants. Citiventure via phone when not in town.

Briefings with Councils:
Monthly by staff. Threetkey briefings by Citiventure in joint session with Planning Commission.
STREETCAR Community Visioning Workshop

Thursday May 12th       6:00 - 8:00 pm
Columbus Center at 2531 South 400 East

6:00 - 7:00  Streetcar introduction and questions/answers
7:00 - 8:00  Roundtable discussions on station area plans for each stop

LEARN:
• How this streetcar system will work
• The public space and potential amenities in the corridor, including Parley’s Trail
• What new development is planned nearby

SHARE:
• Your ideas for what you would like to see in the corridor
• Your thoughts about potential changes
• How you think you will use this corridor in the future

Hosted by:

For more information:
SSL residents: Sharen Hauri at the City of South Salt Lake 801.464.6771 shauri@ssl.net
SLC residents: Wayne Mills at Salt Lake City at 801.535.7282 wayne.mills@slcgov.com
Streetcar Visioning Workshop
Group Discussion notes
05.12.11

State Street-200 West Group 1

What would encourage you to use the streetcar corridor more?
1. Free Parking and Available Parking
2. Easy access to all industry-Good traffic planning
3. Well lit, will help with safety & low graffiti
4. Various Industry
5. Green Space

Where should Stations be?
1. One every other intersection

What kind of trail would you use most?
No Answer

What should the character of the neighborhood be?
1. Safety fences to keep children away from the rail
2. Keep to current character in Sugarhouse and carry it into South Salt Lake and Vice Versa
3. Charming-Old school architecture and lighting

Where are catalytic sites and opportunities?
1. Central Pointe is very catalytic and full of opportunities

What are the issues in the area?
1. Right now it is a very industrial area
2. Aesthetically it’s not the most pleasing to the eye
3. Lighting could use a lot of work.

What will make the streetcar a success?
1. Revitalization of the corridor area.
2. The development of various retailers.
3. Lighting, Lighting, Lighting!
4. Ridership is key. You will build ridership if you make the corridor development a destination spot. Green space areas, theaters, live music venues, galleries, Culture, Culture, Culture!!!
5. Think the North end in Boston. Brilliant

Where should the end of the line be:
In Sugar House?
In Central Pointe?
1. The end of the line should be the area where you can transfer to the main line artery to the rest of the valley.
State Street-200 West Group 2

What would encourage you to use the streetcar corridor more?
1. Artistic Businesses
2. Make it here, buy here
3. Jobs-get to work
4. Connections to other destinations
5. Trees, gardens

Where should Stations be?
1. Center of block between State and Main
2. One at West Temple

What kind of trail would you use most?
1. One with overpasses at State Street and 700 East (or a pedestrian tunnel under the street.)
2. Bike access to TRAX
3. Bike lockers

What should the character of the neighborhood be?
1. Crime Free
2. Graffiti Free
3. Fun and Artistic
4. Local Flair
5. Higher Density Residential
6. Charter School
7. Community Gardens

Where are catalytic sites and opportunities?
1. Make it here, buy it here
2. Refurbish rather than reconstruct
3. Preserve Pat’s BBQ

What are the issues in the area?
1. Reuse existing buildings
2. Remodeling
3. Expansion and double track

What will make the streetcar a success?
1. Reduced headway between trains
2. Low fares
3. Bikes on train
4. Have development face corridor

Where should the end of the line be:
In Sugar House?
1. In Sugar House Park!
In Central Pointe?
500 East-State Street       Group 1

What would encourage you to use the streetcar corridor more?
1. Viable Destinations
2. The Trail
3. Will be quiet (cars quiet)
4. If it is green/aesthetically pleasing

Where should Stations be?
1. State Street: East side, close to residential
2. Or if West side of State is activated then station on West
3. 500 East: West side of Street Close to St. Ann’s
4. Stops closest to high density residential.

What kind of trail would you use most?
1. Mix of cycling/pedestrian
2. Small pocket parks along trail corridor-look for parcels along trail for pocket parks.
3. In proximity to stations
4. Good separation between trail and track OR
5. No separation between trail and track

What should the character of the neighborhood be?
1. Walkable
2. Mostly residential in character-preserve established residential
3. Don’t want a huge commercial/MFG corridor between state and 500 East.
4. Less Industrial
5. Public/Private Initiative to maintain visual aspect of corridor-Paint fences, houses, landscape, etc.

Where are catalytic sites and opportunities?
1. State St/Bowling Alley-huge parking areas
2. Entryway to SSL on West side of State: Entry statement to SSL and Vice Versa
3. Paper Co./cooking school on 300 E.
4. Park on 400 E.
5. Legacy retail center on 2700 S and 300 E

What are the issues in the area?
1. Safety-Access to neighborhoods, Crime, gangs, tagging/graffiti, will street car bring undesirables?
2. Noise-What noise impacts? sound walls?
3. Lighting-Unobtrusive
4. Landscaping-Native plants, xeriscape
5. Bowling Alley- Unsavory activity
6. Unkempt Properties-Unsavory Activity
7. Fencing of Corridor-Vinyl? No graffiti

What will make the streetcar a success?
1. Accessibility from adjacent streets
2. Trail
3. Directional signage
4. Coordination w/bus system
5. Pedestrian Street Crossings
6. Lighting for Safety
7. Sidewalk improvements
8. Pedestrian amenities (benches, planters, shelters)

Where should the end of the line be:

In Sugar House?
1. To Sugar House Park
2. Connect to University Line
3. Foothill Boulevard
4. Along Highland going South

In Central Pointe?
5. Terminating at TRAX Station on West Side (300 West)

5 Main Points
1. Safety
2. Redevelopment at State Street
3. Maintaining existing residential
4. Make usable/feasible/walkable for residents
5. Trail is important component
What would encourage you to use the streetcar corridor more?
1. Discounts (or free) for residents abutting tracks
2. Pay for how far you are traveling
3. dogs/pets on trail
4. Do we want a fence?
5. Do we want trees as a buffer?
6. Have they done a survey? How much property does UTA own, where are the property lines
7. What are the trains going to look like?
8. Make the trains look similar to historic street cars
9. Stop at 800 East to maximize use for 800 E business
10. No station then at 900 East

Where should Stations be?
1. West Side of 700 East
2. Different opinions on location of 900 East
3. Skip 900 East
4. Have a station at every paved crossing, on-demand
5. If you are around 800 East, one block and cross each road w/o 800 East station
6. Put it on side with church to increase usage

What kind of trail would you use most?
1. Where corridor is more residential make it more park not trax line
2. Trees
3. For bikes, pedestrians, Skateboards, wide enough
4. A lot of lighting! To deter crime, vandalism, but should not impact neighbors, don’t want it to look like industrial issue
5. Get bike community off busy streets
6. Overpass over 700 East
7. Best on North Side

What should the character of the neighborhood be?
No Answer

Where are catalytic sites and opportunities?
1. Discount or business permits along line to incentive-ize development

What are the issues in the area?
1. Property value
2. Access to garages on corridor; is noww from “unofficial alley” possibly along corridor
3. Track in center with trees on both sides OR track on one side and trail on other
4. Need stoplight at 800 East
5. Hours minimal 9:00-6:00
6. Limit frequency/headways

What will make the streetcar a success?
No Answer
Where should the end of the line be:

In Sugar House?
1. McClelland
2. No station at Sugarmont and 900 East

In Central Pointe?

4 Main Points
1. Free passes or pay-as-you-go
2. Trail-Park Feel, Trees, Lighting
3. Stops—Maybe at 800 East Not Sugarmont
4. Streetcar to look/feel historic
900 East-500 East  Group 2

What would encourage you to use the streetcar corridor more?
1. Well lit trail
2. No BALLASTS!!-will aide with accessibility and feel
3. Beautification

Where should Stations be?
1. Either side of 700 East as long as pedestrian access
2. 900 East-Good location
3. 500 East-Good location

What kind of trail would you use most?
1. Trail on one side or the other

What should the character of the neighborhood be?
1. Lit corridor-comfortable, safe.
2. Ballasts aren’t inviting-ugly.
3. Mix between ballasts, grass
4. Potential park at 600 East and Sugarmont
5. Residential=quiet-noise levels

Where are catalytic sites and opportunities?
1. Continue Sugar House identity to the West
2. No “ghetto” of Sugar House
3. 600 East to 500 East to North side of corridor, mixed-use project.

What are the issues in the area?
1. Property values-single family in commercial area, limit options
2. Sugar House BBQ
3. 700 East-Bridge, not underground
4. Accessibility, city agreement
5. Reagan billboard
6. Preserve multi-modal access at 700 East
7. Potentially 4 lights between I-80-N
8. 700 East Park & Ride infrastructure needed
9. Bridge vs. on-grade crossing
10. Neighborhood parking issues
11. DI should provide public parking
12. Security-lighting needed
13. Preserve historic character, accentuate the old, get rid of crap.
14. Recognize budget constraints, bust must make nice as possible-brick pavers at strategic locations
15. Look at adding on street parking on 700 east
16. 700 East above grade crossing-do not block access to existing building or create negative impact

What will make the streetcar a success?
1. Extend/widen sidewalks
2. Endpoint needs to extend to Highland-Right away
3. Don’t put in Ballast

**Where should the end of the line be:**
- In Sugar House?
- In Central Pointe?
  - No Answer

**4 Main Points**
1. Pedestrian bridge at 700 East-accessibility
2. Extend to Highland
3. Minimize Ballasts
4. Corridor/Trail Safety
1300 East-900 East Group 1-
What would encourage you to use the streetcar corridor more?
   1. A bike path through the corridor

Where should Stations be?
   No Answer

What kind of trail would you use most?
   No Answer

What should the character of the neighborhood be?
   No Answer

Where are catalytic sites and opportunities?
   No Answer

What are the issues in the area?
   No Answer

What will make the streetcar a success?
   No Answer

Where should the end of the line be:
   In Sugar House? Highland
   Why doesn’t the line run all the way to 11th East/Highland. Opportunity lost. Redevelop the “old” DI into a station. Keep in mind Parley’s trail will run 11 to the street car tracks. It will have to connect to or meet the tracks in a seamless manner-preferably on the east side of 11th East on Wilmington.

   In Central Pointe?
900 East-1300 East  Group 2

What would encourage you to use the streetcar corridor more?
1. Connect to Highland High School, connect to University or go to BBQ place
2. Get on 1300 E to hospital-would use it if it gets me somewhere
3. Connect to the airport (45 min or less)-dependent on long term parking
4. Downtown
5. Concerts, Jazz games
6. Too expensive, cheaper to drive and park, dependent on # of passengers-taking grandkids is expensive
7. Convenient to not bother with parking

Where should Stations be?
No Answer

What kind of trail would you use most?
1. Sugarmont-linear park
2. Really pretty connecting trail through Sugar House Commons-currently street and building. Needs trees, landscaping, lining a pretty walkway. Park is nice, abrupt shift.
3. Like to see a lot of trees
4. Like the grass in the rail tracks

What should the character of the neighborhood be?
No Answer

Where are catalytic sites and opportunities?
1. 900 East tennis courts-nice piece of property. Do something commercial-coffee shops, restaurants etc. similar to what used to be at Meacham property
2. Align streetcar up Wilmington-low traffic
3. Granite block-convention center, boutiques
4. Warehouses west of 700 East

What are the issues in the area?
1. Not going to be a catalyst for new development along the corridor
2. Concerned about impact to residents south of Elm and north of Row.
3. Noise wall (or landscaping as noise mitigation)

What will make the streetcar a success?
No Answer

Where should the end of the line be:
In Sugar House?
In Central Pointe?
No Answer

5 Main Points
1. Concern about visual impacts to residential neighborhoods at crime at Fairmont
2. 110 E is an opportunity for a Station
3. Should at least go east until 1300 East
4. 900 East Tennis courts are a good opportunity for redevelopment
5. Trail corridor should be nicely landscaped, high visual quality. Important to separate walkers and cyclists.
900 East-1300 East Group 3

What would encourage you to use the streetcar corridor more?
1. Better pedestrian connections-enhances crosswalks 21st 13th 9th side
2. Better bike facilities-difficult to cross 21st and Highland
3. Pedestrian circulation 13th-throughout RD
4. Less driving trips
5. Break up the larger blocks
6. Speed on 21st-not comfortable
7. Safe peds for Westminster Students
8. Bike lanes on 21st? One less lane of traffic each direction, less traffic oriented

Where should Stations be?
1. Has to be Highland
2. For early success-stop near library
3. Street car stop in Plaza

What kind of trail would you use most?
No Answer

What should the character of the neighborhood be?
1. Should not have large parking lots
2. More buildings fronting street
3. More mid-block crosswalks
4. Monument Plaza should be a usable plaza space-remove road?
5. Use canal as connections
6. Realign

Where are catalytic sites and opportunities?
No Answer

What are the issues in the area?
1. Neighborhood must be connected to trail and stops
2. 900 East-Restaurants and shops
3. Preserve neighborhoods very important to connect neighborhoods
4. Scale-smaller scale-human scale
5. Important connection on 900 East

What will make the streetcar a success?
1. Riders
2. Attracting Businesses
3. Frequent
4. Time for donation events
5. Has to run late
6. Less Parking
7. City should adopt a parking maximum
8. Shared parking
9. Bikes on street cars
10. Bike storage at stations
Where should the end of the line be:
In Sugar House?
In Central Pointe?
  1. Terminates at Highland-has to connect to Highland or it doesn’t connect Sugar House
  2. Possibly farther East
  3. Westminster
  4. Circle Sugar House?
Streetcar Corridor Group 1

What would encourage you to use the streetcar corridor more?
1. Restaurants along the line
2. Retail
3. Known destination because rails
4. Make trail to West go to 2100 S Trax as well as continued on Haven
5. Get it built!

Where should Stations be?
1. If 900 East is a station, next east station should be farther east
2. Could make McClelland a temp Station
3. West side of 700 East
4. Move State Street toward middle of block between State and Main
5. Close to intersection-good crossings, east to get across, doesn’t matter which
6. Build in capacity to get them at every block-not preclude them, we may need them

What kind of trail would you use most?
1. Trail for families
2. Fast bikers should use alternative route
3. Grade separated at 700 & State is safer for families
4. No big fence
5. Opposite of what Jordan River parking-control growth of landscaping, fewer goatheads
6. Trees are great
7. Multiple accesses from streets-kids use it to get to school, mid-block?
8. Trail=catalyst for development-trail becomes a “pedestrian street” 16th St mall in Denver
9. More urban, not like other Jordan River Trails

What should the character of the neighborhood be?
1. Go to any station and get a newspaper and a cup of coffee-delis
2. 2-4 stories mixed with Higher at 700 E and State and close to Trax
3. Hotels in Sugar House CBD for destination
4. Dense but not necessarily tall-3 or 4 stories-more compact

Where are catalytic sites and opportunities?
1. Sugar House monument at 2100 South and Highland-iconic location
2. More in SSL-Industrial sites, have Central Pointe become like Sugar House

What are the issues in the area?
1. West side is cut off from street car project
2. Development backed up to corridor-2100 South already has business facing street
3. Compatibility with existing neighborhoods-w/interface of street car/development, height is important

What will make the streetcar a success?
1. Connect better to attractive destinations-Westminster, SLCC
2. Make corridor between State and Main a “pedestrian street”
3. Turn development to face corridor
4. No barriers between corridor & development
5. Encourage shared parking
6. right development in corridor-same opportunity as San Antonio, not as long
7. At-grade crossings for trail

**Where should the end of the line be:**

**In Sugar House?**
1. At least Highland
2. Probably Westminster-maybe even a loop to SLCC

**In Central Pointe?**
3. Connect uses between I-15 & TRAX to west side of line-at least to 2100 S TRAX Station, maybe with trail
4. Long-term all of the direction on eastside-similar to what Central Pointe has now
Streetcar Corridor Group 2

What would encourage you to use the streetcar corridor more?
1. Continue to Highland
2. Plan for linear park
3. Plan for multi-use pedestrian trail
4. Natural/aesthetic barriers between streetcar and trail, trees, hedges, gravel divide, grass burn
5. Safe pedestrian crossings on streets such as State Street and 700 East-crosswalk, hawk crossing signals, possible bridges, tunnels

Where should Stations be?
No Answer

What kind of trail would you use most?
1. Green
2. Safe
3. Lighted
4. Accessible
5. Maintained

What should the character of the neighborhood be?
1. Mostly residential with small areas for business
2. Walkable
3. Fun, friendly
4. Historical, industrial style

Where are catalytic sites and opportunities?
1. Central Pointe and Sugar House attractions
2. Funding Amenities/the trail
3. “Backs” of property

What are the issues in the area?
1. Unmaintained property
2. Vacant developments
3. Not very walkable, especially on the west-end
4. Auto Barriers I-80, State Street, 700 East

What will make the streetcar a success?
1. The trail with Pocket Parks
2. Late Service
3. Good/welcoming stations
4. Make the corridor much more visually appealing then it is now
5. Clean up corridors!

Where should the end of the line be:
In Sugar House?
In Central Pointe?
No Answer
Streetcar Corridor  Group 3
What would encourage you to use the streetcar corridor more?
   1. Pedestrian friendly
   2. Trails for pedestrians/bikes
   3. Grass/dog-friendly
   4. Feel safe at night/blue light safety phone
   5.
Where should Stations be?
   No Answer
What kind of trail would you use most?
   No Answer
What should the character of the neighborhood be?
   No Answer
Where are catalytic sites and opportunities?
   No Answer
What are the issues in the area?
   1. Provide tax/RDA incentives for improvements to back of single family houses
   2. Encourage Art
   3. Pedestrian crossing issues on 700 south and State Street
   4.
What will make the streetcar a success?
   1. Connect East end to Westminster and U of U
   2. Connecting to students will be important
   3. Run a streetcar loop that connects with 400 South line at University so all of East Salt Lake City is served.
   4. The cost to ride needs to be affordable
Where should the end of the line be:
In Sugar House?
In Central Pointe?
   1. Connect Streetcar to Sugar House Park.
SH talked about meeting. Wants to know what committee’s reactions were to the table sessions.

- KD said that her table wants the corridor to be family oriented and not the speed bikes. Talked about the ends of each side of the line a lot and that McClelland is not the best end/terminus. Talked about the North/South line and how to get people from the west over to Sugar House? Scale is 3 or 4 stories. Key thing is that this whole group needs to know Lee Archer and Jim Beck talked to KD and said that they have an idea is to get the streetcar off the corridor on West Temple and take it north on West Temple and turn west on either Commonwealth or Utopia. This avoids the issue of Brinkerhoff. IBI had some drawings of this. DP said that there are some issues there and is not an easy solution. Benefit is that they are very supportive of this. Commonwealth is a wider street. Utopia is very narrow with a 33 inch sewer line and there are some advantages there. DP said that we need to look to the future for what is better. JN says that we are dealing in a lot of costs with 4 blocks of pavement, ballast and track.

- DJB said in the short term we could us this as a leverage showing this is a hard core TOD and you have to be involved with the development. Also for long term sake you have to give us the right of first refusal and as soon as you sell that property we are in there first and then we have the option to realign or do something more intense there.

- MS - what is the timing of things we do and reevaluate to get to the point that people are in agreement with a plan? SH said that we have not thought that through. KD said that this will require a reevaluation and a supplemental.

- DP asked that UTA is used to doing this - what do we need to know? August has to be completed. KD said that she would talk to Mary DeLoretto. Schedule is going to be a big issue.

- DJ B asked if Lee Archer says he is not playing ball, is the thinking that we go to the other corridor on the west side of the property just to the south of the church. Are they cooperative? KD said that they are, but we need to see how uncooperative he is going to be first, but know one has talked to Brinkerhoff about it. Is IBI working out some kind of design for that area? No, SH said we have not gotten into that detail. DP said Master Plan is cities’ job, Brinkerhoff discussion the way the alignment shows now that may be best coming from us. KD said that perhaps a project and right-of-way person from UTA would be good to go with you.

- DJ B said that another development strategy idea would to get another development partner on that sight.

- Discussion took place about the problem of getting in touch with Brinkerhoff. KD said that we need to pick who is going to talk to him. Brinkerhoff is hard to track down and DP will try. SH said that Randy Sant would be the best person to talk to Brinkerhoff because they still have options they want to talk to him about. DP felt that if you give him the right top dollar value he would like sell. DJ B said that it would be a good idea to talk to him just about going on the trip to Portland and not property value.

- TH talked about having a look at the issue of 9th east and the McClelland section. Do we want to stay in the right-of-way or do we want to use that signal to jump in the street at that point. At some point we are going to answer that question. JN said to add a paragraph about that in the RFP.

- Discussion took place about a pedestrian crossing. Pratt doesn't know if they want overhead or on street. This is another issue that has to be settled. Problem is even if they have overhead there are people that will still want to cross the street.

- Other comments from tables were: KD - station location – thought that station should be on the left side of 11th East. JW said 8th East was better than 9th.
Talk of pedestrian bridge at 7th East and State – DJ B said that Denver has a wide and well done bridge.

BD said concerning parking issues – Bill Smithers wants station on the west side due to parking. A few people want park-and-ride lots. KD said some talked about shared parking lots. DJ B said that he is reluctant to do park-and-rides.
Streetcar Visioning Issues
05.19.11

This is a summary of the notes from the workshop and comments from participants and facilitators. It is intended to guide the vision and design process by focusing the issues to discuss and potential solutions. These are in no particular order.

1. Safety / Comfort
   - Concern that it is a safe and clean corridor.
   - Lighting often proposed as a solution.
   - Concern for children next to streetcar – fence proposed as a solution
   - Prevent noise impacts
   - Neighborhood east of 900, adjacent to Fairmont Park very concerned about impact
   - Feel safe at night/blue light safety phone

2. Green space
   - Support for idea of the streetcar corridor being a “linear park” because of the Parley’s Trail and potential to add landscaping adjacent to it.
   - Pocket parks or green space along corridor
   - Community Garden
   - Need trees
   - Xeriscape

3. Character
   - Keep character of Sugar House and reflecting historic themes in the corridor
   - Make Central Point reflect this history or be completely new and unique
   - Add pedestrian amenities
   - Small scale / human scale
   - No ballast
   - use brick in key areas
   - Billboard is a problem
   - No large parking lots
   - Incorporate art and culture into the design and the stations – make it a part of the experience, not just an add-on (example: Dallas transit line – each station has different character that helps with identity and wayfinding
   - Fun and friendly
   - Need to consider the name of the streetcar line – will it remain “Sugar House streetcar” or can it be named like the rest of the system (Red Line, etc). Silver Line is appropriate here.

4. Redevelopment
   - Need to convert industrial areas to be more appealing
   - Focus on the arts and culture aspect to make it a destination
   - Desire for more retailers
   - Desire for local businesses (buy local)
   - Need jobs and help people get to jobs with this transit
   - Higher density residential
• Charter school
• Restaurants
• Reuse existing building
• Have the development face the corridor
• Preserve the established residential
• Break up the larger blocks
• Convenience retail – coffee and newspaper by station
• Hotels in Sugar House CBD
• 3 or 4 stories and more more compact
• incentives for improvements to back of single family houses

5. Catalytic sites
• Central Pointe is very catalytic and full of opportunities
• State St/Bowling Alley-huge parking areas
• Entryway to SSL on West side of State: Entry statement to SSL and Vice Versa
• 300 E. (Zellerbach/Kimball)
• 400 E. (open space area)
• 600 East to 500 East to North side of corridor, mixed-use project.
• 900 East – tennis courts
• Granite block
• Former DI property (on Highland)
• Backs” of property

6. Stations
• Central Pointe – ideas to realign it along/within a street to activate the neighborhood
• State St – general consensus to keep it on the west side
• West Temple – possibility of additional stop here
• 300 East – neighborhood character
• 500 East – neighborhood character
• 700 East – idea to relocate it on the west side of the street – supported by the property owners
• 900 East – idea to relocate it further west, closer to 800 East.
• Sugar House – idea to bring it to Highland Dr. or to Sugar House Park (1300 East). Could be at the old DI site. Or near Sprague Library.
• Put stops close to high density residential
• Build in capacity for future stations

7. Ridership / transit
• Concern for getting ridership numbers up
• Interest in keeping fares low, or special deals for neighbors
• Idea to have graduated fares – fee based on distance travelled – believe it would increase ridership
• Plan for future expansion
• Frequent service
• Needs to be easily accessible from adjacent streets
• Run it late so people can go to downtown events
• Get it built!
• Connect to students

8. Trail
• Is a very important component
• Divided on whether major crossings (State and 700) should be elevated or at grade.
• What about dogs / pets on the trail?
• Make corridor between State and Main a “pedestrian street”

9. Bicycling
• Support bike access to TRAX and streetcar
• Need bike lockers
• Family oriented trail, not a commuter trail
• Bike lanes on 2100 S. – make it less car oriented
• More urban character – not like Jordan River Pkwy

10. Walkability
• Walkable neighborhood is essential
• Extend and widen sidewalks
• Need good crossings across 2100 S. and Highland, in addition to State and 700 East. Mid-block crossings would be good
• Safe crossings - hawk crossing signals

11. Access
• Need access to garages on corridor

12. Parking
• Concern that people will park in neighborhood areas since no lots are provided
• May need park and ride on 700 East – could DI provide?
• Shared parking
• Concern for parking at Fairmont Pool and Boys + Girls Club
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>SSL (x)</th>
<th>SLC (x)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlyn Campbell</td>
<td>2205 S. 800 E. Salt Lake City, UT 84106</td>
<td><a href="mailto:carlyn931@msn.com">carlyn931@msn.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 808-4011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Gallegos</td>
<td>2011 S. State Street S-2100</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ngallegos@slcog.org">ngallegos@slcog.org</a></td>
<td>(801) 468-3809</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla Tuke</td>
<td>824 Wilmington Ave.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tukiefive@yahoo.com">tukiefive@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 631-8211</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Case</td>
<td>2773 Alden St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hr10eng@yahoo.com">hr10eng@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 750-2711</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham Larson</td>
<td>2450 Maywood Dr.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:grahamalarson@gmail.com">grahamalarson@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 699-7504</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Bryan</td>
<td>2450 Maywood Dr.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eliz2450@gmail.com">eliz2450@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 699-7504</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Briggs</td>
<td>855 Maple Treet Circle CT #86</td>
<td><a href="mailto:josephb@miam.com">josephb@miam.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 349-6347</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zach Johnson</td>
<td>495 Welby Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(801) 484-9248</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl &amp; Trever Ellis</td>
<td>174 E Commonwalt</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pearl1793@msn.com">pearl1793@msn.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 463-1530</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Clegg</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:robert_clegg@uscorp.com">robert_clegg@uscorp.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammi Diaz</td>
<td>29 Welby Ave</td>
<td><a href="mailto:catmeow1962@gmail.com">catmeow1962@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 688-0810</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Woolley</td>
<td>302 W 5400 S, Murray UT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jowelley@wyclyde.net">jowelley@wyclyde.net</a></td>
<td>(801) 420-0316</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Timmerman</td>
<td>2880 S Main Street #209</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rob@ssldrugfree.org">rob@ssldrugfree.org</a></td>
<td>(801) 834-6923</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Guiness</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:dave@guinessweb.com">dave@guinessweb.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Smithers</td>
<td>2207 S. 700 E.</td>
<td>billsmithers.bl</td>
<td>(801) 558-5080</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon McIlhock</td>
<td>2026 S McClelland</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@sugarhousevet.com">info@sugarhousevet.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 487-9981</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlo Melini</td>
<td>2343 S. Greet Street</td>
<td><a href="mailto:carlo.melini@gmail.com">carlo.melini@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 694-8329</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Reed</td>
<td>2013 S 600 E.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:conniewreed@hotmail.com">conniewreed@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 484-6513</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Floor</td>
<td>557 Driggs Ave.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dpc@ziontribe.com">dpc@ziontribe.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 484-4186</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Ballard</td>
<td>2018 S. Gteas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Buttenob</td>
<td>4879 Brown Villa Cove</td>
<td><a href="mailto:john.buttenob@hdnic.com">john.buttenob@hdnic.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 913-3346</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Berry</td>
<td>1178 Ramona Ave.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sugarhousecouncil@yahoo.com">sugarhousecouncil@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Price</td>
<td>2277 Windsor Street</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kateprice@cybermesa.com">kateprice@cybermesa.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh Kerkmann</td>
<td>777 E Simpson Ave</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kerkmann@gmail.com">kerkmann@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(435) 572-9613</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Nicholas</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dnicolas@bispcoop.com">dnicolas@bispcoop.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>(801) 532-4233</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Cohn</td>
<td>1070 Windsor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:machon9@gmail.com">machon9@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 521-9450</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darryl High</td>
<td>980 Lincoln St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:darryl.high@comcast.net">darryl.high@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>(801) 521-6458</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Gene Davis</td>
<td>865 Parkway Ave.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wgadavis@hotmail.com">wgadavis@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD Hamil</td>
<td>1525 S. 900 E #B</td>
<td><a href="mailto:visiblue@hotmail.com">visiblue@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 486-6926</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Dwyer</td>
<td>1411 S. Utah</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kevidwyer@gmail.com">kevidwyer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 834-6923</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Wheaton</td>
<td>1194 E Crystal Ave</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ken@crsa-us.com">ken@crsa-us.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 949-9541</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aimee Horman</td>
<td>916 Simpson Ave.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aimeehorman@gmail.com">aimeehorman@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(801)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zach Winward</td>
<td>7877 Steffeson Drive</td>
<td><a href="mailto:zach.winward@kiewit.com">zach.winward@kiewit.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 835-0212</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Gold</td>
<td>356 E Haven Ave.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ryan.e.gold@gmail.com">ryan.e.gold@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 467-2389</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Marshedi</td>
<td>2233 S 500 E #112</td>
<td><a href="mailto:annamashedi@gmail.com">annamashedi@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 484-6513</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alisha Petajam</td>
<td>16 Exchange, Salt Lake City, Utah</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alisha@infinetSCALE.com">alisha@infinetSCALE.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 363-1881</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Harris</td>
<td>490 E. 1800 S</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jharris@hntb.com">jharris@hntb.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 520-9318</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Benjamin</td>
<td>1102 S. 800 E</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephenbenjamin64@aol.com">stephenbenjamin64@aol.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 464-4800</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lars Bogness</td>
<td>2437 Highland</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cars@bogness.com">cars@bogness.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 466-5683</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portia Mila</td>
<td>575 Millcreek Way</td>
<td><a href="mailto:portia.mila@gmail.com">portia.mila@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 801-792-0912</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel Hamil</td>
<td>1525 S 900 E</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tuon24@hotmail.com">tuon24@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 486-6926</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Wildauer</td>
<td>4850 S Bitterroot Drive</td>
<td><a href="mailto:matthew.wildauer@parsons.com">matthew.wildauer@parsons.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 419-8466</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Christensen</td>
<td>475 N Redwood Road #50</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mrc@cascadepeak.com">mrc@cascadepeak.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 792-1521</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn Augustus</td>
<td>1525 S. 900 E #B</td>
<td>สถาที่jarator*<a href="mailto:aumts@gmail.com">aumts@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Haganson</td>
<td>1411 S. Utah</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nhilugrafs@hotmail.com">nhilugrafs@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jade DeYoung</td>
<td>2218 S 600 E</td>
<td></td>
<td>(801) 463-3643</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey Turner</td>
<td>252 S 200 E</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gturner@wilbursmith.com">gturner@wilbursmith.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 363-3955</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Walker</td>
<td>2759 E Commonwealth Ave</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gwalker@vcbo.com">gwalker@vcbo.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 891-6214</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Dalten</td>
<td>354 E Burton Ave</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bndfr.dltm@gmail.com">bndfr.dltm@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 755-2464</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirley Pulver</td>
<td>325 E. Utopia</td>
<td></td>
<td>(801) 484-2286</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Henrikson</td>
<td>2249 S Windsor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hahend@gmail.com">hahend@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 485-1948</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toni Hadden</td>
<td>873 N. Sue Michell</td>
<td><a href="mailto:thadden@utah.gov">thadden@utah.gov</a></td>
<td>(801) 965-4527</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah Feister</td>
<td>2197 S 500 E</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gayoteleah@yahoo.com">gayoteleah@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 864-6388</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate Williams</td>
<td>554 E Street</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nate.williams@utah.edu">nate.williams@utah.edu</a></td>
<td>(801) 428-9557</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Morrow</td>
<td>2204 S 800 E</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dfmorrow@gmail.com">dfmorrow@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 484-9364</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricia Pilny</td>
<td>4179 S Riverboat Road</td>
<td><a href="mailto:triciapilny@psomas.com">triciapilny@psomas.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 270-5770</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aric Jensen</td>
<td>790 S 100 E, Bountiful</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ajensen@bountifulutah.gov">ajensen@bountifulutah.gov</a></td>
<td>(801) 298-6190</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Weaver</td>
<td>2532 Maywood Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(801) 699-2090</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabot Nelson</td>
<td>984 Simpson Ave</td>
<td><a href="mailto:adjustable_pilers@yahoo.com">adjustable_pilers@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>(801)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Keddington</td>
<td>1273 E Parkway</td>
<td><a href="mailto:annkeddington@yahoo.com">annkeddington@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 466-2559</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin White</td>
<td>240 E Morris Ave</td>
<td><a href="mailto:justinwhite@breabidlevuniversity.edu">justinwhite@breabidlevuniversity.edu</a></td>
<td>(801) 300-4331</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Barrett</td>
<td>1985 S 700 E</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stefane.barrett@gmail.com">stefane.barrett@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 608-2917</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soren Simonsen</td>
<td>2155 S 2100 E</td>
<td><a href="mailto:soren.simonsen@slcgov.com">soren.simonsen@slcgov.com</a></td>
<td>(801) 706-1055</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daphne Perry</td>
<td>841 E simpson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:daphneaw@usa.net">daphneaw@usa.net</a></td>
<td>(801) 694-1714</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This workshop will be a follow up to the May 28 Community Visioning Workshop and subsequent Community Outreach events.

WE NEED YOUR INPUT NOW!!! --
- Formal design of the corridor begins in September 2011
- Construction begins in 2012
- Streetcar line will open in 2013

Design concepts for the corridor will be presented for community review and input before going to the City Council.

Bring your children, an activity area will be provided!

Refreshments will be provided.

For more information contact:
Sharen Hauri, City of South Salt Lake, 801.464.6771, shauri@sslc.net
or Ed Butterfield, Salt Lake City, 801.535.7254, edward.butterfield@slcgov.com
Please visit: www.shstreetcar.com
- Covered stations for wet weather
- Not just community gardens; community maintained landscaping.
- Open dirt up for community gardens. (Provide water, perhaps gardeners pay per gallon.)
- Rain, snow covered stations.
- Better passageway here. Two lines = moving transportation swiftly, concrete path for clear movement; bad weather day would not be utilized.
- Lots of redevelopment projects suggested. Are these necessary for success of project? What if these don't materialize or owners don't agree?
- Why not put the utilities underground as the first upgrade because other upgrades can be phased later as less cost?
- Parleys trail is essential!
- Create linear parks and community gardens along the corridor; activates the space, makes it safer and properties' more valuable.
- Connect station platforms with linear ped way (across tracks from parleys trail)
- How about garage access?
- Go with the basics to get it up and running and used. It can be made pretty later as funds come along. If people are hit with big costs up front they won't support it.
- Who maintains the weeds?
- What happens to power poles on the north side?
- Imbedded track is good, plazas are exciting ideas.
- Local parking needs will increase plan to cope?
- 2205 South 800 East- concerns about grading, tracks higher than driveways and sidewalks? What about the abandoned alley? Where are the property lines?
- Can we have our single family home eventually rezoned to open a small business/cafè next to the stop? What will SLC do about zoning incentives to change to small businesses in neighborhoods‘?
ARTIST IMPRESSION CORRIDOR-COMMENTS

- Paved pathways
- Community gardens in corridor would be a great way to partner in additional landscaping in a cost effective way.
- Community gardens in corridor.

CORRIDOR VISULATION- COMMENTS

- Please expand up to the 9th & 9th and 15th & 15th.
- Unpaved pathway is **NO GOOD** and will not be used; please pave the bike path.
- As many paved paths as possible.
- Shade/Shelter at stations. (Tress count)
- If upgrades can be phased in, why not do utilities underground first? It would be very expensive to do later, make that the first upgrade priority.
- Would prefer buried lines. What is the positive aspect?
- Use corridor for recreation; bike/ped trail, gold metal mile.
- Please use native vegetation. Transit + Water = Waste—Contradictory??
- Create incentives for developers to share cost of buying power lines, benefit to them.
- Will there be multi-use? Bike friendly in conjunction?
- Going all the way up to 2100 South, Parleys, and connect to Foothill.
- Practical, cost effective and great potential.
- Ped ways on both sides in all cases.

DESIGN ELEMENTS- WHAT IMPROVEMENTS DO YOU VALUE?

INFRASTRUCTURE

- Base Design- Power lines remain, no lighting = **1 dots**
- Upgrade- Pedestrian lighting (one dot) = **37 dots**
- Upgrade- Bury power lines (two dots) = **42 dots**
AMENITIES
- Base Design- Streetcar only = 2 dots
- Upgrade- Parleys Trail (one dot) = 41 dots
- Upgrade- Urban Plazas (two dots) = 43 dots

TRACK
- Base Design- Ballast= 6 dots
- Upgrade- Turf Track (one dot) = 8 dots
- Upgrade- Concrete embedded (two dots) = 26 dots

OPEN SPACE
- Base Design- Dirt + Existing vegetation= 0 dots
- Upgrade- Irrigated native landscape (one dot) = 36 dots
- Upgrade- Irrigated turf and gardens (two dots) = 21 dots
UTA PHASE 1
GRANT PROPOSAL

• 66-foot right-of-way
• Non-irrigated landscape
• Rail on ballast

UTA PHASE +
PRIVATE & PUBLIC INVESTMENT

• 66-foot right-of-way
• Minimal irrigated landscape (native)
• Higher landscape screening
• Informal pathway
• Rail on ballast with concrete curb

UTA + PRIVATE & PUBLIC INVESTMENT:
FINAL BUILD-OUT

• 66-foot right-of-way
• Full irrigated landscape
• Community garden space and informal landscape
• Buried power and utility lines
• Formal paved trail
• Rail on grass pavers with concrete curb

STREETCAR CORRIDOR @ 500 EAST
Final Build-out

Before

After

STREETCAR
South Salt Lake to Sugar House
STREETCAR CORRIDOR @ 300 EAST
Final Build-out

Before

After

VOTE HERE

- 66-foot right-of-way
- Non-irrigated landscape
- Standard UTA platform with minimum amenities
- Rail on ballast

- 66-foot right-of-way
- Minimal irrigated landscape (native)
- Station landmark columnar trees
- Informal pathway
- UTA platform with pavers, canopy, and amenities
- Embedded track

- 66-foot right-of-way
- Full irrigated landscape
- Transit-Oriented-Development
- Plaza
- Buried power and utility lines
- Formal paved trail
- Embedded track
Streetcar Development Marketplace

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

7:30 am - Corridor Tours (optional). Meet at Cucina Nassi to join a tour.

9:00 am - Convene at Cucina Nassi (2155 South Highland Drive, Salt Lake City)
for program and breakfast.

12:00 pm - Program adjourned

This event is free to invited attendees.

PLEASE rsvp to Edward Butterfield by Friday, July 15th.

801.535.7254
edward.butterfield@slcgov.com

ULI is pleased to partner with the Redevelopment Agency of Salt Lake City and
the City of South Salt Lake to offer an early look at the designs and
opportunities of the upcoming Sugar House Streetcar. The region was fortunate
to be awarded a federal transportation grant last year to construct this next
addition to our growing transit system. Work is underway on an expedited
schedule for a 2012 groundbreaking and 2014 opening day.

The line will run from the Central Pointe TRAX station to Sugar House, and
will feature at least seven stops along the two-mile route. Streetcar is
different from light rail and commuter rail in design, operations and
development potential. We look forward to this transit enriching the
neighborhood by expanding opportunities to live, work and play close to
downtown. The cities encourage new residential, commercial, retail and
entertainment projects and plan to invest in civic projects to complement
this.

Please join us for an invitation-only event designed to bring you up to speed
on the project, meet other key property owners and developers, and explore
specific station area development opportunities. The public sector has taken
the lead on planning the infrastructure element, but capitalizing on the
investment and building the community it will come from the private sector.

We hope you will participate in our first-ever "Street Car Marketplace" with
your enthusiasm, wisdom and ideas!

Click here to view the meeting agenda.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Type</th>
<th>RSVP Status</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
<th>Work Phone</th>
<th>Employer Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Private Member</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Stuart Adams</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Adams Company</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sa@theadamsco.com">sa@theadamsco.com</a></td>
<td>(801)546-6000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Private Member</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Richard L. Albrecht</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Albrecht</td>
<td>Lattice Properties, LC</td>
<td>Principal <a href="mailto:richard.albrecht1@gmail.com">richard.albrecht1@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(435)640-9898</td>
<td>Development Firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Leader</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Lee Archer</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Archer</td>
<td>Archer / Beck</td>
<td><a href="mailto:james.archer7@rsn.com">james.archer7@rsn.com</a></td>
<td>(801)486-1899</td>
<td>Development Firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Private Member</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Richard L. Albrecht</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Albrecht</td>
<td>Lattice Properties, LC</td>
<td>Principal <a href="mailto:richard.albrecht1@gmail.com">richard.albrecht1@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(435)640-9898</td>
<td>Development Firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Leader</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>David Bryce Baker</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Hamilton Partners</td>
<td>Development Manager <a href="mailto:dbaker@hamiltonpartners.com">dbaker@hamiltonpartners.com</a></td>
<td>(801)931-5531</td>
<td>Development Firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Leader</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Bruce Barrett</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>Beck</td>
<td>Beck Archer / Beck</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bbarrett@blackbear.com">bbarrett@blackbear.com</a></td>
<td>(801)557-8237</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Public Member</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Patrick Bienvenue</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Bienvenue</td>
<td>Leucadia Development Corporation</td>
<td>President <a href="mailto:beckjamesc@gmail.com">beckjamesc@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(801)521-1000</td>
<td>Development Firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Private Member</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Nathan Roger Boyer</td>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td>Boyer</td>
<td>The Boyer Company</td>
<td>Project Manager <a href="mailto:nboyer@boyercompany.com">nboyer@boyercompany.com</a></td>
<td>(801)300-1378</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Public Member</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Michael M. Brodsky</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Brodsky</td>
<td>Hamlet Development</td>
<td>President <a href="mailto:michael@hamilethomes.com">michael@hamilethomes.com</a></td>
<td>(801)281-2223</td>
<td>Development Firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Private Member</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Douglas A. Clark</td>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Fairpoint Capital LLC</td>
<td>Managing Director <a href="mailto:dclark@fairpointcapital.com">dclark@fairpointcapital.com</a></td>
<td>(801)949-6000</td>
<td>Development Firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Private Member</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Scott Collins</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Collins</td>
<td>Cottonwood Partners</td>
<td>CFO <a href="mailto:scollins@cottonwoodpartners.com">scollins@cottonwoodpartners.com</a></td>
<td>(801)365-6236</td>
<td>Development Firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Private Member</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Paul Dickamoore</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Dickamoore</td>
<td>Zellerbach</td>
<td>President <a href="mailto:beckjamesc@gmail.com">beckjamesc@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(801)974-4205</td>
<td>Development Firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Private Member</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Jeffrey Gochnour</td>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Gochnour</td>
<td>Cottonwood Partners</td>
<td>President-Development Services <a href="mailto:ygochnour@cottonwoodpartners.com">ygochnour@cottonwoodpartners.com</a></td>
<td>(801)365-6200</td>
<td>Development Firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Private Member</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Edward L. Grampp, Jr.</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Grampp</td>
<td>Anderson Geneva Development Inc.</td>
<td>Vice President and General Counsel <a href="mailto:egrampp@and-dev.com">egrampp@and-dev.com</a></td>
<td>(801)990-4914</td>
<td>Development Firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Private Member</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Brett Hansen</td>
<td>Brett</td>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td>Staker Company</td>
<td>Partner <a href="mailto:brett@stakercompany.com">brett@stakercompany.com</a></td>
<td>(801)-886-8388</td>
<td>Development Firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Private Member</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>James M. Hill</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>East West Partners</td>
<td>Partner <a href="mailto:jhill@ewpartners.com">jhill@ewpartners.com</a></td>
<td>(435)333-6504</td>
<td>Development Firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Private Member</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Jeffrey M. Horne</td>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>M. Horne</td>
<td>South Parc.</td>
<td>President <a href="mailto:jmhorne@email.com">jmhorne@email.com</a></td>
<td>(801)580-5800</td>
<td>Development Firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Private Member</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M. Thomas Jolley</td>
<td>M. Thomas</td>
<td>Jolley</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tom.mtjlaw@gmail.com">tom.mtjlaw@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>President (801)541-6102</td>
<td>Development Firm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Private Member</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Kim Kimball</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Kimball</td>
<td>Kibbali Distributing</td>
<td>President <a href="mailto:skimball@kimballinc.com">skimball@kimballinc.com</a></td>
<td>(801)466-0569</td>
<td>Development Firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Private Member</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Benjamin R. Magelsen</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Magelsen</td>
<td>Createrra, Inc.</td>
<td>President <a href="mailto:magelsen@createrra.net">magelsen@createrra.net</a></td>
<td>(801)938-8100</td>
<td>Development Firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Private Member</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Ben Massamino</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Massamino</td>
<td>Apartment developer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bmmassamino@gmail.com">bmmassamino@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Private Member</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Marc Miller</td>
<td>Marc</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Milligan Lotus Development</td>
<td>President <a href="mailto:marcmiller@lotusdevelopment.com">marcmiller@lotusdevelopment.com</a></td>
<td>(801)345-6085</td>
<td>Development Firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Leader</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Cory Robert Moore</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>Big-D Construction</td>
<td>Development Director <a href="mailto:cmoore@big-d.com">cmoore@big-d.com</a></td>
<td>(801)415-6085</td>
<td>Development Firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Leader</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Matthew Tyler Mullin</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Mullin</td>
<td>Ironwood Resort Development</td>
<td>Principal <a href="mailto:mmullin@ironwoodresorts.com">mmullin@ironwoodresorts.com</a></td>
<td>(435)940-0147</td>
<td>Development Firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Member</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Hank S Nelson</td>
<td>Hank</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>ROC Developments</td>
<td>President hanknelsong@com</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Private Member</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Ryan Peterson</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td>Peterson Development Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.b. July 20 Developers’ Forum- Invitation List**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Member Type</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Associate Private Member</td>
<td>Richman</td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Richman &amp; Associates Consulting</td>
<td>Christine Richen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:christine@richmanassociatesconsulting.com">christine@richmanassociatesconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>(801)883-9498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Full Private Member</td>
<td>Shine</td>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>Woodside Homes</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joels@woodside-homes.com">joels@woodside-homes.com</a></td>
<td>(801)299-6700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Associate Private Member</td>
<td>Shirzad</td>
<td>Ko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Full Private Member</td>
<td>Sleen</td>
<td>Desire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Associate Private Member</td>
<td>Wang</td>
<td>Shaoseng</td>
<td>American Hintech</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:sam@americanhintech.com">sam@americanhintech.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Full Private Member</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Cottonwood Partners</td>
<td>Chairman &amp; CEO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jwest@cottonwoodpartners.com">jwest@cottonwoodpartners.com</a></td>
<td>(801)365-6223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Full Private Member</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Cottonwood Partners</td>
<td>Senior Vice President</td>
<td><a href="mailto:west009@msn.com">west009@msn.com</a></td>
<td>(801)365-6227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Full Private Member</td>
<td>Whyte</td>
<td>W. Don</td>
<td>Kennecott Land</td>
<td>President</td>
<td><a href="mailto:don.whyte@riotinto.com">don.whyte@riotinto.com</a></td>
<td>(801)204-2789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Jeff Woodbury</td>
<td>Woodbury</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Woodbury Corp</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jeff_woodbury@woodburycorp.com">jeff_woodbury@woodburycorp.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Robin Hutcheson</td>
<td>Hutcheson</td>
<td>Robin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:r.hutcheson@felhrandpeers.com">r.hutcheson@felhrandpeers.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>D. J. Baxter</td>
<td>Baxter</td>
<td>Justin</td>
<td>ROA</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:DJ.baxter@slcgov.com">DJ.baxter@slcgov.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Justin Belliveau</td>
<td>Belliveau</td>
<td></td>
<td>ROA</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Justin.belliveau@slcgov.com">Justin.belliveau@slcgov.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Frank Gray</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td></td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>CEO Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:frankgray@slgov.com">frankgray@slgov.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Wayne Mills</td>
<td>Mills</td>
<td></td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Waynemills@slgov.com">Waynemills@slgov.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Ben Davis</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:benjamin.davis@slgov.com">benjamin.davis@slgov.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Wilford Sommerkorn</td>
<td>Sommerkorn</td>
<td>Wilford</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>Planning Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Wilford.sommerkorn@slgov.com">Wilford.sommerkorn@slgov.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Kathy Olson</td>
<td>Olson</td>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Olson@rideuta.com">Olson@rideuta.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Bruce Jones</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Brucejones@rideuta.com">Brucejones@rideuta.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Balint Jackson</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Balint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jackson@rideuta.com">Jackson@rideuta.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Larry Kogut</td>
<td>Kogut</td>
<td>Larry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Larrykogut@rideuta.com">Larrykogut@rideuta.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Nat Stull</td>
<td>Stull</td>
<td>Nat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Natstull@rideuta.com">Natstull@rideuta.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Steve Meyer</td>
<td>Meyer</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Smeyer@rideuta.com">Smeyer@rideuta.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Craig Mecham</td>
<td>Mecham</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Mecham Management</td>
<td>Developer/Property Owner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cmcham@aoel.com">cmcham@aoel.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Joe Ambrose</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jambrose@mac.com">jambrose@mac.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Dan Leipren</td>
<td>Leipren</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cowboy Partners</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dleipren@cowboy.com">dleipren@cowboy.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>John Thackeray</td>
<td>Thackeray</td>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ghart@itcompany.com">ghart@itcompany.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>John Gardiner</td>
<td>Gardiner</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Gardiner Properties</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:johngardiner1234@msn.com">johngardiner1234@msn.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Jake Boyer</td>
<td>Boyer</td>
<td>Jake</td>
<td>Boyer Company</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jboyer@bovercompany.com">jboyer@bovercompany.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Todd Olsen</td>
<td>Olsen</td>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>Dee's Incorporated</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tolsen@dees-inc.com">tolsen@dees-inc.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Wade Olsen</td>
<td>Olsen</td>
<td>Wade</td>
<td>Dee's Incorporated</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:welson@dees-inc.com">welson@dees-inc.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Jeff Vitek</td>
<td>Vitek</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Boulder Ventures Development</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jeff.vitek@buvdinc.com">jeff.vitek@buvdinc.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Mark Isaac</td>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Boulder Ventures Development</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mark.isaac@comcast.net">mark.isaac@comcast.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Russ Callister</td>
<td>Callister</td>
<td>Russ</td>
<td>Mecham Management</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Just use Craig Mecham's email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Aabir Malik</td>
<td>Malik</td>
<td>Aabir</td>
<td>Colmena Capital</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:abbir@colmenacapital.com">abbir@colmenacapital.com</a></td>
<td>(801)961-1121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Lance Bullen</td>
<td>Bullen</td>
<td>Lance</td>
<td>Colmena Capital</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lbullen@colmenacapital.com">lbullen@colmenacapital.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Dennis Pay</td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>SOL</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:dpay@sol.com">dpay@sol.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Tricia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Sharren Haun</td>
<td>Haun</td>
<td>Sharren</td>
<td>SOL</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:shaeun@sol.com">shaeun@sol.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Mclees Ulter</td>
<td>Ulter</td>
<td>Mclees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Ron Staker</td>
<td>Staker</td>
<td>Ron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Sherry Devoge</td>
<td>Devoge</td>
<td>Sherry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:sherrydevoge@boulderco.gov">sherrydevoge@boulderco.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Bill Rothman</td>
<td>Rothman</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Boulder Ventures Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Dustin Holt</td>
<td>Holt</td>
<td>Dustin</td>
<td>Boulder Ventures Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Edward Butterfield</td>
<td>Butterfield</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Don Marano</td>
<td>Marano</td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>BHI Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tour Only</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Brinkerhoff</td>
<td>Brinkerhoff property</td>
<td><a href="mailto:abrinkerhoff@brinkerhofflaw.com">abrinkerhoff@brinkerhofflaw.com</a></td>
<td>801-703-5240, 801-293-1006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alan T.</td>
<td>Alan T.</td>
<td>Brinkerhoff property</td>
<td><a href="mailto:abrinkerhoff@brinkerhofflaw.com">abrinkerhoff@brinkerhofflaw.com</a></td>
<td>801-703-5240, 801-293-1006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Tour Only</td>
<td>Randy Sant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:sant@southsaltlakecity.com">sant@southsaltlakecity.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Mike Florence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mflorence@southsaltlakecity.com">mflorence@southsaltlakecity.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Added by Sharen 7/8**
- **Info from Emily 7/12**
Group 1: Central Pointe

What do you like and dislike about the proposed design?

- Federal grants-proximity to transit gets funded
- Housing above commercial
- Daybreak Blvd has center running TRAX – look at this example
- Need to utilize empty parcels for redevelopment first.

What types of development is appropriate for this station?

- 4-5 types of housing- across the spectrum- 3-4 price points
- Need bodies
- Need walkable trail
- Entertainment
- Housing to serve the people who already live here
- Destination draw- concert, venues, park, entertainment
- 15 minutes to everywhere
- UTA should be happy with all of it
- Industrial- how do we start to talk to them

Outlook:

- Looking at TIGGER grant (Energy reduction + transit )
- Want a regional bike path plan
- concentrate on 6  catalytic sites from HUD Sustainable Communities grant
- Focus on complete streets instead of separated paths
  - $60 K per mile for bike lane separated from traffic with planters
  - $ 500 K to $1 million per mile for gGrade separated costs
  - Discuss at Monday meeting
  - Portland example
- Very positive benefit
- make it a neighborhood, not just a building plopped down
- HUD grant will help find funds for this
Group 2: 300 East – 500 East

What do you like and dislike about the proposed design?

Likes:

- Gives ability to build up
- Provides access to higher education
- Potential for larger neighborhood
- Transportation opportunities for residents (Trails & Transit)
- Breaks down barriers in the City and unites neighborhoods
- Needs to be built complete now (trail, stops, streetcar, linear park)

Dislikes

- Headways too short

What type of development is appropriate for this station?

- Critical Mass – preserve housing, restore density, newer uses at higher density, frequent stops
- Need to create a destination that people want to come to.
- Trail creates use and safety. Creates mobility.
- Boutique/ Mom & Pap establishments.
- Local businesses
- Cater to younger families

What is the role of the public sector is making sure development happens?

- How to make purchasing property and development profitable?
- Create pedestrian area. Ballasted track doesn’t lend itself to pedestrian friendly space (safety issues)
- **Need to be trail and streetcar at the same time
- Build a showcase area and show it can be successful. (Public and Private)
- Get money for the trail

What ideas do you have for financing this development?

- Funding has been a deterrent to financing in the past
- Assessment Area-Zone of benefit
- TDR - Transfer of development rights
  - Purchase density
  - Work when there is a demand for density
  - Property owners trade density rights
- Can we capture monies from zoning changes
What is your outlook on transit-oriented development?

- Unifies the City; breaks down physical barriers that currently exist.
- Draws people to rail line
- Need to have frequent stops and joint transportation modes.
Group 3: 500 East to 900 East

Facilitators: Wayne and Ben (SLC)
Participants: Owners and developer of properties adjacent to 700 East station

What do you like and dislike about the proposed design?

- 700 East station- like it West of 700 East
- Open ped access vs. designated ped crossing for safety
- Extend station area (700 east station) to 2100 South.
- Trader Joe’s and Megaplex → 600-700 East around 700 East station
- Granite Development – Bruce Barrett.
- Max 10 stories → step up from surrounding residential → 4 stories
  - Will not exclude vehicular access
  - Would like to have a big plaza with inlaid track/ underground centenary
  - Parking garage- want to create an easy parking experience
- 500 East station- agree that station should be anchored in residential
- Look at adding a station at 800 East → to serve the residential neighborhood.

What is the role of the public sector in making sure development happens?

- Reduce entitlement costs!
- TOD zoning/ height flexibility
Group 4: Sugar House

What do you like and dislike about the proposed design?
• UTA accommodate development, identify funding
• Current stop is a road to nowhere. People don’t want to look at back of Granite block
• Inviting
• Closer to Highland
• Multiple stops in business districts
• Leave McClelland
• End is not a catalyst

What types of development is appropriate for this station?
• Service, retail, office, and residential.
• 3-7 stories
• Density change as streetcar is running → denser later. Increased ridership → increase height and density.
• Employment Center. Not a headquarters.
• Parking → can you develop accordingly → Retailers demand parking; may limit type of development.
• Initial projects will need parking. Underground is expensive.
• 30-40% gives up a car.
• Retail stays intense office

What is the role of the public sector is making sure development happens?
• Parking meters to price on- Street parking to its true value.
• Taxing a lead in development- A parking plan for the area. Take into account the evolution of the area.
• Buying the power lines
• Public space plan → Linkage among plazas
• 2.6 spaces per 1000, good for office(Craig M.)

What ideas do you have for financing this development?
• Most difficult to finance infrastructures’ and parking.
• Extend the RDA
• SAA → List them and as a group decide → streetscaping
  ✓ Lighting
  ✓ Traffic calming
What is your outlook on transit-oriented development?

- It is the FUTURE.
- See lots of examples of success stories.
- Critical mass → completion helps everyone.
- 2000 units better.

- Shade
- Boys and girls club as potential development.

Robin Hutcheson notes

- Inviting entry point to Sugar House
- Incentivize the development; incentivize the ridership
- Fairmont underutilized
- Retail/ some retail/ residential mix
- could be increased height/ density buying what we consider now
- Parking
  ✓ can you impact on/of parking
  ✓ density- must have parking
  ✓ retailers want parking
  ✓ retail demand is intense/office
  ✓ parking garage
  ✓ rethink: pricing, centralized

- 222 parked 2 per 1, on selling point is TRAX
- Paid parking in Sugar House?
- Parking plan/district
- Evolution in parking
- Financing- public mechanism
  ✓ Infrastructure
  ✓ Parking
  ✓ Extend timeline

- PPD
  ✓ CDA
  ✓ Assessments-must be a cost benefit analysis
  ✓ List priorities

- What maximizes
  ✓ Trees
  ✓ Traffic calming
✓ Lighting
  • Parking plan-public spaces

TOD
  • New, still figuring out if successful
  • Cautiously Optimistic
  • Sooner you can get 2000 units the better
  • Coordination is essential
  • Market should dictate
5. Comments from Community Events

Sugar House Streetcar
Outreach at Freedom Festival July 2, 2011

Showed people the three boards explaining the project. Explained the phasing and what is included in phase one. Explained the connection across the valley. About ⅓ of people from SSL, some from Sugar House, some from Sandy, WVC, other areas. About 50% aware, 10% very aware of project.

Talked to about 50 people directly, about another 50 people looked at boards, but didn’t want to comment. Collected 9 names who wanted further information.

Major comments:
- Support project (all but one person expressed support)
- Willing to raise taxes for additional landscaping and trail
- Very interested in the trail
- Development is great – get people back into the city
- Is this the best choice for transit here? Versus bus or train

Other comments
- Don’t like sharing the train with the road
- Don’t want taxes raised – this city is too poor
- Is this a necessity? Don’t want to get ahead of ourselves
- Moved to be close to this transit – very interested in this project

Sugar House Streetcar Outreach at Sugar House Street Fair July 4, 2011

Maria Vyas, Fehr & Peers

1. Key themes: excitement about Phase 1, glad that something is finally being done with the corridor, some confusion over what it was and whether it was really going to happen.
2. I probably talked to about 30 people.
3. Level of support for project was high. I would say most were in favor, a few were indifferent, and only one person do I recall being decisively against the project. (“I want SOUTH SALT LAKE people to stay in SOUTH SALT LAKE! I don’t want them coming OVER HERE!”)(heaven forbid).

Julie Bjornstad, Fehr & Peers

There was a lot of interest in the project. The overwhelming response was very positive. They thought it was great it connected to TRAX, did not run along 2100 South, and came all the way to Sugar House. People did express disappointment that construction and completion were a few years away. Oddly
enough, a few people thought construction had already started. People also expressed support for extending the streetcar further into Sugar House, for instance to Wilmington Gardens.

Some people had confusion if we were proposing the project or if it was actually going to be built. One person told me he heard the whole thing was being cancelled. There was also confusion as to where the project would start and stop. A number of people did not know it would connect to the TRAX station and a few people thought it would go all the way to the Jordan River Parkway.

There was not any one would responded negatively to the project itself. One person told me he thought we shouldn’t use brick crosswalks because buses can crush bricks. This was a result of misunderstanding the future mockup (Parley’s Trail is red for effect, but he thought it was brick). People were very excited about the addition of a Safeway, and some were noticeably disappointed when I told them it was just a simulation.

The booth attracted a lot of people. It’s hard to estimate how many people stopped at the booth because many people read the boards a few feet away from the booth. People also gathered in clusters and would listen to what I was telling someone else without actually talking to me. Given these stipulations, I think I probably had a conversation with roughly 50 people.

Helen M. Peters, Sugar House Community Council

What I heard . . . people are excited by the SH Streetcar. Individuals who live on the corridor want to know how their property will be separated from the corridor.

I talked to a lot of people -- it was busy between 12:00 Noon and 2:00 pm I handed out a lot of Open House flyers.

Level of support of the project was very high. -- probably only had one or two individuals who focused on the negative -- graffiti and public subsidy of transit.

Nick Norris, SLC Planning Division

Just wanted to give you an update on my 2 hours at the streetcar booth yesterday; lots of people had general questions about the alignment, where the stops were. Most people were willing to take a flyer, but did not want to sign up for the email thing. I only spoke with 2 people who were opposed, but they seemed to understand that it was coming. There were a lot of questions about when construction would start, how long it would take, etc. I estimated that I talked to about 75-100 people in the 2 hours I was there and probably handed out about 50 flyers. No one was really interested in putting sticky notes on the boards. The renderings were pretty good, but as usual people have a hard time grasping that they are concepts.
Notes from the SHCC POST, LU/Z and Transportation Committee meetings
August 15, 2011

POST Committee notes:

Follow-up discussion about tennis courts at Fairmont, and future of community garden. Sent message to Mayor, brought it to attention of Leslie Chan. Chan said two of the acceptable uses for Open Space funds are trails and community gardens. She will come to the next POST meeting to talk about this. Want to look at the DI/Fire Station property as site for Parley’s Trail and for community garden.

One alignment proposed for Parley’s Trail would pass through the DI property, pass east through the Olsen property, then bend north to Hidden Hollow.

Rawlins: the 1985 Master Plan proposed extending Sugarmont to Simpson Avenue. The RDA proposed making that connection between Sugarmont and Wilmington. The benefit of using Simpson is that it isn’t as steep going up to 1300 East as Wilmington is. (Attach graphic from MP.)

Discussion of Circulation and Alternative Alignments

Trail connections: Parley’s Trail

Opportunities and Constraints:

Parley’s Trail could depart from street and streetcar alignment and pass through the Fire Station block. DI vacant, but Fire Station and SHBD maintenance building is still there. Fire Dept. reps say building won’t be replaced for at least five years; existing bldg being remodeled instead.

If Sugarmont connects to Wilmington through the Granite block across the Zion’s Bank corner, the RDA needs to make sure that the improved street is wide enough to accommodate Parley’s Trail as well as the streetcar, and sidewalks on both sides of the street.

Assuming that Sugarmont connects to Wilmington, Rawlins suggests that the 1100 E. segment that arcs around the NE corner of Fairmont Park be closed, and
the block that is circled by Highland, 11th, Ashton & Simpson be a loop. Fire trucks can still come out on Simpson. Worry about a cruising circle at Fairmont Park?

He suggests that surplused streets like Simpson be restored through large blocks to increase circulation in the Business District. The Dee’s Corp. is going to redevelop the block (Darlene Batatian, Mountain Lands Dev Srvcs, said they had subdivided the property for collateralization purposes.) Some of the buildings in the Sugar House Shopping Center could come down to allow for redevelopment around the new connections, and open corridors along the alignments of Elizabeth, 1200 E. and Douglas streets should be introduced into the redevelopment plans.

Rawlins wants the trail to connect to Hidden Hollow in two places, east of BB&B and east of the new Woodbury project on Wilmington. After reaching Hidden Hollow, Parley’s Trail could pass north along existing walkway, then exit north on 1200 East alignment, cross at new light, connect to College.

Helen wants to create a new bicycle intermodal hub where the two trails intersect and the streetcar passes by. Could be where the DI was. Makes more sense than community garden at that location. Sally, could be a market spot, sell flowers, produce, and artisan breads.

Sally: Why can’t garden stay where it is, since the tennis courts may never be converted back to regulation size tennis courts? Irrigation ditch limits their size. Ron: Maybe courts could be big enough if they were turned 90°. Helen: Could stay as garden as well as have community market there. Or community gardens could go back where the parking is in the south east corner. That part of the park is isolated, new use could prevent problems there. Emil: But current location for community garden has better sun.

Larry: On Fairmont tennis courts….consider two courts in the park. The current location is too hot, noisy and dry. There is room in the park and lighting could be good for security and more usage.

Rawlins: Think of Fairmont Park as a community park, with services that community parks provide. Stop cannibalizing it. How many other community parks have community gardens in them. Need to acquire more land for additional uses, such as community garden.

Helen: Cross the two trails where the DI is, make that an intermodal hub. Streetcar, trail, transit and bike, Saturday market could all be located there. Design the building so it could be a market. Or it could be on the north side of Sugarmont at Highland, where Zion’s Bank is now located.
If the streetcar station were moved from McClelland to Highland, that would be ideal. Judi: Master Plan calls for Highland Dr. to be the terminus of the streetcar.

Could use the old Park City line, put the station at that alignment. Natural opening through the buildings. Put a line through the Sugar House Shopping Center from Wilmington to Simpson, Highland to 1300 East. Cut that block into fourths. Then you have more retail, four sides on each fourth. Or sixths, with corridors on the 12th E. and Douglas Street alignments.

On Granite Block, use the Brickyard spur curve, and the canal alignment to divide the block into smaller quadrants. Make that block like the River Walk. Put the canal trail along the Brickyard Spur north of Ashton, through the parking lot.

Sugarmont/Wilmington realignment or Sugarmont/Simpson: which has the better chance of happening? Look at old master plan and realign Wilmington rather than Sugarmont. Putting the new street at a right angle to Highland Dr. makes it easier for automobiles.

Establish a community gathering place. Woodbury planning a community plaza at the new development south of Hidden Hollow. Close the Monument street and enlarge the Monument plaza. (See graphic from 1985 MP, p.15.)

Would lose parking for Cobwebs and barber shop. Employee parking is just paved area south of Rockwood, with access over property that belongs to Mecham. Need public parking on Granite block.

Like having PRATT Trail separate from the street.

Would prefer to have cars on street, trails on a separate path. What if the Shopko block were re-developed like Gateway, with high density residential, market rate as well as affordable, with something like an outdoor mall, lifestyle mall, pedestrian-only streets. Need a parking structure there, too.

City Center development took ten-acre blocks and turned them into four separate blocks (1 – 1 ½ acre ea). Use Gateway as the example for the Shopko block, and would have the density that you want. City Center will be fun, exciting.

One thing we don’t have in SH is a 500-seat theater, like the black-box or the studio theater at the Rose Wagner. Nice to have some cultural uses in this mix.
Maybe the old Deseret Industries building could be used. Could be a 200-seat theater. Great spot. Building built in fifties, probably could be gutted. Could have an arts cinema or Sundance theater here. Move the intermodal hub, make that site the cultural center for the Business District. Would attract other new businesses, restaurants, etc.

These ideas allow for intermodal hub, auto-separated trails, smaller blocks.

If the streetcar comes east, where do we want it to come out on Thirteenth East? Straight shot up Simpson or Park City line?

Land Use/Zoning and Transportation Committees:

Where do you want to go on the streetcar and what do you want to do when you get there? Based on comments from open houses and stakeholder meetings, the alignment alternatives are heading north, south, or east.

Evaluate the alternatives according to the questions provided by F&P.

A lot of people want it to go to 9th South. From the current terminus at McClelland, going north on 1100 E goes near Westminster College. Do we want it to go up all the way to Sunnyside?

The eastern route would take 2100 South to 21st or 23rd East. Would have the opportunity to collect riders from the neighborhood north of 21st, and convey them to the TRAX line. In October, when the bus starts going to Park City, it will stop on Parley’s and Foothill. Larry liked going up 21st South to Fifteenth East, going past Garfield School, and hitting 15th & 15th. It’s a nice, wide street. Then it could go on to the University.

If the streetcar is going to go wherever the street goes, then we could extend Sugarmont to Simpson and go up to 1300 East.

Want to find opportunities for housing, workplaces near transit, in order to create demand and justify expense of constructing transit lines. There are several new Housing developments planned in SHBD, Woodbury’s and Gardiner’s. Also Rinaldo Hunt has new project on 21st South.

Emigration Creek blocks 1700 East connection, but 13th 15th and 19th East go through to Sunnyside, and you don’t have to build a bridge across the creek.

The south route connects to Millcreek, where bus routes head west.

How do we serve the Highland Park neighborhood? UTA could have a circulator run through that neighborhood, which could deliver people to the streetcar. Scott mentioned an article in the paper about the impact of TRAX, and the ability of
UTA to provide a neighborhood bus system. Rawlins: Need a larger investment in citywide transit. Lynne: Make the point that it’s important to build the streetcar now, the bus routes will follow. Once the streetcar is running, it will generate the demand for a greater circulation system that will hook up to it.

Where are the public facilities that people want to access? Library, Highland HS, the Monument, Aquatic Center and Fairmont Park, Sugar House Park, Westminster College, Garfield School, Wasatch Hollow, commercial node on 15th & 15th, Foothill Village, Research Park, the University & University hospital.

What are chances that TRAX could extend down Foothill? Bus will go from University to Park City in October.

The I-80 freeway is huge divider. Highland Drive is one way to cross it. 1700 East is another.

Question about how well Brickyard is doing; does it need help? Looks like spaces on south side are rented. Canal Trail will connect to Brickyard. Motorists use Highland Drive north and south from the SHBD a lot. Not far from Westminster. Makes sense to connect business nodes.

Love to see Highland Drive closed off down to the freeway, and have streetcar only. Second choice is to have streetcar share the road with cars. Divert cars to 1300 E and 900 East. But don’t think 13th could handle it.

We need an internal circulation system in the SH business district. Regardless of where the terminus of the trolley is, if your purpose is to move people to the University, you could use 900 E., which goes all the way to TRAX on 400 S.

TRAX is a transportation system, getting you from one destination to another. But the streetcar is a pedestrian trip extender. If that’s its purpose, then just route the streetcar around the business district, and forget taking people to the University.

Look at loops, through the Sugar House shopping center, to make an internal circulator. But people who get off on Sugar will not walk to the post office. So bring it up to 21st South. Or what if you bring it up to 1700 South?

Don’t want to just help people get to the University. Want to support our district. Take the loop up Highland Drive to 21st, then east to 15th; north to 17th S., then west to 11th Ea. and back to Sugarmont. Alternate could be west to 9th East, then back to Sugarmont. Serves the Sugar House Park and the high school. This is reinventing the Salt Lake Trolley. Will get push back from 1500 East residents.

Does this support existing businesses and residents? Provide addition convenience for employees, students and residents? Yes, better than any other route. Would get support from Westminster College, Woodbury, Mecham and Olsen’s, Gardiner and Hunt. Would connect to both trails. Might reduce auto use
among Westminster students, alleviate some of the objections of Westminster neighbors to the College’s plan to impose a parking fee. They fear that students will just park in the neighborhood. This works as a people mover, connects residents with the commercial area and could receive sting (perhaps financial support) from Westminster because it is safe and connects their campus with their new properties at Garfield School and campus with SH residential project.

Phase One needs to end at Highland. Use RDA funds to make that happen, and talk to City Council members and candidates about that. Doesn’t try to move people too far on a slow train, brings a lot of residential into the loop, improves circulation through the most congested area.

DI becomes a bike/ped intermodal hub, with a community market. With some mid-block crosswalks. If we can get the trolley to go to Highland, then it becomes urgent for the City to buy the DI parcel now. Use RDA money to do that and build the intermodal hub. Consider putting shuttles around the CBD similar to what is used at the U of U, perhaps electric or NG powered.

Look at the route for the canal trail again, and figure how it should intersect Parley’s Trail and the streetcar route. Larry asked about the actual route of the canal. The canal intersects the Granite block in a good location for an internal pedestrian pathway. A mid-block walkway could still be built, but would stop at the south line of the Johnson’s property. Then, someday, it might be able to put it the rest of the way through. In the meantime, the pathway provides extra retail frontage for Mecham and for Boulder Ventures.

Larry: to get away from all the conflicts on the Granite block, take the canal trail west from Highland on Simpson or Sugarmont, then north on McClelland. Lynne is concerned about conflicts with autos accessing the Mecham, Johnson and Vitek properties at the Elm Street entrance on McClelland, and parking on-street to go to the shops north of the Granite parking lot. Judi has a problem with narrow sidewalk on McClelland. Not wide enough as is, much less for a trail and a bike lane.

Question about entrance on Highland to Mecham’s development. Fine print of planning commission approval, engineer recommended eliminating the crosswalk on Highland. We still want a crosswalk across Highland by the library. Larry asked how trail users could cross 2100 South if the trail were located mid-block.

More discussion about Sugarmont and Wilmington realignment. Avoid the curvy connection; start farther back from Highland Drive and make the connection a straight line that intersects Highland at a right angle. Check the Wikstrom Report, and find a place for the high-density housing overlooking the park that is recommended in the Master Plan update.
If the streetcar goes straight east across Highland, the DI block could be the site of the intermodal hub. Or it could be on the south east corner of the Mecham property if Zion’s Bank is relocated to another location on Highland Drive.

The block south of the DI/fire station property could also be redeveloped.

Discussion about whether Sugarmont should connect to Wilmington or Simpson. If the streetcar goes up Highland, would the steep grade on Wilmington be irrelevant, since it would only be used by autos, pedestrians, and bikes?

Must get Phase 1 to terminate at Highland. Get the RDA to help pay for that, and assess developers to pitch in.

Group made these specific recommendations:

- Close the Monument Street.
- Phase 1 Streetcar must go to Highland.
- Phase 2 Streetcar system should be a Loop, Highland to 21st, east to 15th, north to 1700 East, west to 13th, 11th or 9th, then south to Sugarmont.
- Re-insert (auto or pedestrian) street system into the new developments to break up the big blocks.
Sugar House Streetcar

What would you like to see in the streetcar corridor?

Public comments as of November 3, 2011, 2:00 PM

All Participants around Salt Lake City

As with any public comment process, participation in Open City Hall is voluntary. The statements in this record are not necessarily representative of the whole population, nor do they reflect the opinions of any government agency or elected officials.
Sugar House Streetcar

What would you like to see in the streetcar corridor?

Introduction

Mayor Becker has made the return of the streetcar to Salt Lake City a priority and Sugar House is where it all begins!
Sugar House Streetcar

What would you like to see in the streetcar corridor?

As of November 3, 2011, 2:00 PM, this forum had:

Attendees: 279
Participants around Salt Lake City: 25
Hours of Public Comment: 1.3
Sugar House Streetcar

All Participants around Salt Lake City

Heather Hendriksen in District 7
August 25, 2011, 4:17 PM
I live between 700 E and 900 E. Where will the stop be for 700 E? On the west side or the east side? Will there be a traffic light, cross walk, or sky walk in the plans for 700 E? There are many people who jay-walk near Simpson Ave in order to cross 700 E and I can only imagine that there will be more of this once the street car is finished.

Jahn Barlow in District 3
August 15, 2011, 5:04 PM
As a former Sugar House resident, now living in the Avenues, I am jealous. This is going to be a real asset to the east-west corridor, especially since the streetcar will not be competing with vehicle traffic as much as the 400 South University TRAX line. I agree with others, it would be cool to see the street car connect to Sugar House Park and Highland High - or better yet all the way to Parleys Way and the new Wal-Mart. Eventually, a new Trax line could run from the University along Foothill and connect to the Sugar House streetcar on Parleys, thus making a full public transit loop around the east side of the city. Maybe the city should negotiate a deal with Wal-Mart to incorporate the streetcar line into their design in exchange for letting them tear down the old K-Mart building and build a new one like they want. If we're going to have a new Wal-Mart, it would be cool if it were as environmentally friendly as possible. Public transit should be a part of that.

Name not shown in District 6
August 2, 2011, 6:07 PM
I am, overall, very excited about the prospect of a street car in the Sugarhouse business area. It would be terrific to be able to easily access different areas of the district without driving. We currently ride our bikes and walk, and I would very much like to see a project that incorporates and improves both pedestrian and cycling traffic. We are east of 2100 South, so for us, access would be primarily within the area between Granite Block and Central Point, including transferring to other trax lines. We will still use our bikes and walk between 1500 East and Granite Block. As such, we're very excited about the trail creating access from Sugarhouse Park to the west side of 2100 South and that shopping/entertainment area-- without having to cross the surface street at 2100 South.

In reading previous comments, I've noted that some have expressed interest in an extension of the line northward on 1500 East. I absolutely OPPOSE any such extension. 1500 East between 2100 South and 1300 South is for many families and children the primary (if not the only) route to schools in the neighborhood.

My children and many others, must cross 1500 East to get to school no matter what school they attend. Adding a street car line to cross would exponentially increase the safety hazard of the road. 1500 East is in the heart of a number of neighborhoods and I do not believe it is appropriate to have a line running right in front of the homes where children, families, and pets are at play and where kids of all ages must use and cross the street to access their schools.

The line is going to be a fantastic addition to the business district and we look forward to the development it will bring to the area. Our car is used very little around town, and with a streetcar line, we'll need to use it even less. The currently proposed line-- at least from what limited detail is available from the map-- seems like a well suited location, providing access to businesses, parks,
recreation, and entertainment, with (hopefully) minimal disturbance to neighborhoods.

Name not shown in District 7  
June 20, 2011, 11:37 AM

The streetcar will be an great asset to the Sugar House business district and the residential neighborhoods around it. The public investment will be returned many times over by the increase in private business investment. Developers know that more people will be moving into the neighborhood because of the permanent transit system, which they can rely on for decades. Bus routes change all the time, but with UTA and the City making this serious commitment for the streetcar, investors can be assured that the streetcar service will be here for the long-term, long enough to justify new residential and commercial developments in the area.

I want to see a beautiful trail alongside the streetcar; new housing; convenient, safe and accessible connections to intersecting sidewalks, bike paths, and streets; street furniture, lighting, and amenities that make it attractive, safe, and pleasant to use at all hours, every day of the week.

Ross Chambless in District 3  
May 27, 2011, 4:14 PM

I am very supportive of the proposed streetcar for the same reasons that others have mentioned here. In addition, I simply see this as smart planning for the future. Future generations will thank us for having some foresight (something that's often lacking in our society) in regard to energy and mobility in the future. We have lost our cultural knowledge of streetcars since they passed several generations ago, so we have lots of questions. But I don't see gasoline prices getting any cheaper. Along with impending carbon regulations, fossil fuel options will be diminished in the future. And as our population grows urbanites like myself will look for accessible and reliable modes for getting around. I think streetcar lines, if planned carefully, could bring multiple benefits to our communities.

I think the proposed streetcar "pilot" for the existing passage area of Sugar House makes a lot of sense. I'd like to see lots of public areas around the line, so that neighborhoods have room to flourish around the line corridor. And these corridors should also be designed safely for pedestrians or bicyclists.

Ashley Eddington Hoopes in District 6  
May 25, 2011, 10:19 AM

I am in favor of the street car but I wish that it would extend up 21st south, have a stop at Sugarhouse park, and then head north along 15th East. The university neighborhoods of Wasatch Hollow and Yalecrest would love to have the street car return to their area, and would support it en mass. To have the streetcar pass the 15th and 15th business district, and then head east on 15th and 13th to pass the 13th and 17th business district would be fantastic. It could continue all the way up to Foothill where it would make sense to have a line heading to the new Natural History Museum and Red Butte Gardens. The fact that streetcars used to wind through out the Salt Lake City neighborhoods shows that it can be successful. People are ready to ditch their cars, connect with their neighborhoods, and get on the street cars! Thanks Mayor Becker!!

Name not shown in District 3  
May 24, 2011, 10:24 AM

Suggest you title the artist's rendering 2175(?) South 800 East.
Please reconsider the use of ballast (crushed stone) for the railway base. It is difficult to walk or bike on or near. Its best attribute, I suppose, is that it is cheap.

Please educate us all on the safety aspects of streetcars coexisting on the same right-of-way as pedestrians and automobiles. That is how it was designed in the early 1900s. What are the streetcar speeds? I hope we can avoid chain link fences cutting the streetcar off from the rest of the world in this 3-mile section. After all, we don't fence in all of our streets to keep pedestrians and bicycles away from traffic. How is this different?

Living as I do east of 2300 East, I hope to see this streetcar line extended at least to 2300 East. Currently the 21 bus is a 20 minute walk away for my neighbors and me. It was only 5 minutes prior to the route change, which is much more reasonable.

Jack Matheson in District 3
May 19, 2011, 3:45 PM
• What would you like to see in the streetcar corridor?

It would be awesome if we could daylight Parley's Creek after Hidden Hollow and run it down this corridor!!!

• What do you think about the potential changes?

Very excited to be able to access Sugarhouse via rail! I hope Bike and Pedestrian Networks will be well accommodated in this corridor as well.

• How you think you will use this corridor in the future?

I will ride the Streetcar, Walk down the sidewalks, and ride my bike. Hopefully along Parley's Creek.

John Wilkes in District 5
May 19, 2011, 11:06 AM
There have been many failures and bad decisions concerning Sugarhouse recently. This could revive the area again, if it is handled properly.

What solutions are being considered to ensure the very heavy auto traffic already in the area will not become a larger problem? I'd like to think people would reduce their driving, but that seems idealistic. How about designating the entire corridor area as pedestrian only, kind of like a park? In fact, if the streetcar line was extended to the Sugarhouse Park area, that could reduce the unsavory type of traffic that enters the park. In any case, having the streetcar go to the park seems sensible instead of ending at 11th East (if I'm reading the map correctly).

I always enjoyed the off track, old-fashioned trolley cars that used to run from Trolley Square to the downtown hotels. I never understood why they were eliminated. Anything that reduces traffic and pollution is a great idea.
As a Sugar House resident I have been in favor of this idea for a long time. The current corridor is wasted space and does nothing to enhance our community. I envision using this street car to get to work and downtown to avoid traffic and parking hassles. The big questions to me as a very near resident of the business district is the holistic approach to getting people into Sugar House via the streetcar. Currently we have nearly impossible roads to cross of 2100 S, 1100 E, and 1300 E. Unless you are at a major intersection it is extremely dangerous to cross the street. We need safer crosswalks, we need a better pedestrian circulation system in the business district that doesn't encourage people to drive from each development pad as currently happens. It doesn't do any good to create a pedestrian oriented business district when it's down right dangerous to be a pedestrian. We need to rethink how traffic goes along 2100 S and perhaps mirror the improvements done on 1300 E that created a dedicated turn lane in the middle and allows traffic to flow on either side more smoothly. It is no surprise that traffic along 2100 S between 700 E- 1300 E is an absolute nightmare.

I am very excited about the streetcar!

Matthew Kirkegaard in District 6

I very much support the streetcar as currently planned. In fact I support it to such an extent that I do not believe the current plan goes far enough. The city ought to have streetcars all around the city especially jutting off of Trax lines to reach areas untouched by much public transportation such as the 9th and 9th district or up either 3300 S or 3900 S. In terms of the Sugar House line, I would even like to see it extend just a bit farther to at least Highland Drive. I would hope there will be accommodations for bikes on the streetcar itself, so that riders may bike to and from the line.

The leaders of Salt Lake City should be applauded for this great move towards mobility and sustainability, especially Mayor Becker. As an environmentalist, it is inspiring to finally see efficacious environmental efforts on a city wide scale for the benefit of the citizens of Salt Lake.

Adam Holmes in District 7

Extend the proposed streetcar terminus at least to Highland Dr. This will make the streetcar more visible to everyone and reduces the walking time to current businesses in the area. People who shop have bags and don't want to carry them very far. Extend into Sugarmont Dr, if needed. I highly support this project as it uses an existing transportation corridor and could revitalize properties along the route. This will also speed up the construction of the PRATT walking trail along the corridor, another benefit to the region.

Name not shown in District 5

Every day at certain times I see a Trax train with 2-4 cars going up or down 400/500 South with only a scattering of passengers. Looks great though. The Sugarhouse streetcar will likely be another pretty addition to the ambience of Salt Lake but will not provide much benefit because few will use it. The majority of shoppers in Sugarhouse live in Sugarhouse and must therefore drive south, north or west to the stores. Very few will come from a connection through Trax. And if it really does result in an influx of businesses and new housing units, congestion on 2100 South will only increase. And the artist's rendition shows pedestrians and a pretty red train peacefully co-existing, but the reality is that...
kids and others will be at greater risk of being crushed. Another reality of Trax is that it creates an almost impenetrable barrier to both cars and pedestrians, which will reduce walkability.

I like the concept, but the benefits will not equal the costs, both initial and ongoing.

Glen Elkins in District 5
May 17, 2011, 9:04 PM

It seems many people are thinking 21st South per se, when the route is actually a bit south of 21st South. I don’t see it requiring little if any demolition; the rail corridor already exists.
I support the concept, and hope there would cafes and shops along the route with wide sidewalks and outdoor dining.
I would hope that passengers could get on and off along the route using one ticket ... it would encourage use and promote commerce.
I’m on board!

Name not shown in District 5
May 17, 2011, 5:29 PM

I’m excited to expand the rail system. I haven’t really seen the kind of transit oriented urban infill development that is described in the plan, though. For example, it seems like 400 S. is all full of surface parking lots and strip malls despite easy access by rail. Sugar House has been having issues with unwanted strip-mall type development.

In general I like rail better than buses because the bus routes keep changing and the rail stays where it is. The proposed streetcar doesn't really substitute for the existing 21 bus line which connects Sugar House to the U of U and is also used by Highland High School students. If the 2 mile rail line eliminates the existing 17 and/or 21 routes it’s going to become a lot harder for Sugar House/ Liberty Wells transit riders to get to the University of Utah.

Some of the nodes shown on the map (Salt Lake Community College, Columbus Center, Sugar House Park) aren’t very walkable from the proposed rail line, especially at night.

The pedestrian/bike linkage between the Sugar House Business District and Sugar House Park should be improved and perhaps that could be part of this project.

I like the idea of having a bike path in the transit corridor since East/West biking presents some difficulties in the Sugar House area. The bike route going south along 600 E kind of dead ends at 21st S since there is no traffic light, though.

Name not shown in District 3
May 17, 2011, 4:39 PM

I hoped this corridor would eventually be used for a future high-speed rail to Park City and Denver...

Matthew Gray outside Salt Lake City
May 17, 2011, 4:06 PM
I am very supportive of the Sugar House Streetcar Line. Not only would it help to relieve congestion along 2100 South, but it would also be a major incentive for economic development in the area. I think it would be great to have a pedestrian and bike path running parallel to the streetcar line, as I have seen in renderings of the project. The streetcar, accompanied by a pedestrian/bicycle pathway would greatly encourage pedestrian-oriented development and a greener and healthier lifestyle.

Julie van der Wekken outside Salt Lake City
May 17, 2011, 3:56 PM

I've been excited about this project since first hearing about it 3 years ago. We live just south of Sugarhouse (across from Nibley Golf Course in an unincorporated area of Salt Lake), and would definitely frequent the streetcar if indeed it is established. We frequent the area often, but it is just a bit too far to be within walking distance for us. If the streetcar is established we would be within walking distance to one of the stops along the route. I'm hoping this project will focus on local businesses and in getting more local shops established along and within walking distance of the route. I also hope that open space will also be a big consideration in regards to this project. That could include park space, community gardens and walking paths among other things.

Name not shown in District 3
May 17, 2011, 3:00 PM

I see a lot of concerns around cost and "subsidies." Do our highways and roadways pay for themselves? No. They are all funded through taxpayer dollars. Why the big concern around public transportation being subsidized? The idea of returning the streetcar to Salt Lake City is very forward thinking. Gas is slowly getting more and more unaffordable over time and I'll be pleased that city leaders saw this coming and have alternatives ready to go when most of us get to the point of losing our cars because of the expense.

Many areas along the corridor are ripe for development so don't assume that a large swath of single family homes is going to be razed - that's simply not economically feasible for the city or for a developer to do. Go down to the area and take a look at where the streetcar will be and you'll see that there's more than enough space to redevelop.

Joseph Doubek in District 7
May 17, 2011, 2:35 PM

What will this cost the taxpayers? We are currently paying some unknown level of subsidy for every ticket UTA sells. How much does it cost to provide a ride on the buses or light rail? Two times the amount the ticket costs ... or maybe three times.... or maybe more? Let's require UTA to tell us what their current costs are before we commit to adding additional costs to the tax paying public. And then, before heading down the street car path, lets have an honest discussion about cost and funding. Where will the money come from to obtain the corridor and other land needed, to lay the tracks and buy the cars? Equally important how much will it cost to run the system including management, labor, security, maintenance and depreciation. Until I see realistic cost figures, I will strongly oppose the Sugar House street car corridor plan.

Name not shown in District 6
May 17, 2011, 2:17 PM

I have a few questions when I read the specs of this endeavor. The project analysis specifies 4000 new households and 7000 new permanent jobs in the street car corridor. Are these 4000 new
households actual houses with yards? Or are they predominately densely packed apartment buildings? How many single-family houses need to be demolished and replaced with apartments to support this 4000 household figure. As for the jobs, how many of these are full-time jobs that are capable of sustaining a family versus how many are low-paying cashier and burger-flipping occupations? What are the annual on-going maintenance costs of the system compared to alternatives? Are these costs to be paid by the 3000-or-so daily users of the street cars and the surrounding businesses? Or, will the rest of Salt Lake’s residents be forced to sustain the project? Unlike Trax, it seems this project is only going to be useful for a relatively small area. How will the increased development and displaced auto-traffic impact the east-west corridors in the area? I know the street cars themselves take some of the load, but they certainly can’t take it all. Will the already packed 2100 south corridor be widened to accommodate the extra vehicle traffic, or should we just expect it to get worse?

Overall, I think a traditional street with sidewalks makes more sense as it can be used by street cars, bikes, cars, buses, delivery vehicles, van-pools, taxis, etc. The rail-only approach is basically only for UTA.

Burton Brown in District 7

May 17, 2011, 12:54 PM

I used to kind of support the idea of a street car...but Mayor Becker is ruining my support for it. Instead of keeping it simple, its now a complicated TRAX Lite..... I urge everyone to speak up when/if the city tries to take current open space or even City Park space and use it for anything other than open space or park use. Please speak up if the city tries to allow the building pathetic strip-type malls along the route, or if the city tries to build apartments or some such nonsense in nice, open park space.....these have all been mentioned directly to me by Mayor Becker...so it can not be denied. Please speak up if any zoning change requests do not make any practical sense.

Name not shown in District 7

May 17, 2011, 12:17 PM

I hope the City is realistic about the ongoing subsidies that will be required to keep this running and where they will be found. This is much more an ego trip than a thoughtful response to a transportation need.

Carole Straughn in District 7

May 17, 2011, 12:08 PM

Since I live in Sugar House, the streetcar will really help get me out of my car to shop or go out via public transit. Good job! Keep up the work, City Leaders!
November 4, 2011

Susan Gallagher of King’s Cottage invited UTA, Salt Lake City, and neighboring residents and business owners to a meeting to discuss the location of the 700 East Sugar House Streetcar station platform. Approximately twelve people, including UTA staff, Salt Lake City staff, a Deseret Industries’ representative, local artists and business owners, and neighbors attended the meeting. The attending residents and business owners support the streetcar. They support a platform on the east side of 700 East. They feel a platform on the east side of 700 East would service the community better. They believe a platform on the west side will service the community better when it is developed. They would like a station on both sides of 700 East because crossing 700 East to get to a platform is not safe under current conditions.