



MEETING NOTES

PLANNING DIVISION
COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

To: Downtown Master Plan Advisory Group
From: Molly Robinson
Date: November 14, 2014
Re: Meeting Notes from November 6, 2014 meeting (#6a)

Attendees

Advisory Group: Karla Bartholomew, John Bennett, Angela Dean, Michael Fife, Michael Iverson, Mark Peach, Alice Steiner

Community Members: Christine Ashworth, Beth Colosimo, John Peppinger, Kristina Robb, Soren Simonsen, Wendy Weaver, Jena Woodbury

City: Jill Love, Cheri Coffey, Nick Norris, Molly Robinson, Doug Dansie, Michael Maloy, Tracy Tran

This was the first of three small group meetings with the Advisory Group to discuss proposed changes to the Draft Plan in response to issues raised at the October 7, 2014 Advisory Group meeting (#5).

Following all of the small Advisory Group meetings, a list of recommended changes will be developed and shared with the Advisory Group. The Planning Commission will review these changes and decide whether to include them in their recommendation to the City Council.

Meeting Notes

- P. 19 – No comments
- P. 23 – Lighting and night sky. Does this addition preclude “beacons” on towers (typically required for tall buildings exceeding downtown height limits and therefore contributing to the skyline)?
 - Change “is optimal” to improves
- P. 23 – Strike proposed tree language beyond “pleasant and comfortable downtown...”
 - Health of trees is an important point in light of climate change issues
 - Statements that are restrictive may not be the right approach. Ex. Fruit trees may be ok in more low scale neighborhoods
 - This section needs to be reworked.

- Does Forestry already have some policies?
- Should this be left up to the City Forester?
- Make 30' a suggestion
- What's appropriate for different areas downtown?
 - We should consider district-level conditions
 - Street trees should consider the character of the street to match the right trees to the right street.
 - Discuss with City Forester on a project-by-project basis
- Should the second part of the paragraph be deleted (after the highlighted section on the handout). Health Dept. suggests leaving it in. Others wondered if it was valuable to do so.
- Follow-up with City Forester
- P. 24-25 – The pdf version is not showing every letter. Might need to check to make sure the font is supported when converted to pdf.
- P. 31 - Homeless/social services is a huge issue. How can it be discussed further? Seems like the plan is forgetting about it.
- P. 46 – Prefer use of “require.” It is stronger.
 - Building entrances: no comments on change
 - Parking structures
 - Make it stronger, likes the existing language. Community Council wants it stronger. (2 Planning Commissioners suggested it should be stronger as well).
 - ...structures to be placed...
 - Do we need to explain why this, and others are in the plan? Include intent of each action
 - Do interior parking structures put people on the sidewalk?
 - Does interior location negatively impact mid-block walkway goals?
 - Some concern about watering down master plans and having them lose the ability to push the City to take the next step.
 - Change the recommendation so it reads “Parking structures and surface parking to be located...”

- Whatever the final change is, make it consistent with the other similar statements (recommended change on page 62 is very similar)
- P. 49 What is nested structure of all plans and is that spelled out in the plan somewhere?
 - Check “Geography of the Master Plan”
 - Reference the economic development plans in this section
- P. 54 – no comments
- P. 62 – Goal 4: remove “encourage”
 - Make consistent with similar action items
 - Worry that watering down language does not effectively get us what we want as a community
- P. 62 – Add action to Goal 4 – Manage public parking to support cultural, retail, and other activities.
 - Add reference to Downtown In Motion
 - Add “as recommended in Downtown in Motion
 - Make it more clear that there are different wayfinding systems for different modes; what works for pedestrians doesn’t work for drivers.
 - Can they be more universal?
- P. 70 – strengthen the safety and life of public spaces (add “safety” somewhere)
 - Goal 1, action item re: eliminating blank walls.
 - Is this practical? Should it be reduce the impact of blank walls on public spaces?
 - Goal 1, eyes on public spaces
 - Add something about safety. Is it redundant if it is in the “safety section”?
 - Can we make these types of actions simpler? Instead of saying “animate the public realm” can’t we just say something like “Make public spaces safer and more active by encouraging new development to allow people to look onto public space by providing windows, doors, balconies, porches and other similar features.” It adds intent and avoids vague language without being directive.
 - Goal 2, playgrounds: no comment from group
- P. 74 – Under Goal 2: no comments
 - Can we delete the “depending on the district” part from the sentence? Not sure it is necessary.

- P. 90 – no comments
- P. 95 – Is it ok to have window displays? Make this clear.
 - “Maximize visual transparency...”
 - “Provide interior display zones or site lines...”
 - Add definition of visual transparency (or define intent of action).
 - Make this similar to other places where it talks about transparency
 - Work with the language to get to the point where we are basically saying “allow people to see in and out by encouraging storefronts.”
- P. 96 – Reference to property owner v. places.
 - Listing key property owners may not be appropriate.
 - The uses in the first bullet are the problematic part. Is it a commercial site?
- P. 99 – Display zone: make consistent with other similar action items.
- P. 103 – Display zone: make consistent with other similar action items.
- P. 106 – Gateway Park – is this still a good idea?
- P. 106 – Gateway Commons Park
 - Is it still a goal, considering where UTA is with the bus yard?
 - It’s more of a “managed” open space
 - Is this contrary to current development trends (i.e. Is it even possible given new development demands)?
 - Should be a major entry/welcome point to downtown
 - “Park-like setting with commercial development.” – not explained as such
 - Envisioned as Sugar House-like park for residents
 - What are the ethics of housing within ¼ mile of highways? And is environmental history of the site a problem?
 - The map may need to be modified/explained so it is clear what the park means. Is it the intent to make it a giant park in that area?
 - Maybe the goal should be to make the area more park like, in terms of adding more greenery like street trees and parkstrips; not a literal park.

- Introduce research about health impacts of living next to freeways. Maybe housing should be pushed ¼ mile away from the interstate in this area.
- The area has environmental issues too, so maybe another reason to think about housing.
- P. 107 – Add action that supports the retention of the Utah Jazz in downtown.
 - When thinking about what the area needs, no one would say make it more dog friendly, but everyone would say make it safer to walk in. Need to address the homeless/panhandling issue more.
 - Downtown should be the home of the Utah Jazz, the plan needs to call that out more. Build up more stuff about that and the importance of the arena.
 - What about sports expansion? Should we include something about that?
 - Yes, but not district specific.
 - Depot district is ideal for sports expansion. Regional destinations are ideal for the Depot District because of transportation links.
- P. 107 – Add under Welcoming & Safe: Evaluate homeless services in their current land configuration for impacts
- P. 112 – Connect Temple Square but maintain public streets (no street vacations)
- General Comments
 - Homeless Issues & Land Use
 - How are issues associated with homeless addressed in the plan?
 - Bigger picture (see Housing, Equity, and Welcoming & Safe sections)
- What's the one thing the plan must say?
 - More about performing arts
 - Distinctive Places – a good addition. Underscores the quality of our downtown.
 - Noise v. land use/building code – How can the plan balance these destination v neighborhood impacts?
 - Daytime v nighttime delivery
 - Requiring off-street delivery in zoning
 - Emphasis on visual arts
 - Plan needs to balance pop-ups and concerts with residential activities

- Emphasis on higher education
- Emphasis on creating a vibrant downtown
- Green spaces and green loop are important to downtown residents
- Need to address gentrification
- Need stronger language on affordable housing
- Need to address internet infrastructure as a utility
- Change photo opposite the Forward – needs to be more futuristic
- Plan needs to address public infrastructure and capital planning for it
- Emphasis on storefronts and walkability
- Need more about performing arts and support of small companies
- Need to adjust framework to put downtown in global context: resources, fuel, building products. If most of the world's population is going to live in urban centers, how does that impact our resources? Need to be prepared for downtown population of 50,000.
- Need to ensure plan is a living document (see Salt Lake County).



MEETING NOTES

PLANNING DIVISION
COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

To: Downtown Master Plan Advisory Group
From: Molly Robinson
Date: November 14, 2014
Re: Meeting Notes from November 10, 2014 meeting (#6b)

Attendees

Advisory Group: Stacy Bare, Alison Beddard, Jake Boyer, Mark Gibbons, Lynnette Hiskey, Jim Olson, Vasilios Priskos, Matt Minkevitch, Jason Mathis, Matt Sibul

Community Members: Matt Baldwin, Bruce Bingham, John Dahlstrom, Jesse Dean, Babs De Lay, Heather Knowlton, Paul Leonhardt, Dan Lofgren, Jim Lohse, Bruce Lyman, Robert Miles, Anne Palmer, Kristina Robb, Joshua Stewart, Linda Wardell

City: Jill Love, Mary DeLaMare-Schaefer, Nick Norris, Molly Robinson, Michael Maloy, Tracy Tran

This was the second of three small group meetings with the Advisory Group to discuss proposed changes to the Draft Plan in response to issues raised at the October 7, 2014 Advisory Group meeting (#5).

Following all of the small Advisory Group meetings, a list of recommended changes will be developed and shared with the Advisory Group. The Planning Commission will review these changes and decide whether to include them in their recommendation to the City Council.

Meeting Notes

- P. 19 –
 - Plan is too prescriptive; needs to allow market conditions to drive future development. Concerned with the overall tone.
 - Plan should say what the City wants to see. How could this be different?
 - Example of prescriptive nature: the part that says all units should have a certain number of days of sunlight, views, etc. It is unrealistic to expect every unit to have each of those. None of the current projects have all of those things in a single unit.
 - Direct access might be difficult.

- This will exclude new residential in downtown. At City Creek, only about 30% of units have access to outdoor space, through balconies or something else. Should this be a percentage instead.
- Word territory is too aggressive.
- Define “eyes on the street.”
- Words like “each” “all” or “should” are challenging and absolute. Encourage and similar words are better choices.
- Need to decide if amenities are going to be public space or private space. Who provides them, the City or the developer? Shouldn’t have to double them up.
- “Should” v. “Will do”
- Ideals v realities
- Percentage of units with outdoor access v. all units
- “Should” is an absolute
- Direct access v. access
- Each, all, and should need to be removed from the plan
- Encourage is appropriate
- List is unattainable
- Plan doubles-up amenities: public and private
- P. 23 –
 - Identifying intent is helpful
 - Lighting: Take out reference to Union Metal. Identifying one provider drives up the cost.
 - Trees: work with the urban forester on language
 - Tree planting for retail exposure and safety needs to be addressed. . The trees should have a high canopy so you can still see the storefronts. The small trees are challenging, block views. Low canopies create hazards for pedestrians.
 - Prefer uniform plantings (same species by block/development) v. organic. Some blocks with uniformity create a great streetscape, while the less organic approach, which seems to be the current thinking, doesn’t.
 - Need better maintenance and removal of dead trees.

- P. 46 – Encourage [development of] individual building entrances
 - Goal 4, Action 1: Change in regards to work with the state to change liquor laws. Encourage policies that support a vibrant dining scene and night life.
 - Can we change “Actions” to “Ideas”? Action item makes it sound like it is definitely going to happen and there are concerns about that, who does it, etc.
 - Alternatives: suggestions, considerations, solutions
- P. 46 - ...provide amenities for children needs to say how
 - Could it be changed to something else, such as “the City will provide...” This probably goes for all action items, who is going to do it? Can we someone identify those things that the City does vs. those things that the private sector does?
 - Within reasonable proximity of housing
 - Important to keep the focus on housing
 - What amenities?
 - Downtown has to include children.
 - Goal 3, bullet 3: change to promote. Doesn’t current zoning already direct this?
 - Transparency requirements at street level. Can parking be on upper levels? Is this already addressed in zoning?
 - “Should” sounds like the law
 - Zoning has transparency requirement; ground level/street level is identified
 - Is this project-dependent?
- P. 49 – agreed on change
- P. 54 – The Church of... (with a capital “T” in the)
- P. 62 – nationally-consistent wayfinding/signage
 - Signage can’t be piecemeal
- P. 62 –
 - “encourage parking structures” is ok
 - Goal 4, new action item on wayfinding:

- Is there some kind of national standard? In NYC, they are consistent throughout so you know what the signs mean.
 - A piecemeal approach creates more confusion. City should fund an overall plan to avoid the piecemeal approach.
 - Goal 2: Consider timing lights
 - Continually updated to meet the needs of the public
 - Goal 3: U of U to Central Station: red line may not go to Central Station; could go to Airport
- P. 70 – Goal 2: Safety needs to be part of child-friendly
 - Ground floor
 - How is this different from current requirements? Can't we just defer to the zoning ordinance?
 - Goal 1, last bullet: no comments
 - Goal 2, 4th bullet: change to locate playgrounds near housing instead of prescribing the distance. Who provides the playground, City or Developer?
 - No mention of safety in this item. Needs to be worked in.
 - (Add) Public or private schools
 - How will we encourage playground development?
 - Does locate mean on private property or public property?
 - Divide Actions into public and private responsibility categories
 - Who is responsible for executing the plan?
 - Can we divide the list of actions (document wide) into City responsibility vs. public responsibility?
 - Investment by private sector is limited by regulation/constrictions. a. Private sector cannot have so many restrictions. It makes development harder. Development is getting more difficult. Move away from the notion that "the city knows best"
 - Plan needs to make it easy
 - This room is filled with people who make private capital investments in Downtown. Previous group was not. How do you balance out the differences in comments?
- P. 74 – infill development may be restricted

- Goal 2, last bullet: infill development may not have a large enough footprint to accomplish everything outlined in this section.
 - Need language that is more adaptable to different types of development
- Goal 4: Skyline shaping conflicts with housing goals
 - If we shape building height, we might not get 10,000 new units. Running the numbers, the City has not seen the kind of growth that would be required to match this goal in 25 years. 500,000 SF of housing needs to be built every year for 20 years to meet 10,000 unit goal (10,000 housing units divided by 25 years equals 400 housing units per year.)
- P. 95 –
 - (Add) whenever possible
 - Walkable... List multiple options: Tokyo scramble, restricted right turns, or other options that prioritize pedestrians. This is already a challenge in some areas where there are so many pedestrians that it hinders automobile traffic. Maybe the City should think about having some intersection where all vehicle movements are stopped at the same time to allow pedestrian to move in any direction through an intersection, then give the cars a chance to turn right? Car should not be seen as the enemy.
 - ...all transit lines have extended hours (not just Airport line and not just TRAX)
- P. 96 – Allude to site, but don't name specific property owner/property. It should just say South Anchor.
 - It is challenging to plan a block without the owner's consent/input. Creates a city vs. property owner situation. Should be left as a fairly open canvas.
 - Identify ESA and Gateway as western anchors
 - Recognize Grand and Little America as hospitality anchors. Instead of 'transform" the area it should enhance what is already there.
 - May not be end of CBD in 5, 10, or 20 years. Downtown does not end at 500 South, so maybe it should recognize that Main St. extends further south to 900 South. This section should recognize it. Should the south anchor be further south?
 - What about the Sears site as a catalytic site?
 - What about growth north to Marmalade?
- P. 106 – Gateway Park is inconsistent with bus depot activities
 - Linear park opportunity is ok but a major park is problematic
 - The way the map is shown it might make those property owners think the City is going to condemn their property. Might want to rethink this.

- The map should be redone, including the maps in the districts.
- P. 107 – statements about ESA don't go far enough
 - ESA: activating the plazas isn't what the ESA needs. The events already do this.
 - Plan needs to support the Jazz staying downtown and being a big part of it.
 - ESA is concerned about people getting to and from the arena, particularly by cars and making sure the access remains good and the streets aren't restricted.
 - Parking is a challenge. ESA recognizes they don't own the parking and are reliant on existing parking lots. As those parking lots change, it puts pressure on the Jazz. There has to be a place for parking in the surrounding areas so that ESA is not boxed in with no options to address the impacts on them. ESA wants to work on a solution and are willing to do their part, but they want to make sure the City is supportive and options are maintained. Parking and traffic concerns: "moving a small city in and out every night."
 - Incentives for solutions needed
- P. 108 – Farmer's Market in Rio Grande – last paragraph is inconsistent with Arts use.
 - Programming of the Rio Grande Building. Is this appropriate to be put in the plan?
 - Does this mean that the existing galleries would get kicked out? The paragraph should be deleted.
 - We should remove this paragraph.
- P. 113 – work with ESA to accommodate their needs
 - Catalytic site for Temple Square goes too far
 - This would eliminate all of the parking for the Utah Jazz.
 - Similar comments made about south anchor apply here as well. Planning a block that is privately-owned.
 - Remove this catalytic project from the plan
- P. 1 (new text) – "Transform" suggests that today's condition is inadequate; consider "build upon" or "enhance." Why not build on everything that Downtown has. This is throughout the plan. That word should not be used.
- Arts – need more diverse arts-based activities, not just more of the same (repetition)
- P. 114 – Grand Boulevards
 - Welcome to visitors by car

- Policing for drugs is conflicting with welcoming element
- Safer place to cross is great, but it needs to consider the impact to traffic. These two streets are the major auto entrances to the City and that needs to be the focus. Don't negatively impact the number of lanes.
- Would this result in a reduction of lanes? Any change would have to be approved by UDOT.
- Does the plan adequately address the role that these streets play and removing lanes or restricting car travels restricts that role?
- Boulevards need to maintain movement of people and goods as priority
- Distinctive Places: Add "Beloved" places that contribute...



MEETING NOTES

PLANNING DIVISION
COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

To: Downtown Master Plan Advisory Group
From: Molly Robinson
Date: November 14, 2014
Re: Meeting Notes from November 12, 2014 meeting (#6c)

Attendees

Advisory Group: Maria Garcia, Christian Harrison, Michael Larice

Community Members: Derek Kitchen, Joyce Marder, Kristina Robb, John Schaefer

City: Jill Love, Cheri Coffey, Nick Norris, Molly Robinson, Michael Maloy, Tracy Tran, Matt Dahl, Debbie Lyons

This was the third of three small group meetings with the Advisory Group to discuss proposed changes to the Draft Plan in response to issues raised at the October 7, 2014 Advisory Group meeting (#5).

Following all of the small Advisory Group meetings, a list of recommended changes will be developed and shared with the Advisory Group. The Planning Commission will review these changes and decide whether to include them in their recommendation to the City Council.

Meeting Notes

- P. 3 or 12 – Need language about what this plan will do
 - Define: vision statement, principle, goal, action
 - Not too technical
- P. 19 – at previous meeting, developers were concerned with this being too prescriptive.
 - It might not be too prescriptive, but could be worded better.
- P. 23 –
 - Lighting

- Light pollution issues for residents. Expensive to block street lights (curtains, blinds, etc.). □
Common complaints from residents about the street lights. They look great, but they create a lot of light that shines up into people's windows. Should this policy be rethought?
 - Lighting needs to be capped. Shield the lights from trespassing into peoples homes.
 - Added paragraph is not enough. Light pollution is a health issue and lights the night sky unnecessarily. Lights should be pointed down, directed to sidewalk. ADD: Focus on lighting the pedestrian realm and manage light trespass into residences.
 - Trees
 - We have a lack of specimen trees downtown. Too many decorative varieties that don't add anything.
 - Need more architectural trees: large canopy and tall
 - Need a quick and efficient replacement program for dead and damaged trees
 - Need to address maintenance issues for trees in containers; containers quickly become ashtrays and filled with trash. Rethink the concept of a planter and the planting environment, maybe less raised planters.
 - Consider trees in terms of both function and aesthetics
 - Need strategies to maintain long-term health and longevity of street trees. Need to mention maintenance more. It is lacking.
- P. 46 –
 - Need stronger language, particularly to address back-facing entrances. Discourage back facing/loading buildings, where the entrance is from the parking lot. Think Costco.
 - Language should be stronger
 - Good rules make good cities.
 - Make it clear that we are talking about new developments.
 - Downtown has enough surface parking. Goal should be to decrease amount of land used for surface parking without reducing number of stalls.
 - Additional language: reducing parking in the aggregate should be a city policy
 - It is important to keep some strong language for future elected officials to hold to long standing policies.
 - Does this language provide enough flexibility to change how the times change? If technology changes, peoples preferences changes, etc.

- Can there be some move to prohibit parking lots being used as land banks?
 - Parking can also be underground, which isn't mentioned.
- P. 49 – local business
 - How to bring small, local business in and enable them to stay around
 - Proposed change reflects the notion of the City.
 - Blight can be a good thing because it provides affordable rents for local businesses.
 - Business ownership of the building that they are in is important and helps lead to a strong small business community.
 - Fine grained ownership, such as commercial condos is the idea and a way to fend off the wrong kind of gentrification.
 - Can be done by restricting land assembly, having a menu of development options that include commercial condos, etc.
 - Add a sentence about SLC role in the international market place and how it impacts local economy; it is changing the world economy and cities need to adapt.
 - Retail condos (like residential condos)
 - Less monolithic development; discourage multi-parcel developments
 - Explore gentrification policy that identifies receiver neighborhoods for both residential and commercial uses (including artists). It is controversial and essentially redistribution of wealth but assures a space for small business.
- P. 62 – comprehensive and collaborative
 - Move away from regulation. It seems like the City is moving towards a discretionary planning process. Which is ok and less rigid than traditional planning, but requires a very savvy staff and policies.
 - Should include collaborative so it is more legible. Look at “legible London” as an example of wayfinding that is universal, yet includes unique branding.
 - Graphic visibility is important.
 - Transparent throughout
- P. 70 –
 - Goal 1:

- open up/permeability (not just glass) to include other design features and incorporate visual interest
- Add: ample visual interest and architectural design
- Last bullet ok with change
- Goal 2: playgrounds is too specific. Suggest “playscapes” or “playspaces” instead.
 - kids gravitate to nature. Rethink what a playground is.
 - Play space drives residential.
 - Term playground is catered to a certain age group. Kids outgrow playgrounds quickly and need space for a different type of play that a playground cannot provide. What about using play space or some other term? Recreation and leisure space? What about places for people to play?
 - Any space for kids need to be reassuring for the parents, they need to feel it is safe.
 - Less prescribed, get away from the notion of playground that has been around since the 60’s.
 - Avoid age specific equipment
 - Keep in mind, we don’t need to change downtown, but show things are accessible for kids and that there are things to climb on, jump off, etc.
 - If it is friendly for kids, it will be friendly for everyone.
 - What about publically owned private spaces and privately owned public spaces? Are either acceptable?
 - Is there a 2 page spread about the public realm?
- What is going to keep the elderly in Downtown? Where is their play space? What does that mean to them?
- Need flexible playscapes for all ages
- P. 74 – plan should address city policy for POPS – Privately Owned Public Spaces
- P. 90 – no comments on change, but maybe rethink the map.
- P. 95 – lighting for night and shading for day. Encourage is ok.
- P. 96 – other language for “south end of Main Street.” It is the south end of the CBD.
 - Explore language to be more grand. The block could be a lot more than just commercial, or residential or mixed use. Is there a place for institutional, civic, etc. uses?

- City doesn't have a great public square. Is this it? Could it be?
 - Can language be changed to be more comprehensive and collaborative?
 - This space needs to be thought of as an overlay. It is where a number of different districts come together and mixes a lot of different patterns, uses, etc. leave language unspecific so it can better take that into account when it comes time to develop/plan that block. Leave it hazy.
 - If you make it too general, you run the risk of making it so vanilla it is no longer catalytic.
 - It isn't just that block, think about the uses around it and in the area. The hotels and civic buildings are large draws.
 - New language: This is a special site at the confluence of multiple districts and land uses: CBD, Civic, Hospitality. It deserves special consideration in its development to ensure a dense, diverse, and vibrant place.
- P. 97 – what does the picture have to do with downtown?
 - P. 99 – no comments on change
 - P. 107 – Vibrant and active: need to think about resiliency.
 - P. 125 – This is a map without context. Not useful.
 - Overhead transmission lines are an impediment to development
 - Need stronger language to bury the lines
 - City needs to embrace policy of burying all power lines
 - P. 126 – Removing viaduct will alter the neighborhood; Granary community has expressed desire to keep it as a buffer. Maybe if it is just improving the existing structure, spaces around it and underpasses it would be ok.
 - General
 - Need a section that really explains how the plan will be used, what the vision means, what the guiding principles and action items mean. It should be seen as a time to educate others about what planning in SLC means.
 - A vision statement does this...
 - A guiding principle means this
 - A principle does this...
 - Intent is not be prescriptive but visionary.

- The plan needs to be simple, memorable and reiterated continually so everyone knows about it. Right now some of it is too technical. It needs to be more memorable.
 - Add a statement about the future desire of downtown and what kind of place it will be, in terms people know and understand.
 - Vision and principle paragraph is too technical, buried in the text on page 3. Make it stand out, less wordy.
 - People on the ground are disinterested. The plan need to keep people interested.
 - People efforts (time, money, dedication, investment, etc) are not recognized.
 - What are the 4-5 reasons we need the plan? Add them.
- Where is the conversation on homelessness? Three things from the Pioneer Park Coalition
 - Plan needs more details about homeless individuals and the City's plans to address issue. Homeless issue is the number one issue facing downtown and needs to be addressed. Identify homeless issue as important, deserving of a concentrated effort and action plan to address the unique nature of the issue.
 - City Council and HLC need to work together for a better housing plan
 - Pioneer Park – need to make the area more family-friendly 24-7; need to address homeless issues; park needs consistent programming
- Add to Assumptions: Homelessness is an issue that cannot be solved in one master plan