



CITY OF OREM
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
56 North State Street, Orem, Utah
March 24, 2015

*This meeting may be held electronically
to allow a Councilmember to participate.*

3:30 P.M. WORK SESSION – PUBLIC SAFETY TRAINING ROOM

1. **DISCUSSION - Mayor and City Council Compensation (30 min)** – Mayor Brunst
2. **UPDATE – UTOPIA (45 min)**
3. **BUDGET DISCUSSION / PREVIEW – General Fund (45 min)** – Richard Manning

5:30 P.M. STUDY SESSION – PUBLIC SAFETY TRAINING ROOM

PREVIEW UPCOMING AGENDA ITEMS

4. **Staff will present to the City Council a preview of upcoming agenda items.**

AGENDA REVIEW

5. **The City Council will review the items on the agenda.**

CITY COUNCIL - NEW BUSINESS

6. **This is an opportunity for members of the City Council to raise issues of information or concern.**

6:00 P.M. REGULAR SESSION - COUNCIL CHAMBERS

CALL TO ORDER

INVOCATION/INSPIRATIONAL THOUGHT: By Invitation

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: By Invitation

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

7. **MINUTES of City Council Meeting – March 10, 2015**
8. **MINUTES of Joint City Council / Recreation Advisory Commission Tour – March 12, 2015**

THE PUBLIC IS INVITED TO PARTICIPATE IN ALL CITY COUNCIL MEETINGS.
If you need a special accommodation to participate in the City Council Meetings and Study Sessions,
please call the City Recorder's Office at least 3 working days prior to the meeting.
(Voice 229-7074)

This agenda is also available on the City's Internet webpage at orem.org

MAYOR’S REPORT/ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL

- 9. **UPCOMING EVENTS**
- 10. **APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS**
Heritage Advisory Commission1 vacancy
- 11. **RECOGNITION OF NEW NEIGHBORHOODS IN ACTION OFFICERS**
- 12. **PROCLAMATION – Purple Day – Epilepsy Awareness**
- 13. **REPORT – Sleepy Ridge Golf Course**

CITY MANAGER’S APPOINTMENTS

- 14. **APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS**

PERSONAL APPEARANCES – 15 MINUTES

- 15. **Time has been set aside for the public to express their ideas, concerns, and comments on items not on the Agenda. Those wishing to speak should have signed in before the beginning of the meeting. (Please limit your comments to 3 minutes or less.)**

CONSENT ITEMS

- 16. **There are no Consent Items.**

SCHEDULED ITEMS

- 6:20 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING – CDBG**
- 17. **Receive Public Comment on the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Projected Use of Funds for Fiscal Year 2015-2016**

RECOMMENDATION: The Community & Neighborhood Services Manager recommends the City Council hold the first of two public hearings to receive public comment on the projected uses of funds for the 2015-2016 Community Development Block Grant.

PRESENTER: Steven Downs

POTENTIALLY AFFECTED AREA: Citywide

BACKGROUND: During the past few months, the CDBG Citizen Advisory Commission heard funding proposals from various applicants who wish to receive CDBG funding. The Commission will present its recommendations to the City Council then the public hearing will be opened for comment on the proposed uses of funds.

Following a second public hearing that is scheduled for April 28, 2015, at 6:00 p.m., the City Council will adopt a resolution approving the CDBG Final Statement of Projected Uses of Funds for 2015-2016.

Funding includes new entitlement and projected program income.

6:20 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING – Parking Permit Area

18. RESOLUTION – Amending the Residential Parking Permit Area between 800 South and 925 South and 600 West and 725 West to include the north and south sides of 800 South between 600 West and 725 West

RECOMMENDATION: The Chief of Police recommends that the City Council, by resolution amend the residential parking permit area adopted by Resolution R-2015-0005 on February 24, 2015, to include both the north and south sides of 800 South between 600 West and 725 West in Orem, Utah.

PRESENTER: Lt. Craig Martinez

POTENTIALLY AFFECTED AREA: Sunset Heights

BACKGROUND: The City of Orem is responsible for protecting the health, safety, and general welfare of the City. With the ongoing enrollment of students and the expansion of Utah Valley University, there has been an increase in the number of nonresidents who are using 600 West, 725 West, 800 South, 925 South, 950 South and the connected cul-de-sacs as on-street parking during the university's business hours. The nonresident motor vehicles remain on these streets for the majority of the day between 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. To resolve this parking issue, the Orem City Council adopted Resolution R-2015-0005 creating a residential parking area. Upon further investigation and after further discussions with 800 South residents, the Orem Police Department has discovered that this parking pattern extends to the north and south sides of 800 South between 600 West and 725 West. The Orem Police Department, in order to resolve these parking concerns, finds it necessary to include the north and south sides of 800 South between 600 West and 725 West in the residential parking permit area established by Resolution R-2015-0005. The residents who reside on the north and south sides of 800 South between 600 West and 725 West have indicated a desire to be included in the residential parking area. The cul-de-sac of 880 South will not be included in the residential parking permit area at the request of the residents living in that cul-de-sac.

Having supplemented the investigation upon which Resolution R-2015-0005 was based, and having obtained the consent of each of the residents impacted, the Orem City Police Department now recommends that the City Council amend the residential parking permit area created by Resolution R-2015-0005 to include both the north and south sides of 800 South between 600 West and 725 West.

If the City Council amends the residential parking permit area as proposed, any resident within the residential parking permit area will be permitted to park any cars registered to his/her dwelling in the residential parking permit area, and each dwelling within the residential parking permit area will be given two (2) visitor/guest permits.

COMMUNICATION ITEMS

- 19. There are no communication items.**

CITY MANAGER INFORMATION ITEMS

- 20. This is an opportunity for the City Manager to provide information to the City Council. These items are for information and do not require action by the City Council.**

ADJOURN TO A MEETING OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF OREM

DRAFT

CITY OF OREM
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
56 North State Street Orem, Utah
March 10, 2015

3:00 P.M. JOINT CITY/RDA STUDY SESSION – PUBLIC SAFETY TRAINING ROOM

CONDUCTING Mayor Richard F. Brunst

ELECTED OFFICIALS Councilmembers Hans Andersen, Margaret Black, Tom Macdonald, Mark E. Seastrand, and David Spencer

APPOINTED STAFF Jamie Davidson, City Manager; Brenn Bybee, Assistant City Manager; Greg Stephens, City Attorney; Chris Tschirki, Public Works Director; Scott Gurney, Fire Department Director; Gary Giles, Police Department Director; Richard Manning, Administrative Services Director; Bill Bell, Development Services Director; Charlene Crozier, Library Director; Jason Bench, Planning Division Manager; Steve Earl, Deputy City Attorney; Jason Bench, Planning Division Manager; Neal Winterton, Water Division Manager; Sam Kelly, Engineer; Ryan Clark, Economic Development Division Manager; Steven Downs, Assistant to the City Manager; and Jackie Lambert, Deputy City Recorder

EXCUSED Brent Sumner

UPDATE – State Street – IBI

David Nicholas, IBI Group associate, and Jason Bench presented an update on the Orem State Street Corridor Master Plan. Mr. Bell asked for the Council to provide feedback so any questions and issues could be addressed sooner rather than later.

Master Plan Elements

- Vision/Framework
 - Mobility
 - Land Use
 - Urban Design
 - Implementation
 - Vision Statement:

Create a dynamic and incremental framework to guide future growth throughout the State Street Corridor resulting in economic development initiatives, transportation solutions and enhanced community image and identity. The State Street Corridor will promote a family-friendly culture while becoming an attractive, urban lifestyle alternative for residents, businesses and visitors.

- Objectives

DRAFT

- 1 ▪ Create economic development initiatives
- 2 ▪ Create transportation solutions
- 3 ▪ Enhance community identity and image
- 4 ○ Project Goals
- 5 ▪ Provide regional, local and multimodal transportation solutions
- 6 ▪ Lateral approach to a linear corridor connecting adjacent neighborhoods
- 7 east and west
- 8 ▪ Increase building frontage real estate through finer grain street and block
- 9 network leveraging opportunities with Orem Boulevard
- 10 ▪ Concentrate density nodes around potential transit system station areas
- 11 ▪ Create a complimentary network of character districts to establish sense of
- 12 place
- 13 ▪ Enhance urban open space system to encourage walkability, community
- 14 gathering, healthy living and active storefronts
- 15 ▪ Improve the aesthetic appearance of the corridor
- 16 ▪ Redefine development standards and policies to manage growth
- 17 ▪ Maintain bedroom community character while embracing critical and
- 18 strategically located mixed-use density
- 19 ● Public Outreach/Communications Plan
- 20 ○ Public meetings
- 21 ▪ Three open houses held
- 22 ▪ Two more open houses scheduled
- 23 ○ MindMixer
- 24 ▪ Over twenty-one topics launched over five months
- 25 ▪ Topics included State Street traffic, safety, aesthetics, walkability,
- 26 business and commercial development and variety, land use, and future
- 27 transit opportunities
- 28 ▪ What do you want Orem to be known for? Top answers:
- 29 ● Family friendly and safe
- 30 ● Business friendly and progressive
- 31 ● Beautiful and attractive
- 32 ● Framework Plan – Growth Nodes
- 33 ○ Mobility
- 34 ▪ Signals/Boulevard/Street network
- 35 ▪ Multiway Boulevard
- 36 ▪ Future Transit
- 37 ○ Land Use
- 38 ▪ Nodes/Districts
- 39 ● The North Village (1600 North)
- 40 ● Uptown (800 North)
- 41 ● City Center (Center Street)
- 42 ● Arts District (800 South)
- 43 ● University Place
- 44 ▪ Existing Conditions
- 45 ▪ Overall Corridor Projection
- 46 ▪ Growth Nodes
- 47

DRAFT

1 Mr. Macdonald asked about the breakdown of respondents on a given topic on MindMixer.

2
3 Mr. Nicholas said topics were launched and respondents had the opportunity to present ideas,
4 which other respondents could reply to. Mr. Nicholas said the majority of respondents said they
5 wanted to see more variety in the types and qualities of commercial and business developments,
6 as well as more parks and open space. He said that was a good indicator that residents enjoyed
7 current city parks and open space. Mr. Nicholas said in a recent topic showed 69 percent of
8 respondents in support of State Street acting as a transit corridor for either Bus Rapid Transit
9 (BRT) or Light Rail Transit (LRT) in the future. Even if public transit took fifteen years or more
10 to establish in the city, it was important to plan for appropriately. Mr. Nicholas said in deciding
11 what made the most sense for “downtown” Orem, the “downtown” area first needed to be
12 created and/or defined. They had identified three of the growth nodes (City Center, Arts District
13 and University Place) that would tie together to create Orem’s “downtown”. Five-year, ten-year,
14 and twenty-five-year incremental growth plans had been developed for the identified key growth
15 nodes. All data provided was hypothetical and subject to change. There were many ways
16 development and growth could go, and these plans were just tools for a vision to be shared with
17 private development and investment.

18
19 Mayor Brunst asked about other communities where malls had gone through a similar
20 development expansion.

21
22 Mr. Nicholas said suburban mall conversion was happening in many areas throughout the
23 country, from complete conversions like a mixed-use lifestyle center to hybrid conversion
24 keeping the mall’s core and adding residential and business around it. Orem was looking at the
25 hybrid option, as were malls in Arizona and Southern California. He said in twenty-five years,
26 University Parkway could be an intermodal hub for transit.

27
28 Mr. Macdonald asked for direction on how the Council could best process the presented
29 information to provide valuable feedback and ask applicable questions.

30
31 Mr. Nicholas said thoughts, first impressions, feedback from constituents and staff, as well as
32 feedback from the public in general would all be helpful. Traffic models needed to be completed
33 for projections regarding mobility, so if the Council wanted to focus on land use, that would help
34 focus the conversation.

35
36 Mrs. Black clarified that nodes were the land use ideas the Council might focus on. She said thus
37 far she appreciated the focus and detail on the nodes in the city. She was not surprised that
38 beautification was a key element MindMixer respondents had specifically indicated what they
39 hoped to see.

40
41 Mr. Davidson said there would be a site visit for the City Council to Salt Lake City and another
42 to Ogden. Many of the ideas presented here had been done or were proposed in those areas so the
43 Council could see first-hand examples of development.

44
45 Mr. Andersen asked about University Parkway and whether the proposed developments would
46 increase or decrease traffic there. He wondered about the vision for improving the intersection.

DRAFT

1 Mr. Nicholas said they were more looking at the peripheral areas on the intersection to create
2 better opportunities for development, but UDOT was focusing on the future of University
3 Parkway.

4
5 Mr. Davidson said there were meetings scheduled with UDOT on March 11, 2015, at 3:00 and
6 4:00 p.m., discussing the University Parkway intersection.

7 8 FOLLOW UP – Utility Master Plan

9 Mr. Tschirki presented information he said he hoped would answer questions asked at the study
10 session on February 24, 2015. He distributed information that showed per unit increases for
11 typical residential versus nonresidential units. Mr. Tschirki explained that the \$9.38 amount was
12 the average increase over the next five years, but initially the amount would be closer to
13 \$12.00 dollars with later years at an amount closer to \$7.00. He said there would be an open
14 house about the proposed increases, with the possibility of more. Brochures would be sent to all
15 account holders with information about Capital Improvement Project (CIP) plans and rate
16 increases in coming weeks, and a subsequent mailer after the open house.

17
18 Mrs. Black asked if there was a way to have the first increase be a smaller amount, and more
19 evenly distributed through the years.

20
21 Mr. Tschirki said the proposed increase schedule was the recommended plan for CIP, but it
22 could be modified. Mr. Macdonald clarified if the reason the initial increase was higher was to
23 essentially “catch up” for years with no improvement. Mr. Tschirki said that was the case.

24
25 Mr. Andersen asked if the figures were monthly. Mr. Tschirki said they were monthly, under
26 scenario 2, following the recommended CIP.

27
28 Mayor Brunst asked for clarification on identified projects for water, sewer, and storm water,
29 which Mr. Tschirki provided. He explained that the amounts on the projects were in today’s
30 dollars. Because they could not predict future inflation, those numbers were subject to change.
31 There were areas of immediate need scattered throughout the city, like areas with 2-inch and
32 4-inch pipes when the current standard was nothing less than 8-inch pipes. Another immediate
33 need would be a ten-million-gallon storage facility

34
35 Mayor Brunst asked where that facility might go and how it would be constructed.

36
37 Mr. Tschirki said a study would need to be done to determine those things, but the location
38 would likely be in the middle of the city to accommodate needs on the west side. Mr. Tschirki
39 said tertiary treatment was needed at the water treatment facility to help offset demands for peak
40 summer usage in the southwest and central part of town. A new well was needed in southwest
41 Orem, regardless of whether or not the proposed annexation took place, to help offset needs in
42 that area.

43
44 Mayor Brunst asked about water availability usage and if a new well was necessary.

DRAFT

1 Mr. Tschirki said the usage would vary from year to year, and the well was necessary. The well
2 would not increase water availability, but would give the ability to tap into the source from
3 different geographic locations. It would not enlarge the water right, but increase availability.
4

5 Mr. Winterton said the CIP process was ongoing, year to year for the foreseeable future. Staff
6 would continue to update the Council on needed CIP funding.
7

8 Mr. Tschirki said there had been discussion about automated metering infrastructure. 90 percent
9 of costs with automated meters would come from replacing meters, and the other 10 percent
10 would provide the tools to allow staff to monitor the system. While the online accounts and
11 phone applications were nice tools for consumers, they were more valuable to city staff for
12 customer service.
13

14 Mr. Winterton said Siemens was looking at the energy side of using automated meter systems.
15

16 Mayor Brunst asked about savings from using automated services.
17

18 Mr. Tschirki said there would be around 10 percent of a loss in actual water consumption. There
19 would be some savings in terms of personnel, as meter readers would no longer be required, but
20 technicians who could read the information would still be needed.
21

22 Mayor Brunst asked about other cities in Utah that had made these changes in utilities.
23

24 Mr. Tschirki said Orem was one of the last to look at this. Provo was already implementing
25 theirs, and Sandy was on its second round.
26

27 Mayor Brunst asked about replacing the main line on State Street.
28

29 Mr. Tschirki said when that time came they would coordinate with UDOT and construct on the
30 far west edge on the shoulder, outside of travel lane. There was a parallel system running up and
31 down State Street.
32

33 Mr. Kelly said staff met with UDOT every month, and once Orem moved forward they would be
34 coordinated with.
35

36 Mrs. Black asked about how CIP was prioritized.
37

38 Mr. Tschirki said projects were prioritized in terms of rate of return, or the ability to recoup the
39 money, as well as immediate need.
40

41 Mrs. Black said it would be important for the brochures to present detailed information in such a
42 way that the data was clear and understandable for all account holders.
43

44 Mayor Brunst agreed and said he thought it should be eye-catching enough that account holders
45 would read the brochure and not discard it without reading. Communication about proposed
46 changes would be a challenge but was important. He suggested making the information available
47 online as well.

DRAFT

1 Mr. Davidson cautioned against overloading the brochure, or causing undue concern for
2 residents about availability of some services.

3
4 Mr. Tschirki said information would be available online following the meeting. He said he could
5 prepare a draft of the brochure for the City Council to review and give feedback.

6 7 DISCUSSION – University Place Participation Agreement

8 Mr. Stephens said the plan was to bring the University Place Participation Agreement before the
9 Orem Redevelopment Agency (RDA) on March 24, 2015. The agreement was between the RDA
10 and the University Mall Shopping Center LC. Mr. Stephens reviewed information on the tax
11 increment reimbursement structure. It detailed what a developer had to do to be eligible to
12 receive tax increment, and how much tax increment a developer could receive. The general
13 definition of tax increment was the difference between property tax revenues generated for a
14 specific piece of property, post development, and what the property taxes were for that same
15 property during a given base year. In the project area plan, the base year determined for the
16 project was 2013. Mr. Stephens said all the taxing entities would receive the same property taxes
17 they received up to 2013. The tax increment reimbursement was the increase from the 2013
18 levels to the post development levels. The RDA entered into interlocal agreements with each
19 taxing entity, and each of those taxing entities allowed the RDA to use a certain percentage of
20 that tax increment. Alpine School District agreed to allow the RDA to use 65 percent, while the
21 remaining entities of the City of Orem, Utah County, Central Utah Water Conservancy District,
22 and the Metropolitan Water District allowed the RDA to use 75 percent of tax increment that was
23 in play for the project area. Mr. Stephens said of the 65 to 75 percent in the project area plan, the
24 RDA said it would keep 10 percent – 5 percent for administrative costs, 5 percent for RDA
25 improvements. The remaining 90 percent of the available tax increment actually received by the
26 RDA would be available to developers that met requirements. Mr. Stephens said the risk for the
27 project was with the developer.

28
29 Mayor Brunst said the agreement involved no debt or bonding.

30
31 Mr. Stephens said the tax increment reimbursement structure was divided into eight benchmarks.
32 The benchmarks indicated the required development, the reimbursable infrastructure, the
33 estimated cost, the additional cap, and the total cap. He clarified that the “orchard/green space”
34 referred to on Benchmark 1 was the equivalent of a public park, not necessarily an orchard of
35 fruit trees.

36
37 Mrs. Black asked about the 10 percent the RDA would receive, and what the Woodbury
38 Corporation would be receiving.

39
40 Mr. Stephens said each taxing entity would retain a percentage of the tax increment, with the
41 Alpine School District retaining 35 percent and the other four entities retaining 25 percent. Of
42 the amount retained by the RDA, the RDA would take out 10 percent of the 65 to 75 percent
43 from the taxing entities.

44
45 Mr. Andersen asked whether RC Willey owned its retail space or if the mall owned that. He also
46 asked if RC Willey was eligible for the tax increment reimbursement.

DRAFT

1 Kathy Olson, with Woodbury Corporation, said RC Willey already owned its retail space.

2
3 Mr. Davidson said the agreement was with Woodbury Corporation, not other entities. He said he
4 could only speak to the relationship with Woodbury, but RC Willey was not part of that contract.

5
6 Mr. Stephens said that, ultimately, the maximum amount a developer could receive would be the
7 lesser of what was listed as the total cap and the available tax increment the RDA actually
8 received.

9
10 Mrs. Black asked for clarification on requirements.

11
12 Mr. Stephens said the structure was set up to encourage developers to get to Benchmark 8 and
13 complete their projects. For flexibility on Benchmarks 2 through 7, each additional 100,000
14 square feet of office space there would have an associated parking structure that needed to be
15 built. They could be reimbursed for actual costs on parking structure up to \$4 million for those
16 benchmarks. If they reached Benchmark 8, the cap would be removed and they would be able to
17 receive 90 percent of all available tax increment that was actually received by the RDA.

18
19 Mr. Andersen asked for clarification benchmarks.

20
21 Mr. Stephens said certain developments were required before any reimbursement or
22 advancement to higher benchmarks. They would only get direct reimbursement for the
23 reimbursable expenses, such as specified infrastructure.

24
25 Mr. Macdonald said the 100,000 of class A office space would cost more than \$10 million, so
26 actual costs outweighed reimbursement.

27
28 Mr. Stephens said Lewis Young Robertson & Burningham had been retained to evaluate the
29 terms of the agreement. The study showed the RDA was receiving fair value, and they believed
30 the increment was necessary to drive development in project area.

31 BUDGET DISCUSSION / PREVIEW – Compensation

32
33 Mr. Davidsons said staff was preparing next year's fiscal budget. The General Fund included a
34 majority of Orem employees' and staff's compensation. Approximately \$21 million in wages
35 represented 50 percent or more of the General Fund. Employee compensation was something
36 City management took very seriously. They looked at where Orem was in terms of the market
37 for developing a long-term, sustainable plan for the future. There had been discussions in the
38 past as to the classification of positions, and tools were used to assess the market. The Hay
39 Group provided market information to develop compensation philosophy in the past. The City
40 had contracted with Mike Swallow, owner and president of Personnel Systems and Services, to
41 validate the information from the Hay Group. Mr. Swallow had worked with many agencies in
42 Utah and, specifically, with local governments. Mr. Davidson turned the time over to Mr. Bybee,
43 Mr. Manning, and Mr. Swallow to present where Orem was going with its compensation
44 program and recommend a go-forward plan.

DRAFT

1 Mr. Bybee said his presentation represented a summary of data. They would give contextual
2 information and focus on different market and benefit comparisons, as well as demographic
3 trends leading to recommendations.

4 5 Orem City 2014/15 Compensation Study & Equity Instrument Validation

- 6 • Agenda
 - 7 ○ Project Background & Context
 - 8 ○ Market Comparison Tables
 - 9 ○ Benefits Picture
 - 10 ○ Employee Demographics
 - 11 ○ Recommendations for Going Forward
- 12 • Project Objectives
 - 13 ○ Assess the need for revising weighted job factors (e.g. education, experience,
14 certifications, safety, etc.)
 - 15 ○ Test & verify internal relationships
 - 16 ○ Determine need or interest for additional job factors/worth-of-work elements (e.g.
17 stress, public interaction, increased emphasis on risk, etc.)
 - 18 ○ Market sample & analyze base pay & total compensation comparability
 - 19 ○ Review compensation administration practices, i.e., pay progression, pay plan
20 design philosophy, etc.
 - 21 ○ Determine need to update pay ranges and revise pay grade assignments
- 22 • Historical Practices
 - 23 ○ Pay plan design
 - 24 ○ Pay progression objectives
 - 25 ○ Market posture – competitive position
- 26 • Ongoing Challenges
 - 27 ○ Economics – revenue stream
 - 28 ○ Marginal utility
 - 29 ○ Fiscal accountability
 - 30 ○ Recruitment issues & objectives
 - 31 ○ Talent retention
- 32 • Market Data – Survey Group (Data included from multiple <not necessarily all>
33 benchmark matches
- 34 • Orem Compensation Study
 - 35 ○ Pay range minimum rate comparison
 - 36 ■ Overall average -4.1%
 - 37 ○ Pay range midpoint rate comparison
 - 38 ■ Overall average -0.9%
 - 39 ○ Pay range maximum rate comparison
 - 40 ■ Overall average 1.3%
 - 41 ○ Current average actual pay comparison
 - 42 ■ Overall average -2.2%
 - 43 • Removing grade 4 puts the average at -0.4%
 - 44 ○ Survey range compared to Orem average
 - 45 ○ City range compared to city average
 - 46 ○ 60th percentile comparison – range minimum
 - 47 ■ Overall average -7.0%

DRAFT

- 1 • Examining the average formal range 60th percentile minimum of
- 2 the survey participants in comparison to Orem's formal range
- 3 minimum, shows the city's pay range starting rates trailing the
- 4 market on average -7.0%
- 5 • Benefits Picture
- 6 ○ Core fixed benefits
- 7 ▪ Health insurance, Life insurance, Health savings accounts, Vision
- 8 insurance, Dental insurance, Cafeteria contributions, EAP, Wellness plans,
- 9 misc.
- 10 ▪ Regular employees fixed benefits comparison (family coverage – hourly
- 11 basis)
- 12 ○ Core variable benefits
- 13 ▪ Retirement, Social Security, Medicare, Long term disability, Short term
- 14 disability, misc.
- 15 ▪ Regular employees variable benefits comparison
- 16 • Full-time fire employees received 28.75% in total retirement
- 17 benefits and full-time police employees receive 44.39% in total
- 18 retirement benefits
- 19 ▪ Regular employees Grade 10 base pay impact comparison
- 20 • Starting pay of a Grade 10 at the 60% was \$42,574
- 21 ○ City of Orem health plan analysis
- 22 ○ Medical Claims – PEPM
- 23 ○ Rx Claims – PEPM
- 24 ○ Net Loss Ratio – PEPM
- 25 ○ Orem Health Plan Utilization
- 26 ▪ Standard plan – 171%
- 27 ▪ High deductible – 56%
- 28 ▪ Retirees – 339%
- 29 • Number covered by Retiree Plan
- 30 • Market Analysis Results
- 31 ○ Jobs potentially ahead of market – 10 positions
- 32 ○ Jobs potentially behind market – 27 positions
- 33 ○ Mitigating considerations
- 34 ▪ Given the overall needs, interests, organizational philosophy and general
- 35 understanding of the market place (based upon market analysis
- 36 instruments) should the city place greater credibility upon the internal
- 37 equity instrument?
- 38 ▪ What indicators currently support a necessity for action, i.e., attrition,
- 39 recruitment issues, retention issues, talent development objectives, etc.?
- 40 ○ Employee Overview
- 41 ▪ City of Orem Turnover 2005-2014
- 42 ▪ City of Orem employees leaving for other employment
- 43 ▪ Current Orem workforce age
- 44 ▪ Orem employee years of service
- 45 • Conclusions
- 46 ○ The Hay internal equity methodology was generally validated and consistently
- 47 reliable

DRAFT

- 1 ○ The analysis of the city’s compensation practices revealed that maintaining the
2 60th percentile philosophy resulted in:
 - 3 ▪ The city is modestly lagging behind with regard to starting pay rates
 - 4 ▪ Is competitively positioned with regard to midpoint rates
 - 5 ▪ Enjoys a slight competitive edge with regard to pay range maximums
- 6 ○ As illustrated previously, the city lags in overall total compensation based upon
7 benefit costs; however not accounted for in the benefit data is “level of benefit”,
8 which dramatically influences costs, nor is the individual employer experience
9 ratings that may govern premiums. The approach used is a comparison of “out-of-
10 pocket” costs
- 11 • Going Forward
 - 12 ○ Reset compensation philosophy and update relevant supporting and
13 communicating documentation (e.g. Employee Handbook)
 - 14 ○ Redesign pay plan structure relative to range practices
 - 15 ▪ Market average proposed pay plan
 - 16 ▪ Proposed pay plan – 60th percentile
 - 17 ○ Articulate potential pay progression formulas based upon learning curve,
18 merit/performance (individual & work team recognition) and longevity
 - 19 ▪ Salary increase historical view
 - 20 ▪ Cost of living adjustments amongst comparable cities
 - 21 ▪ Merit increases amongst comparable cities
 - 22 ▪ Average base pay increases by industry
 - 23 ○ Reset organizational culture to expect and deliver excellence, through a redefined
24 performance evaluation process
 - 25 ○ Prepare implementation strategy and timeline for compensation and classification
26 adjustments (e.g. FY 2016 Budget Process, targeted pay grade adjustments)
 - 27 ○ Identify features and enhancements to job valuation method that can strengthen
28 internal equity outcomes (e.g. through additional examination of job descriptions
29 to ensure accuracy with current practices and note additional job valuation
30 criteria)

31
32 The staff and Council discussed Orem’s general position in terms of employee compensation and
33 benefits, comparison of positions with surrounding and comparable municipalities, employee
34 retirement, and the recommendations moving forward with the budget.

35
36 Mr. Bybee clarified that in some positions comparison across the board with other municipalities
37 and districts was difficult, but the comparisons were as close as could reasonably be done. Mr.
38 Bybee said Orem wanted to be a little above market to recruit and retain the best talent, and
39 maintain a competitive edge. He said market analysis was one tool in the box, with another being
40 internal equity.

41
42 Mr. Manning said turnover rate of employees leaving Orem for other employment had been on
43 the rise in recent years. Orem had seen no or minor increase in wages in several years, and the
44 spike in employees leaving for other employment was most often those having been employed in
45 the zero- to four-year range. They would work in Orem and learn their tradecraft, and then leave
46 for higher paying employment elsewhere. Mr. Manning said it was preferable for the city to
47 retain the employees they trained.

DRAFT

1 Mr. Davidson said during recent years of economic downturn, Orem had been able to retain key
2 employees because of the “buffer” created by accelerating employees to midpoint within a three
3 year period. That had been the historical practice, but with economic and other factors that
4 system would not always be sustainable.

5
6 Mr. Bybee said the recommendation was to shift the paradigm from longevity to merit or
7 performance based compensation, while still maintaining a competitive edge. The previous
8 structures had created an expectation that was difficult to meet. Once everyone was in their
9 appropriate range, a merit-based system would be better moving forward. Mr. Bybee said other
10 cities were moving to the trend of merit versus market as well.

11
12 Mayor Brunst asked if this would be a two percent increase every year.

13
14 Mr. Davidson said the increase would not be a set number, but a particular commitment to a
15 compensation program. The uncertainty for employees has posed a challenge, particularly for
16 employees currently in the bottom ranges. If there was no prospect of progress, employees were
17 likely to search out other opportunities, and Orem would lose quality employees. He said the
18 philosophy would be to give an employee a range where they had the opportunity to progress
19 through the entire range over the course of their career. If over the course of years an employee
20 maintained strong performance, they would reach the top of the range. Important factors in that
21 decision-making process would be employee evaluations from department directors, budget
22 resources and availability of funds, and the market.

23
24 Mr. Bybee said they first wanted to show justification behind proposing these increases, and then
25 more specific data would be determined and presented to the Council as part of the budget for
26 Fiscal Year 2015.

27
28 Mr. Davidson said they had tentatively programmed 1 percent for structure, and a 3 percent merit
29 increase for the budget that was included in the \$21 million for wages. If they were consistently
30 willing to dedicate resources it would keep Orem from falling behind market as well as send a
31 message to employees and staff that they were valued as important members of the organization.
32 He said ultimately it was the Council’s budget, but this was the recommendation.

33 34 35 **5:30 P.M. STUDY SESSION – PUBLIC SAFETY TRAINING ROOM**

36
37 CONDUCTING Mayor Richard F. Brunst, Jr.

38
39 ELECTED OFFICIALS Councilmembers Hans Andersen, Margaret Black, Tom
40 Macdonald, Mark E. Seastrand, and David Spencer

41
42 APPOINTED STAFF Jamie Davidson, City Manager; Brenn Bybee, Assistant
43 City Manager; Greg Stephens, City Attorney; Chris
44 Tschirki, Public Works Director; Scott Gurney, Fire
45 Department Director; Gary Giles, Police Department
46 Director; Richard Manning, Administrative Services
47 Director; Bill Bell, Development Services Director;

DRAFT

1 Charlene Crozier, Library Director; Jason Bench, Planning
2 Division Manager; Steve Earl, Deputy City Attorney; Jason
3 Bench, Planning Division Manager; Neal Winterton, Water
4 Division Manager; Ryan Clark, Economic Development
5 Division Manager; Steven Downs, Assistant to the City
6 Manager; and Jackie Lambert, Deputy City Recorder

7
8 EXCUSED Brent Sumner

9
10 Preview Upcoming Agenda Items

11 Staff presented a preview of upcoming agenda items.

12
13 PRESENTATION – Miss Orem Float Design Options

14 Kimberly Harris, Miss Orem Director, provided information and presented options on the float
15 design for the upcoming season. The theme for this year’s SummerFest was “Dream Big”. She
16 asked for input from the Council on which designs they would prefer and any changes they
17 wanted to make to any existing designs.

18
19 Mayor Brunst thanked Ms. Harris for her efforts in working with the Miss Orem program and the
20 City.

21
22 Agenda Review

23 The City Council and staff reviewed the items on the agenda.

24
25 City Council New Business

26 There was no new City Council business.

27
28 The Council adjourned at 5:53 p.m. to the City Council Chambers for the regular meeting.

29
30 **6:00 P.M. REGULAR SESSION – COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

31
32 CONDUCTING Mayor Richard F. Brunst, Jr.

33
34 ELECTED OFFICIALS Councilmembers Margaret Black, Tom Macdonald,
35 Mark E. Seastrand, and David Spencer

36
37 APPOINTED STAFF Jamie Davidson, City Manager; Brenn Bybee, Assistant
38 City Manager; Greg Stephens, City Attorney; Chris
39 Tschirki, Public Works Director; Scott Gurney, Fire
40 Department Director; Gary Giles, Police Department
41 Director; Richard Manning, Administrative Services
42 Director; Bill Bell, Development Services Director;
43 Charlene Crozier, Library Director; Steve Earl, Deputy
44 City Attorney; Jason Bench, Planning Division Manager;
45 Steven Downs, Assistant to the City Manager; and Jackie
46 Lambert, Deputy City Recorder

DRAFT

1 EXCUSED Brent Sumner

2

3 INVOCATION /

4 INSPIRATIONAL THOUGHT Kari Rutherford

5 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE John Bartholomew

6

7 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

8

9 Mrs. Black **moved** to approve the February 24, 2015, City Council meeting minutes. Mr.
10 Spencer **seconded** the motion. Those voting aye: Hans Andersen, Margaret Black, Richard
11 Brunst, Tom Macdonald, Mark Seastrand, David Spencer. The motion **passed** unanimously.

12

13 Mrs. Black **moved** to approve the February 25, 2015, Joint City Council/Alpine School District
14 meeting minutes. Mr. Spencer **seconded** the motion. Those voting aye: Hans Andersen, Margaret
15 Black, Richard Brunst, Tom Macdonald, Mark Seastrand, David Spencer. The motion **passed**
16 unanimously.

17

18 MAYOR'S REPORT/ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL

19

20 Upcoming Events

21 The Mayor referred the Council to the upcoming events listed in the agenda packet.

22

23 Appointments to Boards and Commissions

24 Mayor Brunst **moved** to appoint Tim Smith, Christine Alleman, and Blake Tierney to the CARE
25 Advisory Commission. Mr. Andersen **seconded** the motion. Those voting aye: Hans Andersen,
26 Margaret Black, Richard Brunst, Tom Macdonald, Mark Seastrand, David Spencer. The motion
27 **passed** unanimously.

28

29 Recognition of New Neighborhoods in Action Officers

30 There were no new Neighborhoods in Action Officers recognized.

31

32 CITY MANAGER'S APPOINTMENTS

33

34 Appointments to Boards and Commissions

35 Mayor Brunst **moved** to give the Council's advice and consent to the City Manager's
36 reappointment of Sergio Okamura to the Board of Building and Fire Code Appeals. Mr.
37 Seastrand **seconded** the motion. Those voting aye: Hans Andersen, Margaret Black, Richard
38 Brunst, Tom Macdonald, Mark Seastrand, David Spencer. The motion **passed** unanimously.

39

40 PERSONAL APPEARANCES

41

42 Time was allotted for the public to express their ideas, concerns, and comments on items not on
43 the agenda. Those wishing to speak should have signed in prior to the meeting, and comments
44 were limited to three minutes or less.

45

46 John Reinhard, resident, said he had been thinking about the visual and physical appearance of
47 State Street. He wondered how Orem could encourage private property owners to make

DRAFT

1 improvements, and suggested that using CDAs might be a way to accomplish that. Mr. Reinhard
2 thought that might incentivize businesses to develop, because they could receive benefit if they
3 met certain benchmark specifications. He said the plans regarding State Street's future looked
4 like a lot of thought had gone into them, and one important aspect of the plan was how to pay for
5 those improvements and development.

6
7 Mayor Brunst took a moment to update the Council on recent business developments in the city,
8 UTOPIA, and the current legislative session.

9 10 **CONSENT ITEMS**

11
12 There were no Consent Items.

13 14 **SCHEDULED ITEMS**

15
16 6:20 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING – Culver Sign Zone
17 ORDINANCE - Amending Section 14-3-3 of the Orem City Code (Freestanding Signs:
18 (Pole & Monument) (7) Sign Zone Table) by creating a new Sign Zone “F,” and amending
19 the sign zone for property located generally at 780 North 1200 West from Sign Zone E to
20 Sign Zone F

21
22 Jason Bench reviewed with the Council the applicant's request that the City Council, by
23 ordinance, amend Section 14-3-3 of the Orem City Code (*Freestanding Signs: (Pole &*
24 *Monument) (7) Sign Zone Table*) by creating a new Sign Zone “F,” and amending the sign zone
25 for property located generally at 780 North 1200 West from Sign Zone E to Sign Zone F.

26
27 The applicant, Spencer Young, was currently constructing the Culver's restaurant at 780 North
28 1200 West which was adjacent to I-15 on the southeast side of the 800 North interchange. The
29 Culver's site was in Sign Zone E which allowed pole signs to be constructed thirty-five feet
30 above the natural grade or twenty-five feet above the grade of the freeway, whichever was
31 greater.

32
33 The Culver's property was located in a natural depression and the applicant had determined that
34 its signs would not be adequately visible to traffic traveling north on I-15 at the height allowed in
35 Sign Zone E. Specifically, the applicant believed that traffic traveling north on I-15 would not
36 have enough time to identify the Culver's sign in time to exit the freeway. The applicant
37 conducted a study showing balloons at twenty-five and fifty feet above the height of the freeway
38 and concluded that locating the sign fifty feet above the freeway was necessary to provide
39 adequate visibility for northbound traffic to identify their business in time to exit the freeway.

40
41 A topographic survey was conducted by the Engineering department to verify the difference in
42 elevation between I-15 and the Culver's site. The results showed the Culver's site to be
43 approximately thirteen feet (12.94 feet) lower than the grade of I-15.

44
45 Because of the topographically depressed location of the applicant's property, staff
46 recommended that a new sign zone be created to address this specific area without altering all of
47 Sign Zone E (which generally applied to properties located adjacent to the I-15 corridor

DRAFT

1 throughout the City). The proposed Sign Zone F would allow signs in topographically depressed
2 areas to have a maximum height of thirty-five feet above the natural grade or fifty feet above that
3 point of I-15 located directly perpendicular to the sign, whichever was greater. All other
4 regulations for signs in Sign Zone F would be subject to the same regulations as signs in Sign
5 Zone E.

6
7 If the proposed amendment was approved, the applicant would be allowed to construct a sign
8 with a height of sixty-three feet. The City Council approved an amendment to the PD-22 zone
9 (west of 1200 West) in May 2011 to allow the Marriott hotel at 873 North 1200 West to
10 construct an eighty foot tall sign for similar visibility reasons.

11
12 A neighborhood meeting for the proposed amendment was held on January 29, 2015. Four
13 people were in attendance, all of whom were associated with the Culver's restaurant.

14
15 The Planning Commission recommended the City Council, by ordinance, amend Section 14-3-3
16 of the Orem City Code (Freestanding Signs: (Pole & Monument) (7) Sign Zone Table), by
17 creating a new Sign Zone "F," and amending the sign zone for property located generally at
18 780 North 1200 West from Sign Zone E to Sign Zone F.

19
20 Mr. Young thanked the City for the opportunity to come to Orem and to express these concerns.
21 His concern was that his business could not be seen and might fail, like the gas station that had
22 previously been on the property, because of its location in a depressed or "bowl" area that was
23 substantially lower than the freeway deck. They wanted their signs to be seen from the freeway
24 to allow the opportunity to draw in more business.

25
26 Mayor Brunst asked if Culvers was a franchise, and Mr. Young said it was a national franchise,
27 and this location would be the seventh Culvers in Utah. His family would own and manage the
28 location.

29
30 Mrs. Black asked when the opening was scheduled. Mr. Young said the projected opening date
31 was April 27, 2015, so long as the weather cooperated and construction went well. They planned
32 to have a VIP night, which the Council would be invited to.

33
34 Mayor Brunst opened the public hearing. There were no public comments, so Mayor Brunst
35 closed the public hearing.

36
37 Mr. Macdonald **moved**, by resolution, to amend Section 14-3-3 of the Orem City Code
38 (Freestanding Signs: (Pole & Monument) (7) Sign Zone Table) by creating a new Sign Zone "F,"
39 and amending the sign zone for property located generally at 780 North 1200 West from Sign
40 Zone E to Sign Zone F. Mrs. Black **seconded**. Those voting aye: Hans Andersen, Margaret
41 Black, Richard Brunst, Tom Macdonald, Mark Seastrand, David Spencer. The motion **passed**
42 unanimously.

43
44 RESOLUTION – Authorizing the City Manager to execute a partial release of two
45 development agreements recorded against a portion of property in the PD 21 zone (1200
46 South Geneva Road).

DRAFT

1 Steve Earl and Jason Bench reviewed with the Council the applicant's request that the City
2 Council, by resolution, authorize the City Manager to execute a partial release of two
3 development agreements previously recorded against property in the PD-21 zone (1200 South
4 Geneva Road).

5
6 Prior to adopting the PD-21 zone in 2000 (the original Parkway Crossing—now Wolverine
7 Crossing and other projects), the City entered into a development agreement with the original
8 developer of the property concerning a number of issues (hereinafter referred to as the
9 "2000 Development Agreement"). In 2002, the City entered into a second development
10 agreement with the developer (hereinafter referred to as the "2002 Development Agreement")
11 which made certain modifications and additions to the 2000 Development Agreement. Both
12 development agreements were recorded against the property in the PD-21 zone.

13
14 Ben Lowe was the developer of "Area 2" in the PD-21 zone (on the eastern edge adjacent to the
15 railroad tracks). The lenders for the project had requested that the two development agreements
16 be released as to Area 2 upon fulfillment of all terms that apply to Area 2.

17
18 The requirements of the two development agreements as well as the status of each requirement is
19 summarized below:

- 20 1. Developer to construct an overpass, monorail or gondola over I-15 to connect the project
21 with UVU. If construction of the overpass is determined to be impossible or unfeasible,
22 developer is required to increase shuttle capacity to allow capacity to move 20% of the
23 residents between the project and UVU every hour. Must have shuttle departures every
24 10 minutes during peak hours.

25
26 **Status:** This requirement was also included in the text of the original PD-21 zone. A
27 subsequent developer determined that construction of an overpass, monorail or gondola was
28 impossible or unfeasible and requested that the City Council remove this requirement from
29 the ordinance. On October 23, 2007, the City Council amended the PD-21 zone to remove
30 the requirement that the developer construct an overpass or gondola. The City Council also
31 removed the requirement that the developer provide a private shuttle service because UTA
32 had begun providing bus service from the project to UVU.

- 33
34 2. Install sewer lines that gravity feed into the City's trunk line in 1000 South just west of
35 Geneva Road.

36
37 **Status:** Completed.

- 38
39 3. Dedicate a strip of land 12' in width along the western boundary of the PD-21 zone
40 (adjacent to Geneva Road) from 1000 South to University Parkway and construct road
41 widening improvements.

42
43 **Status:** Completed.

- 44
45 4. Dedicate an additional strip of land 15' in width along the western boundary from 1000
46 South to University Parkway just east of the previous dedication for construction of
47 sidewalk and public utilities. Developer to install 8' sidewalk in this strip.

DRAFT

1 **Status:** Completed.
2

- 3 5. Construct and dedicate a signalized intersection at 1000 South and Geneva Road. Install a
4 fiber connection to the new signal from the existing signal at University Parkway and
5 Geneva Road.
6

7 **Status:** Completed.
8

- 9 6. Reconstruct the east leg of 1000 South through UVU from the intersection of 1000 South
10 and Geneva Road to the project site.
11

12 **Status:** This obligation was completed by UTA when they constructed and dedicated 1000
13 South Street to provide access to the intermodal station.
14

- 15 7. Provide access to the project from Geneva Road directly opposite the main access into
16 the UTA property at 1100 South Geneva Road.
17

18 **Status:** Completed.
19

- 20 8. Install a raised median on University Parkway from the intersection with Geneva Road to
21 a point located approximately 600 feet east of the intersection with Geneva Road.
22

23 **Status:** The City Traffic Engineer has determined that a raised median in this location would
24 not be in the best interest of the City. Therefore, this obligation has not been completed.
25

- 26 9. Contribute \$200,000 to the City for future construction of a public safety building on the
27 west side of I-15.
28

29 **Status:** Some property owners in the PD-21 zone have paid their proportionate share of this
30 obligation and the City is working on collecting from those owners who have not yet paid
31 their share. The applicant has agreed to pay his proportionate share before the City Manager
32 executes a release.
33

- 34 10. Project to be developed as one single project as shown in Appendix X.
35

36 **Status:** Although the project was originally intended to be constructed as a unified
37 development, the original developer allowed options on some of the parcels in the PD-21
38 zone to expire which resulted in the zone being developed as separate projects. The City
39 Council has approved amendments to Appendix X (the PD-21 concept plan) to allow
40 separate developments. However, the City has attempted to ensure cross access across each
41 of the properties in the PD-21 zone.
42

43 As the above summary indicated, the only item that had not been fully completed or modified
44 (expressly or implicitly) by the City was the requirement to make a payment toward a future
45 public safety building as described in item 9.
46

DRAFT

1 At this time, the applicant was only requesting that the City Council release the two development
2 agreements as to his property (Area 2—approximately 11.48 acres) and only after he made the
3 payment of his proportionate share toward a new public safety building (\$43,360). However, in
4 the interest of efficiency, staff also requested that the City Council authorize the City Manager to
5 execute a partial release with respect to any other property owner who also paid their respective
6 share of the \$200,000.00 public safety contribution.

7
8 City Staff recommended that the City Council, by resolution, authorize the City Manager to
9 execute a partial release from the 2000 Development Agreement and the 2002 Development
10 Agreement for any property in the PD-21 zone for which payment of its proportionate share of
11 the public safety building contribution has been received.

12
13 Mayor Brunst **moved**, by resolution, to authorize the City Manager to execute a partial release of
14 two development agreements recorded against a portion of property in the PD 21 zone (1200
15 South Geneva Road). Mr. Andersen **seconded**. Those voting aye: Hans Andersen, Margaret
16 Black, Richard Brunst, Tom Macdonald, Mark Seastrand, David Spencer. The motion **passed**
17 unanimously.

18 19 COMMUNICATION ITEMS

20
21 Mr. Davidson said UVU and Slide the City had approached the City about having a large
22 waterslide in conjunction with the first week of school activities. The slide would go down
23 800 South and impact homes and traffic in that specific area for one day. Only approximately
24 100 of these events would be scheduled this year throughout the USA, and this would be the only
25 event in Utah County. Anyone looking to participate would purchase an armband for specific
26 times to slide. Mr. Davidson said he would bring this issue to the Council for consideration.

27
28 Mr. Macdonald asked if the liability issues had been considered. Mr. Davidson said they had
29 been resolved. Mr. Macdonald said he thought it would be a fun activity and a great opportunity
30 for partnership with the City and UVU.

31
32 Mrs. Black suggested homeowners that were inconvenienced should get a free slide or some kind
33 of compensation. Mr. Davidson assured the Council that they would be taken care of.

34
35 Mayor Brunst asked about safety and emergency personnel at the event. Mr. Davidson said they
36 could require those, as well as private security.

37
38 Mr. Seastrand asked about parking for the event. Mr. Davidson said the student lots would
39 accommodate for parking.

40
41 Mr. Davidson asked the Council to consider the possibility of a City Council Retreat on April 17,
42 2015. This would be a one day event, likely held at the Sundance Resort. He said they would
43 receive an email invitation, and asked that Council check their calendars and respond to email.

44
45 Mr. Davidson said there was the opportunity of attending a CenturyLink presentation in Las
46 Vegas and making a site visit to see how the equipment worked. The site visit was scheduled for

DRAFT

1 April 8, 2015, tentatively at 3:00 p.m., as Council would already be in the vicinity for the Utah
2 League of Cities and Towns conference in St. George.

3
4 Mayor Brunst requested they have the opportunity to speak with public officials from the area
5 and they were in favor of that.

6
7 Mr. Seastrand expressed concern about construction traffic adding many hours to the drive and
8 cutting into the time of the conference.

9
10 Mr. Macdonald asked what the hope was in attending the presentation.

11
12 Mr. Davidson said they would get to see actual equipment and watch fiber installation, as well as
13 speak with the local officials. They could ask questions and get a feel for the expansion of a fiber
14 network.

15 16 CITY MANAGER INFORMATION ITEMS

17
18 There were no City Manager information items.

19 20 ADJOURNMENT

21
22 Mr. Andersen **moved** to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Macdonald **seconded** the motion. Those
23 voting aye: Hans Andersen, Margaret Black, Richard F. Brunst, Tom Macdonald, Mark E.
24 Seastrand, David Spencer, and Brent Sumner. The motion **passed** unanimously.

25
26 The meeting adjourned at 6:43 p.m.

DRAFT

CITY OF OREM
SPECIAL JOINT CITY COUNCIL TOUR
WITH THE RECREATION ADVISORY COMMISSION
345 West 600 South, Heber, Utah
March 12, 2015

3:00 P.M. TOUR - WASATCH RECREATION FACILITY, HEBER

ELECTED OFFICIALS Mayor Richard F. Brunst; Councilmembers Hans Andersen, Margaret Black, and Mark E. Seastrand

RECREATION ADVISORY COMMISSION MEMBERS Rick Clark, Paul Crossett, Chelsea Jolley, Stacey Noel, Phil Patten, Gary Schinnell, and Steve Smith

APPOINTED STAFF Brenn Bybee, Assistant City Manager; Steven Downs, Assistant to the City Manager; Karl Hirst, Recreation Director; Gena Bertelsen, Administrative Assistant

RECREATION DIRECTOR REPORT

Phil Patten welcomed Mayor Brunst, City Council Members and city officials to the bus tour and turned the time over to Karl Hirst.

Mr. Hirst explained that the information gathering tour was at the request of the Recreation Advisory Commissioners. They wanted to share with the Mayor and Council why they would like to recommend a multiuse facility as their top project for funding from CARE revenue. If the Council agreed, the next step would be a market analysis which would cost approximately \$75,000.

While traveling to the Wasatch Recreation Facility in Heber, members of the commission shared how they had reached their decision. They noted that they had spent many hours over the last eight months studying other facilities, listening to presentations from community members, and questioning professionals in recreation and planning.

The Mayor and Councilmembers shared their thoughts and concerns taking this route with CARE funding.

The tour returned to the Senior Center at 5:15 p.m. and adjourned.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, Purple Day is a global, national, and state effort dedicated to promoting epilepsy awareness in countries and states around the world; and

Whereas, epilepsy is one of the most common neurologic conditions, estimated to affect over 50 million people worldwide, almost three million people in the United States, and an estimated 27,000 people in the state of Utah; and

Whereas, one in twenty-six people will develop epilepsy, and one in ten people will have at least one seizure during his or her lifetime; and

Whereas, the public is often unable to recognize common seizure types, or how to respond with appropriate first aid; and

Whereas, lack of knowledge about epilepsy leads to stigma, isolation, teasing, and even bullying of children with epilepsy; and

Whereas, Purple Day will be celebrated annually on March 26th to increase understanding, reduce stigma, and improve the quality of life for people with epilepsy throughout the state, country, and globally;

NOW THEREFORE, I, Richard F. Brunst, Jr., Mayor of the City of Orem, hereby proclaim the day of March 26, 2015, as

“Purple Day” Awareness of Epilepsy

in the City of Orem, in an effort to raise awareness of epilepsy in Utah.



Dated this 24th day of **March** 2015.

Richard F. Brunst, Jr., Mayor

ATTEST:

Donna R. Weaver, City Recorder

CITY OF OREM
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 24, 2015



REQUEST:	6:20 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING Receive Public Comment on the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Projected Use of Funds for Fiscal Year 2015-2016
APPLICANT:	City of Orem City Manager's Office
FISCAL IMPACT:	\$638,190

NOTICES:

- Posted in 2 public places
- Posted on City webpage
- Posted on State Public Noticing Website
- Faxed to newspapers
- E-mailed to newspapers
- Neighborhood Chair

PREPARED BY:
Steven Downs
Asst. to City Manager

RECOMMENDATION:

The Community & Neighborhood Services Manager recommends the City Council hold the first of two public hearings to receive public comment on the projected uses of funds for the 2015-2016 Community Development Block Grant.

BACKGROUND:

During the past few months, the CDBG Citizen Advisory Commission heard funding proposals from various applicants who wish to receive CDBG funding. The Commission will present its recommendations to the City Council then the public hearing will be opened for comment on the proposed uses of funds.

Following a second public hearing that is scheduled for April 28, 2015, at 6:00 p.m., the City Council will adopt a resolution approving the CDBG Final Statement of Projected Uses of Funds for 2015-2016.

Funding includes new entitlement and projected program income.

**FINAL STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
OBJECTIVES AND PROJECTED USE OF FUNDS
PROGRAM YEAR 40
JULY 1, 2014 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2015
GRANT NO.: B-14-MC-49-002
CITY OF OREM, UTAH**

The City of Orem intends to meet the requirement of seventy percent benefit to low and moderate-income persons in the aggregate use of funds to be expended during the program year 2014-2015.

The Community Development Block Grant is designed to assist communities in efforts to improve living conditions for low and moderate-income residents. Each eligible activity must meet at least one of the national objectives established by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Activities must benefit fifty-one percent low and moderate-income persons in a given census tract or block group, improve designated areas of slum and blight, or address an urgent community need.

The activities identified below meet at least one of the national objectives established by HUD. They also meet local objectives specific to the City of Orem.

The targeted local objectives include the following:

1. Improve the quality of life for families by funding projects, which address the needs of low and moderate-income residents.
2. Stabilize older residential neighborhoods and decrease the amount of substandard housing through housing rehabilitation and through eliminating or improving slum and/or urban blight.
3. Encourage and pursue the establishment of commerce and industry, which will provide quality employment for the unemployed and under-employed.
4. Remove architectural barriers and achieve all compliable directives of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), thereby making the community more accessible.

The HUD national objectives include the following:

HUD Defined-Outcome/Objective Codes	Availability/Accessibility	Affordability	Sustainability
Decent Housing	DH-1	DH-2	DH-3
Suitable Living Environment	SL-1	SL-2	SL-3
Economic Opportunity	EO-1	EO-2	EO-3

**FINAL STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
OBJECTIVES AND PROJECTED USE OF FUNDS
PROGRAM YEAR 41
JULY 1, 2015 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2016
GRANT No.: B-15-MC-49-002
CITY OF OREM, UTAH**

ORGANIZATION	FUNDING ALLOCATION	LOCAL OBJECTIVE	NATIONAL OBJECTIVE
CENTER FOR WOMEN AND CHILDREN IN CRISIS	\$ 7,500	1	SL-3
CHILDREN'S JUSTICE CENTER	10,000	1	SL-3
COMMUNITY ACTION SERVICES	14,500	1	SL-3
COMMUNITY HEALTH CONNECT	4,000	1	SL-3
FAMILY SUPPORT& TREATMENT CENTER	10,000	1	SL-3
FOOD AND CARE COALITION	6,730	1	SL-3
HOUSE OF HOPE	5,000	1	SL-3
KIDS ON THE MOVE	5,000	1	SL-3
MOUNTAINLAND COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTER	4,000	1	SL-3
LITERACY RESOURCES (OREM LITERACY CENTER)	2,000	1	SL-3
PARENT EDUCATION RESOURCE CENTER (PERC)	2,000	1	SL-3
PROJECT READ	2,000	1	SL-3
RECREATION AND HABILITATION	7,000	1	SL-3
CENTRO HISPANO	3,000	1	SL-3
PEOPLE HELPING PEOPLE	4,000	3	EO-1
MOUNTAINLAND ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (MAG)	2,000	1	SL-2
BIG BROTHERS BIG SISTERS	1,000	1	SL-3
UTAH COUNTY 4-H	1,500	1	SL-3
HABITAT FOR HUMANITY	35,000	2	DH-2
CITY OF OREM – CODE ENFORCEMENT	120,000	1	SL-3
CITY OF OREM – HOUSING REHAB*	20,000	2	DH-2
*NO NEW FUNDS, BUT UNSPENT FUNDS WILL ROLL FORWARD			
CITY OF OREM – SECTION 108 LOAN REPAYMENT	105,000	3	EO-3
CITY OF OREM – PUBLIC FACILITIES, STREETS/SIDEWALKS	151,960	1,4	SL-3
CITY OF OREM – PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	115,000	ALL	ALL
CITY OF OREM – BUSINESS REVOLVING LOAN FUND	0	3	EO-2
TOTAL	\$638,190		

CDBG FINAL STATEMENT

FUNDING SOURCES
Program Year 41
July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016
B-15-MC-49-0002
City of Orem, Utah

CDBG FUNDING SOURCES AVAILABLE FOR USE:

CDBG Fund Allocation	\$608,190.00
-Repayments in the Housing-Rehabilitation Loan Fund	30,000.00
TOTAL	\$638,190.00

The City of Orem intends to meet the requirement of seventy percent benefit to low and moderate-income persons in the aggregate use of funds to be expended during the program years through 2015-2016.

CITY OF OREM
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
 MARCH 24, 2015



REQUEST:	RESOLUTION – Amending the Residential Parking Permit Area between 800 South and 925 South and 600 West and 725 West to include the north and south sides of 800 South between 600 West and 725 West
APPLICANT:	Police Department – City of Orem
FISCAL IMPACT:	The City will incur the cost of issuing and administering the permits and enforcing the residential parking permit area.

NOTICES:

- Posted in 2 public places
- Posted on City webpage
- Posted on the State website
- Faxed to newspapers
- E-mailed to newspapers
- Neighborhood Chair

SITE INFORMATION:

General Plan Designation:
 N/A
 Current Zone:
 N/A
 Acreage:
 N/A
 Neighborhood:
Sunset Heights
 Neighborhood Chair:
Shaun Heaton

PREPARED BY:
 Heather Schriever
 Assistant City Attorney

RECOMMENDATION: The Chief of Police recommends that the City Council, by resolution amend the residential parking permit area adopted by Resolution R-2015-0005 on February 24, 2015, to include both the north and south sides of 800 South between 600 West and 725 West in Orem, Utah.

BACKGROUND: The City of Orem is responsible for protecting the health, safety, and general welfare of the City. With the ongoing enrollment of students and the expansion of Utah Valley University, there has been an increase in the number of nonresidents who are using 600 West, 725 West, 800 South, 925 South, 950 South and the connected cul-de-sacs as on-street parking during the university’s business hours. The nonresident motor vehicles remain on these streets for the majority of the day between 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. To resolve this parking issue, the Orem City Council adopted Resolution R-2015-0005 creating a residential parking area. Upon further investigation and after further discussions with 800 South residents, the Orem Police Department has discovered that this parking pattern extends to the north and south sides of 800 South between 600 West and 725 West. The Orem Police Department, in order to resolve these parking concerns, finds it necessary to include the north and south sides of 800 South between 600 West and 725 West in the residential parking permit area established by Resolution R-2015-0005. The residents who reside on the north and south sides of 800 South between 600 West and 725 West have indicated a desire to be included in the residential parking area. The cul-de-sac of 880 South will not be included in the residential parking permit area at the request of the residents living in that cul-de-sac.

Having supplemented the investigation upon which Resolution R-2015-0005 was based, and having obtained the consent of each of the residents impacted, the Orem City Police Department now recommends that the City Council amend the residential parking permit area created by Resolution R-2015-0005 to include both the north and south sides of 800 South between 600 West and 725 West.

If the City Council amends the residential parking permit area as proposed, any resident within the residential parking permit area will be permitted to park any cars registered to his/her dwelling in the residential parking permit area, and each dwelling within the residential parking permit area will be given two (2) visitor/guest permits.

DRAFT

RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE RESIDENTIAL PARKING PERMIT AREA BETWEEN 800 SOUTH AND 925 SOUTH AND 600 WEST AND 725 WEST TO INCLUDE THE NORTH AND SOUTH SIDES OF 800 SOUTH BETWEEN 600 WEST AND 725 WEST

WHEREAS the City Council is concerned for the health, safety and welfare of all neighborhoods within the City; and

WHEREAS the City Council has determined that the area between 800 South and 925 South and 600 West and 725 West within the City of Orem has had an influx of motor vehicles owned by nonresidents; and

WHEREAS by Resolution R-2015-0005 the City Council of the City of Orem created a residential parking area between 800 South and 925 South and 600 West and 725 West based on a parking study conducted by the Orem City Police Department; and

WHEREAS the Orem Police Department has supplement its investigation and discovered that the parking issues address by Resolution R-2015-0005 extend to the north and south sides of 800 South between 600 West and 725 West; and

WHEREAS the findings and conclusions of Resolution R-2015-0005 are incorporated into this Resolution by reference and are found to be applicable to the north and south sides of 800 South between 600 West and 725 West.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OREM, UTAH, as follows:

1. The City Council hereby amends the residential parking permit area created by Resolution R-2015-0005 to include the north and south sides of 800 South between 600 West and 725 West which amendment is reflected with the blue line included on Exhibit A attached hereto.

2. All parking restrictions and permits included to Resolution R-2015-0005 are hereby made applicable to the north and south sides of 800 South between 600 West and 725 West.

PASSED and APPROVED this 10th day **March** 2015.

DRAFT

Richard F. Brunst, Jr., Mayor

ATTEST:

Donna R. Weaver, City Recorder

COUNCIL MEMBERS VOTING "AYE"

COUNCIL MEMBERS VOTING "NAY"

DRAFT

EXHIBIT "A"

