



CITY OF OREM
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
56 North State Street, Orem, Utah
April 28, 2015

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

3:00 P.M. WORK SESSION – PUBLIC SAFETY TRAINING ROOM

1. **BUDGET DISCUSSION/PREVIEW – CARE**

5:00 P.M. STUDY SESSION – PUBLIC SAFETY TRAINING ROOM

2. **DISCUSSION – Annual Open Meetings Training**

PREVIEW UPCOMING AGENDA ITEMS

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

AGENDA REVIEW

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

CITY COUNCIL - NEW BUSINESS

5. **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

6. **MINUTES of City Council Meeting – April 14, 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

- 7. **UPCOMING EVENTS**
- 8. **APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS**
Arts Council.....3 vacancies
- 9. **RECOGNITION OF NEW NEIGHBORHOODS IN ACTION OFFICERS**
- 10. **PROCLAMATION – Fair Housing Month**

CITY MANAGER’S APPOINTMENTS

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

PERSONAL APPEARANCES – 15 MINUTES

- 12. **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

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

SCHEDULED ITEMS

- 6:00 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING – CDBG
- 14. **RESOLUTION – Adopt Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Final Statement of Projected Uses of Funds – 2015-2016**

RECOMMENDATION: The Assistant to the City Manager recommends the City Council, by resolution, adopt the updated Final Statement of Projected Uses of Funds for Orem’s 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 presented its recommendations to the City Council in the first of two public hearings on March 24, 2015. Tonight’s public hearing is the final opportunity for public comment on the recommendations before the City Council officially adopts the Final Statement of Projected Uses of Funds for Orem’s 2016-2015 Community Development Block Grant. Please see the allocation recommendations below:

Public Services – limited by HUD to 15% of new entitlement funding
Family Support & Treatment - \$10,000
Project Read - \$2,000

PERC - \$2,000
Center for Women & Children in Crisis - \$7,500
Community Actions Services - \$14,500
Mountainland Community Health - \$4,000
House of Hope- \$5,000
Big Brothers Big Sisters - \$1,000
Literacy Resources - \$2,000
RAH - \$7,000
Friends of the Children's Justice Center - \$10,000
Friends of the Food and Care Coalition - \$6,730
Utah County 4-H - \$1,500
Community Health Connect - \$4,000
Kids on the Move - \$5,000
People Helping People - \$4,000
Centro Hispano - \$3,000
Mountainland Association of Governments - \$2,000

Other

Habitat for Humanity - \$35,000
Code Enforcement (Neighborhood Preservation) - \$120,000
Infrastructure - \$151,960
Administration - \$115,000
Section 108 Loan Repayment - \$105,000
Housing Rehabilitation - \$20,000

COMMUNICATION ITEMS

15. Monthly Financial Summary – March 2015.

CITY MANAGER INFORMATION ITEMS

16. 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

DRAFT

CITY OF OREM
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
56 North State Street Orem, Utah
April 14, 2015

3:00 P.M. WORK SESSION – PUBLIC SAFETY TRAINING ROOM

CONDUCTING

Mayor Richard F. Brunst

ELECTED OFFICIALS

Councilmembers Hans Andersen, Margaret Black, Tom Macdonald, Mark E. Seastrand, David Spencer, and Brent Sumner

APPOINTED STAFF

Jamie Davidson, City Manager; Brenn Bybee, Assistant City Manager; Greg Stephens, City Attorney; Chris Tschirki, Public Works Director; Karl Hirst, Recreation 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; Ryan Clark, Economic Development Division Manager; Reed Price, Maintenance Division Manager; Ernesto Lazalde, Information Technologies Division Manager; Sam Kelly, City Engineer; Steven Downs, Assistant to the City Manager; and Jackie Lambert, Deputy City Recorder

URMMA Presentation – Paul Johnson

Paul Johnson, CEO of Utah Risk Management Mutual Association (URMMA), presented information to the City Council about the possibility of representing groups beyond municipalities. Mr. Johnson said a small special service district had requested to join URMMA, but current documentation would not allow that. The URMMA Board of Directors would require a unanimous vote of each municipality to amend the interlocal agreements to allow URMMA to represent groups like counties or special service districts. Mr. Johnson further explained that not all other groups would be a good fit for URMMA, and there would be an application and vetting process before allowing a group to join. He said adding groups like special service districts would not likely affect other URMMA cities. However, there was potential that a special service district could have a large claim which could impact URMMA reserve funds. Mr. Johnson said it would affect staff to a degree, because specialized training may be required for personnel. He asked the general thoughts of the Council on the possible expansion of URMMA.

Mrs. Black asked what the advantage to URMMA would be in expanding to include special service districts.

DRAFT

1 Mr. Johnson said adding groups could help with reserve funds, depending on the size of the
2 entity. Many special service districts served in areas congruent with URMMA cities, and most
3 special service districts did not have great liability issues.

4
5 Mayor Brunst asked what would be considered a big lawsuit.

6
7 Mr. Johnson said he considered any suit that would take from URMMA reserves would be
8 considered a big lawsuit, around \$.5 million and up. He said there was approximately \$9 million
9 in reserves currently.

10
11 Mr. Sumner asked if there was only the one request to join URMMA.

12
13 Mr. Johnson said only one request currently, but other entities had inquired. The current request
14 came from a small special fire district near the URMMA municipality of Enterprise. The district
15 had assumed they were covered because Enterprise was covered. The fire district had not had
16 claims yet in its history but had the potential for lawsuits as it had taxing authority to raise funds
17 to pay its contract costs.

18
19 Mr. Davidson said Mr. Johnson had done a tremendous job at URMMA and his many
20 improvements to the organization had caught the attention of other groups. URMMA's hands
21 were tied because it was not permitted to expand under the current structure. The Board had
22 asked Mr. Johnson to meet with each municipality's council to gauge whether the councils
23 would look favorably or unfavorably on expanding before URMMA brought anything formally
24 before a council. Mr. Davidson said increasing the pool of working partners in the organization
25 would increase revenues and encourage entities to stay with URMMA. He emphasized that any
26 entity would go through a thorough evaluation process before being allowed to join.

27
28 Mrs. Black said it sounded like it would be a good fit with special service districts.

29
30 Mr. Andersen asked about how rates were set.

31
32 Mr. Johnson said there was a formula to figure the rates. The formula for a city rate was based on
33 budget, number of employees, and the types of activities they would do. They would use a
34 similar formula.

35
36 The general consensus of the City Council was that expansion of URMMA would be viewed
37 favorably.

38 FOLLOW UP – Utility Master Plan

39
40 Mr. Tschirki provided an update on the Utility Master Plan regarding the public information and
41 outreach process. He said Steven Downs and Peter Wolfley had been working to produce a three
42 to five minute informational video that would include interviews with key participants in the
43 update process, aerial shots using drones, and educational illustration. Mr. Tschirki said wells
44 and springs would be included in the aerial shots, as well as footage from the water treatment and
45 reclamation facilities to show residents how water gets from its source to their homes. He said
46 one important point of information would be that the proposed plan was a debt free plan, and that
47 increases would be incremental to cover costs over time. He also said this was a modest course

DRAFT

1 correction to make the systems sustainable into the future. Mr. Tschirki said the mailer would
2 show a one-year snapshot only and would be sent to every resident individually, marked clearly
3 as important so residents know to read it.
4

5 Mr. Downs said they would be contracting with the same individual who had done other Orem
6 videos. He said they planned to use an analogy of doing home repairs sooner rather than later to
7 prevent further damage and cost in the future. The message would be not that Orem had waited
8 too long, but that the time to act was now to avoid major problems into the future. Mr. Downs
9 said the goal was to educate as well as inform as to the necessity for and rationale behind the
10 proposed changes. Along with the video there would be a webpage built to answer frequently
11 asked questions, show graphical representations, break down the utility needs into the three
12 categories of water, sewer, and storm water, and allow for residents to ask questions and receive
13 feedback. The information presented would be as general or as detailed as needed for
14 individual's preference. Mr. Downs also said information would be included on the quarterly
15 newsletter, and there would be a separate mailer that would go out to each residence about the
16 proposed changes. There would be open houses, public information meetings, and an ad placed
17 in the *Daily Herald* to reach all citizens through as many mediums as possible.
18

19 The Mayor and Council reviewed a sample mailer with Mr. Tschirki and Mr. Downs, and gave
20 feedback and suggestions on ways to improve the mailer. Some feedback included adding
21 historical and current comparisons with other cities on utilities, timeline of implementation dates,
22 more accurate wording and clear graphics, a calendar of public meetings and open houses as well
23 as best locations for meetings, and other suggestions for how to inform citizens to ensure
24 awareness of the proposed plan. Another point of feedback was to explain that the increases were
25 tied to CPI (Consumer Price Index), and to give context of what funds will go to immediately
26 and in the future.
27

28 Mayor Brunst suggested showing how limited utility increases had been in Orem previously and
29 that the proposed increases were now needed out of necessity to balance many years with little or
30 no increase.
31

32 Mrs. Black said it was important to show comparisons with other cities, and that many were
33 reviewing similar proposals for utility increases.
34

35 Mr. Macdonald agreed, saying he thought a comparison of Orem and other cities from 2010
36 through 2020 would be of value to show where Orem would fall with the average over the ten
37 years.
38

39 Mayor Brunst said the changes were needed but the amount was high, and he anticipated a lot of
40 feedback.
41

42 Genelle Pugmire with the *Daily Herald* asked for clarification about proposed increases.
43

44 Mr. Tschirki said the proposal was an average annual increase to the monthly bill.
45

46 Mr. Sumner said it might be beneficial to take an average bill and walk through the average
47 increases for residential and commercial utilities.

DRAFT

1 Mr. Tschirki said they planned to have that information available online and at the open houses.

2
3 Mr. Davidson said it might be possible to create an online do-it-yourself tool where citizens
4 could enter their information and the tool would generate the information on increases and show
5 what the amount would be for the new bill. He said creating the tool would take some time but
6 could likely be done within a few months.

7
8 Mrs. Black said it was important to be clear about the timeline for implementation.

9
10 Mayor Brunst said he thought the wording should reflect that the plans were proposed to
11 encourage residents to come out to open houses and give feedback.

12
13 Mr. Davidson said that, from a policy perspective, the Council agreed that something needed to
14 be done. The wording was important, but it was equally important to emphasize the need for
15 these updates.

16
17 Mrs. Black said the wording could reflect the need for the changes to support the proposed plan.
18 That way the need was made clear, and the plan was specified as a proposal.

19
20 Mr. Macdonald said making the need clear was most important.

21
22 Mayor Brunst asked where open houses would likely be held.

23
24 Mr. Tschirki said they planned to have them at the Public Works facility, so residents could get
25 tours of the facility and see equipment. Staff anticipated extending opportunities for tours and
26 personal visits to the water reclamation facility as well.

27
28 Mr. Sumner asked if it might be better to host some meetings in schools throughout Orem, so it
29 would be easier for residents to come.

30
31 Mr. Davidson said having it at the Public Works facility would show the magnitude of the
32 operation to open the eyes of residents who may not realize how much went into it.

33
34 Mr. Tschirki said the meetings could be held at multiple facilities and some equipment could be
35 brought to other locations, but at least one at meeting would be held at the Public Works
36 building.

37
38 Mrs. Black said it might be a good idea for the City Council to tour the various water and utility
39 facilities.

40 41 BUDGET DISCUSSION / PREVIEW – Enterprise Funds, CIP

42 Mr. Tschirki presented on Enterprise Funds and Capital Improvement projects (CIP). He said all
43 but recreation enterprise funds were part of public works. Public works enterprise funds were for
44 water, sewer, storm water, and street lighting. There was a street enterprise fund in the form of
45 Fund 20, which was a road fund. Fund 45 was the City's general CIP fund. Mr. Tschirki said
46 traffic operations were not an enterprise fund, and had received \$1.3 million in grant money to
47 construct improvements for Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS). With that they had added

DRAFT

1 eleven CCTVs, replaced eighteen detection systems, upgraded thirteen data collection stations,
2 and installed eight new data collection stations.

3 4 Public Works Department Fiscal Year 2015-2016 Capital Improvement Projects

- 5 • Capital Improvement Projects
 - 6 ○ Parks (Fund 10/45)
 - 7 ○ Traffic Operations (Fund 10/45)
 - 8 ○ Streets (Fund 20)
 - 9 ○ Water (Fund 51)
 - 10 ○ Water Reclamation (Fund 52)
 - 11 ○ Storm Water (Fund 55)
 - 12 ○ Street Lighting (Fund 10/58)
- 13 • Traffic Operations (Fund 10/45)
 - 14 ○ \$1.3 million ITS Project in FY 2014-2015
 - 15 ○ Fund 45 was used to pay for \$60,000 match
 - 16 ■ Added 11 CCTVs
 - 17 ■ Replaced Detection at 18 Locations
 - 18 ■ Upgraded 13 Data Collection Stations
 - 19 ■ Installed 8 New Data Collection Stations
 - 20 ■ Replaced 21 Cabinets
 - 21 ■ Installed 7.5 miles of New Fiber
- 22 • Streets (Fund 20)
 - 23 ○ NOTE: \$.05 gas tax begins on January 1, 2016. Six months of this increase will
24 be accrued and is estimated to be \approx \$240,000. Revenue approaching \$480,000 per
25 year is expected to start FY 2017
 - 26 ○ \$240,000 will be assigned to the next highest priority overlay project (400 South,
27 800 East to Carterville at \$125,000)
 - 28 ○ State of the Streets Study will be updated this year
 - 29 ■ Identifies revenues needed to provide a variety of LOS (OCI = 80)
 - 30 ○ 2016 Crack Seals
 - 31 ■ \$300,000
 - 32 ■ 28 miles
 - 33 ○ Micro-Surfacing FY 2016
 - 34 ■ \$100,000
 - 35 ■ \$0.25/SF
 - 36 ■ Type 3 = 3/8" aggregate
 - 37 ■ Heavier, better wear and driving surface
 - 38 ○ Slurry Seal FY 2016
 - 39 ■ \$400,000
 - 40 ■ \$0.12/SF
 - 41 ■ Type 2 = 2/8" = 1/4" aggregate
 - 42 ■ Lighter product, good wear and driving surface
 - 43 ○ Overlay/Reconstruct FY 2016
 - 44 ■ \$230,000
 - 45 ■ \$1.00 - \$1.50/SF
 - 46 ○ 2016 Reconstruct
 - 47 ■ None planned

DRAFT

- 1 ▪ \$0
- 2 ▪ \$3.00 - \$5.00/SF
- 3 ▪ 1200 West highest priority
- 4 • Water (Fund 51)
 - 5 ○ \$3.7 million CIP recommendation
 - 6 ○ \$850,000 total available for CIP/CP
 - 7 ○ 400 West
 - 8 ○ Replace Jet/Vac Truck & Backhoe
- 9 • Water Reclamation (Fund 52)
 - 10 ○ \$1.1 million total available
 - 11 ○ \$2.7 million proposed in MP
- 12 • Storm Water (Fund 55)
 - 13 ○ \$610,000 total
 - 14 ○ \$2 million MP recommendation
- 15 • Street Lighting (Fund 10/58)
 - 16 ○ Six Expired Street Lighting Districts
 - 17 ○ Approximately 300 Cobra Heads Owned by RMP
 - 18 ○ City Pays for Power and Maintenance (SCH 11)
 - 19 ○ SCH 11 ~ \$16.54/Month
 - 20 ○ SCH 12e ~ \$4.62/Month
 - 21 ○ Estimated \$1.2M Material and Installation Costs
 - 22 ○ Additional Costs To Be Identified – Further Evaluation Necessary
 - 23 ○ Siemens Energy Audit: Performance Based Contract
 - 24 ○ State Street, Center Street to 1800 South
 - 25 ○ Approximately 106 RMP Cobra Heads Owned by RMP
 - 26 ○ City Pays for Power and Maintenance (SCH 11)
 - 27 ○ SCH 11 ~ \$16.54/Month
 - 28 ○ SCH 12e ~ \$4.62/Month
 - 29 ○ \$500,000? Material and Installation
 - 30 ○ RMP Purchase Cost – Currently Under Evaluation
 - 31 ○ Siemens Energy Audit: Performance Based Contract
- 32 • Fleet (Fund 61)

33

34 Mr. Tschirki said the vehicles that were scheduled for replacement had been repaired and had

35 parts replaced for years during the recession years to keep them running, but it was not cost

36 effective to continue to do so. He said the increase in gas tax of \$.05 would produce around

37 \$480,000 but would not go into effect until January 1, 2016. Money would not flow in on

38 January 1, 2016, but would be programmed from then into the next fiscal year and into the

39 future.

40

41 Mayor Brunst asked how many employees were trained on fiber.

42

43 Mr. Tschirki said three were trained for splicing but only one or two would actually do that.

44

45 Mr. Seastrand asked about the rotation of crack sealing areas.

46

DRAFT

1 Mr. Tschirki said it was an eight-year rotation, with slurry sealing following the crack sealing
2 schedule.

3
4 Mr. Sumner asked if street projects were contracted out, or if the City did those.

5
6 Mr. Tschirki said a good portion of street projects were contracted out, like overlays and
7 reconstructs, but the City did projects like leveling, patches, pot holes, and parking lot
8 treatments.

9
10 Mayor Brunst asked how long it would take to replace small pipes with correctly sized pipes
11 throughout the city.

12
13 Mr. Tschirki said if funding were in place it could be done in a few months. It was not, so pipe
14 replacement would be done incrementally. Lining would extend the life of the pipes.

15
16 Mayor Brunst asked if vehicles being replaced could be sold or recycled in some way.

17
18 Mr. Tschirki said that, generally speaking, very little could be recycled because of the age of the
19 vehicles, and it would be unusable or unsellable because of the heavy use of the vehicle.

20
21 Mayor Brunst asked if there was a grant from Rocky Mountain Power (RMP) for updating to
22 LED street lights.

23
24 Mr. Tschirki said there was about \$80 rebate per LED light. He said the City was also looking to
25 replace RMP lights with Orem lights which would create long-term savings as the City would no
26 longer pay RMP to maintain. Annually the City paid approximately \$400,000 to Rocky
27 Mountain Power for that maintenance and power. If the City owned the lights, they would only
28 pay for the power through RMP.

29
30 Mr. Andersen said replacing existing lights would have higher costs and asked if the City could
31 just replace the bulbs in the cobra lights.

32
33 Mr. Tschirki said the cost to replace lights would be the most cost effective option in the long
34 run because they would save on costs for maintenance. Replacing the bulbs in those lights would
35 not bring any savings to the City. Mr. Tschirki said there were only approximately 300 cobra
36 head lights that needed replacing in a pool of 5,000 lights.

37
38 Mr. Davidson explained that certain programs like Information Technology (IT) were not funded
39 through enterprise funds, but through internal service funds. He turned the time over to Ernesto
40 Lazalde, Information Technologies Division Manager, to present an overview of the Information
41 Technologies Strategic Plan.

42
43 Information Technologies Strategic Plan

- 44 • Key IT Services
 - 45 ○ Network design, installation, and maintenance
 - 46 ○ Network and server security
 - 47 ○ Network and Telephone wiring

DRAFT

- 1 ○ Wireless network design and management
- 2 ○ Integrated Library System (ILS)
- 3 ○ Cell phone account management
- 4 ○ Desktop, laptop, printer, and peripheral support
- 5 ○ Telephone system
- 6 ○ Email and collaboration software
- 7 ○ Third-party applications
- 8 • Mayor Projects FY 2015/2016
- 9 ○ Implementation of the new Integrated Library System (ILS) software
- 10 ○ Replace 70 desktop computers
- 11 ○ Organize a Help Desk system to provide extended hours support
- 12 ○ 311 and citizen service request system
- 13 ○ Develop software that takes advantage of new technologies
- 14 ○ Update the telephone operating system and switch firmware
- 15 ○ Replace two virtual host servers
- 16 ○ Install early warning intrusion detection system
- 17 • Integrated Library System
- 18 ○ Replaces library software that has been in place for over 10 years
- 19 ○ Integrates with the latest technologies and services
- 20 ○ More flexible configuration and user interface
- 21 ○ Supports better integration of digital media
- 22 ○ Database can be accessed through an application programming interface for
- 23 customer features and integration with City financial applications
- 24 ○ Better user experience with mobile apps and customer account features
- 25 • Computer Rotation Plan
- 26 ○ Servers rotated every 3 years (virtual hosts)
- 27 ○ Personal computers every 4 years
- 28 ○ Core switching equipment every 7 years
- 29 ○ Telephones every 7 to 10 years
- 30 ○ Patrol car laptops every 4 years
- 31 • Computer Replacement Summary
- 32 ○ Replaced this year (FY 2014/2015)
- 33 ▪ Fitness Center – 10
- 34 ▪ Public Works – 11
- 35 ▪ Police and Fire – 38
- 36 ▪ Library – 5
- 37 ▪ City Manager’s Office – 4
- 38 • TOTAL – 68
- 39 ○ Next Fiscal Year (FY 2015/2016)
- 40 ▪ Fitness Center – 3
- 41 ▪ Public Works – 11
- 42 ▪ Police and Fire – 16
- 43 ▪ Library – 24
- 44 ▪ Legal Services – 4
- 45 ▪ Administrative Services – 10
- 46 ▪ Development Services – 2
- 47 • TOTAL – 70

DRAFT

- 1 • Computer Rotation Plan
- 2 • Centralized Help Desk Implementation
 - 3 ○ Allows for extended hours support
 - 4 ○ Facilitates cross training of support staff
 - 5 ○ Consolidates personnel resources that are used to support other departments
 - 6 ○ Central access to support databases and resolution information
 - 7 ○ All network administrative tasks can be given to support technicians to empower
 - 8 them with better resolution capabilities and more useful after-hours support
 - 9 ○ Uniform accountability and performance measurements for support staff
 - 10 ○ Cross-training for better user support
- 11 • Help Desk Software (\$85,000)
 - 12 ○ Tracks inventory of computer hardware and software
 - 13 ○ Manages software licensing
 - 14 ○ Provides remote deployment of software upgrades and new installations
 - 15 ○ Comprehensive query features
 - 16 ○ Remote control of user computer by help desk technicians
 - 17 ○ Schedule maintenance updates to groups of computers
 - 18 ○ Will allow IT to support more applications and computers without hiring more
 - 19 technicians
 - 20 ○ Vital as a central tool for a centralized help desk with extended hours support
- 21 • IT Proposed Organizational Chart
- 22 • 311 and Citizen Service Request Software (\$85,000)
 - 23 ○ Automates the process for dealing with service requests and work orders
 - 24 ○ Maintains knowledge transfer (currently the City's secretaries, receptionists, and
 - 25 clerks get about 2,000 calls per month)
 - 26 ○ Faster/efficient service, all FAQ's in one place, increased transparency, more
 - 27 focus on customer service/responsiveness
 - 28 ○ Web/App interface for citizens, employees taking the call, for the employees
 - 29 implementing the service request, and for management/supervisors to see an
 - 30 overview of the requests
 - 31 ○ The flexible nature of this software can integrate with and would enhance existing
 - 32 applications the City has developed or have already been purchased
- 33 • Software Development Goals
 - 34 ○ Convert data access methods in existing applications to SQL (industry standard)
 - 35 ○ Develop all new applications with SQL architecture
 - 36 ○ Develop mobile applications that tie to City databases
 - 37 ○ Add imaging features to existing applications as a step to paperless processing
 - 38 ○ Cross train developers
 - 39 ○ Provide training to staff on new technologies
 - 40 ○ Utilized Cloud Computing in our software development efforts
 - 41 ○ Implement a prioritization system for new applications
 - 42

43 Mr. Lazalde said an intrusion detection system would be to detect intruders into the network in
44 real time and alert staff when the intrusion happens. He said hackers and other organizations
45 were using different techniques that bypassed traditional software security measures. Orem
46 wanted to stay a step ahead and protect its databases. There had not been a security breach thus
47 far, and Orem contracted with a security company to test systems and report on what they found.

DRAFT

1 Every three months a test was conducted to be PCI compliant to allow the City to continue to
2 take payments by credit card. Mr. Lalalde continued that the current ILS system used by the
3 library was running on Windows XP, which was a system that was no longer supported. For
4 library computers to continue to access their ILS system, they had to use old and outdated
5 equipment. They planned to implement the new ILS system in conjunction with computer
6 replacement in the library.

7
8 Mayor Brunst asked about Orem programs on the cloud.

9
10 Mr. Lalalde said some programs were currently on the cloud, for example the meter reader and
11 building inspector applications. He said there were several different types of cloud-based
12 services, and to maintain security and data control Orem would create its own cloud-based
13 service, served from Orem's data center.

14
15 Mr. Davidson said Chief Giles was working with other agencies to establish cloud-based
16 dispatch services.

17
18 Mr. Bybee said Mr. Lalalde had been working to implement a strategic plan for the IT program,
19 and they were trying to spread costs over the years and focus on customer service internally as
20 well as externally.

21
22 Mr. Lalalde said the goal of the technology was to help people do more work with fewer
23 personnel.

24
25 Mayor Brunst asked if the 311 system would be similar to Provo's.

26
27 Mr. Lalalde said it would be similar, with some specific features for Orem.

28
29 Mr. Davidson said it would allow the City to set the foundational piece of a 311 system. The idea
30 in the future was if people had a question about a service the City would provide, they would not
31 need to remember the specific phone number of the department they needed but could call 311
32 and speak to an operator who would direct the call. A physical consolidation, like Provo had,
33 would be additional phase.

34
35 Mr. Davidson said several months ago \$2.8 million was transferred into the CIP (Capital
36 Improvement Project) fund to keep the General Fund from reaching its maximum in reserves and
37 to go toward various projected. He invited Sam Kelly, City Engineer, to present the City's
38 recommendations on how some of those funds were proposed to be spent.

39 40 General Fund Capital Improvement Projects

- 41 • Fire Station #1
 - 42 ○ Parking lot replacement
 - 43 ○ Estimated cost \$300,000
- 44 • Scera East Parking Lot
 - 45 ○ Parking lot replacement
 - 46 ○ Estimated cost \$200,000
- 47 • Westmore Park

DRAFT

- 1 ○ Parking lot replacement
- 2 ○ Estimated cost \$40,000
- 3 • Senior Center
- 4 ○ Carpet replacement
- 5 ○ Estimated cost \$40,000
- 6 • Cascade Park
- 7 ○ Playground equipment replacement
- 8 ○ Estimated cost \$75,000
- 9 • Police
- 10 ○ Body camera
- 11 ○ Estimated cost \$23,000
- 12 • Lakeside Sports Park
- 13 ○ Fence repair
- 14 ○ Estimated cost \$25,000
- 15 • Nielson's Grove/Mt. Timpanogos Park
- 16 ○ Wood structure staining
- 17 ○ Estimated cost \$60,000
- 18 • Signal Upgrade
- 19 ○ 800 South – 1200 West
- 20 ○ Estimated cost \$92,000 (cost share with UVU)
- 21 • Microsurfacing
- 22 ○ 1600 North
- 23 ○ 1060 West – 800 East
- 24 ○ Estimated Cost \$160,000
- 25 • Windsor Park
- 26 • Studies
- 27 ○ MAG Funded Project
- 28 ▪ 1200 South/State Street Intersection Relocation Study
- 29 ▪ Estimated cost \$30,000 (6.77% match)
- 30 ○ MAG Funded Project
- 31 ▪ Lakeview Parkway
- 32 ▪ Estimated cost \$30,000 (6.77% match)
- 33 ○ Transportation Oriented Development (TOD) Study
- 34 ▪ Multi-agency study of TOD and University Parkway
- 35 ▪ Estimated cost \$10,000

36

37 Mr. Kelly said nearly all the playground equipment at Cascade Park would need to be replaced.
38 Because of its age, it could no longer be cannibalized.

39

40 Chief Giles said the real cost with body cameras was not necessarily the cost of the camera itself,
41 but the retention and storage of data. He said following the retention schedules was priority, as
42 well as finding a cost effective way to store and manage the amount of data the cameras would
43 collect. He said body cameras would be a multiyear implementation. There would also need to
44 be staff updates on software training, redacting, and retention schedules. Chief Giles said other
45 municipalities had implemented body cameras with no long-term plan for how to store the data.

46

DRAFT

1 Mr. Davidson said body cameras had been discussed in the legislative session, and he applauded
2 Chief Giles for being a step ahead of a mandate. Once they identified the best system for the
3 cost, significant dollars would need to be invested.

4
5 Mayor Brunst said he was interested in getting Nielson's Grove back to full order.

6
7 Mr. Hirst said Steve Davis had informed him that the plan was to have the fountains working for
8 the coming season.

9
10 Mr. Davidson said the parks crew had done a nice job doing repairs in the park over the winter.
11 He said Mr. Tschirki, Mr. Price, and the park staff were working to get the park back to full
12 working order.

13
14 Mayor Brunst asked about the status of the 1600 North intersection in terms of resurfacing.

15
16 Mr. Kelly said the intersection would not be done at this time because of the plans to buy
17 property to update the intersection. They were negotiating with property owners to get things out
18 to bid to construct and fix road.

19
20 Mayor Brunst asked about the signal upgrade in conjunction with the Alpine School District.

21
22 Mr. Kelly said it would be moved to the north where the pick-up and drop off would be.

23
24 Mrs. Black asked if the signal would keep the crossing guard.

25
26 Mr. Kelly said a crossing guard would still be stationed there during school hours. After hours
27 the intersection would function as a regular hawk signal.

28
29 Mr. Davidson said the projects identified were simple things like parking lot reconstructs, but
30 they were long overdue. He said when the City Council authorized the transfer from reserve to
31 CIP fund, within budgeting guidelines and rules the City could now allocate those moneys to
32 these identified projects. If the Council was comfortable with the outlined projects, then those
33 projects could begin in earnest as no additional formal procedure was necessary.

34
35 Mr. Macdonald said he agreed with the proposed projects but wanted to make sure these were
36 the top priority projects.

37
38 Mr. Davidson said several months ago Mr. Tschirki brought in a long list of CIP for parks. The
39 projects proposed tonight were five of the top priorities on the list, and the idea was to
40 incrementally work through the list as best as possible. They wanted to spread the projects
41 throughout Orem instead of concentrating on specific areas.

42
43 Mayor Brunst said the proposed projects were only about half of the money that had been
44 transferred, so the Council could make suggestions for other projects on the list.

45
46 The general consensus was to move forward with the proposed projects.

DRAFT

ADJOURN TO THE CITY CENTER BASEBALL FIELDS

The Orem Youth Baseball games were delayed due to inclement weather.

5:00 P.M. STUDY SESSION – PUBLIC SAFETY TRAINING ROOM

CONDUCTING Mayor Richard F. Brunst, Jr.

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

APPOINTED STAFF Jamie Davidson, City Manager; Brenn Bybee, Assistant City Manager; Greg Stephens, City Attorney; Chris Tschirki, Public Works Director; Karl Hirst, Recreation 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; Ryan Clark, Economic Development Division Manager; Reed Price, Maintenance Division Manager; Steven Downs, Assistant to the City Manager; and Jackie Lambert, Deputy City Recorder

Preview Upcoming Agenda Items

Staff presented a preview of upcoming agenda items.

Agenda Review

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

City Council New Business

There was no new City Council business.

The Council adjourned at 5:49 p.m. to the City Council Chambers for the regular meeting.

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

CONDUCTING Mayor Richard F. Brunst, Jr.

ELECTED OFFICIALS Councilmembers Margaret Black, Tom Macdonald, Mark E. Seastrand, David Spencer, and Brent Sumner

APPOINTED STAFF Jamie Davidson, City Manager; Brenn Bybee, Assistant City Manager; Greg Stephens, City Attorney; Chris Tschirki, Public Works Director; Karl Hirst, Recreation Director; Scott Gurney, Fire Department Director; Gary Giles, Police Department Director; Richard Manning,

DRAFT

Administrative Services Director; Bill Bell, Development Services Director; Charlene Crozier, Library Director; Jason Bench, Planning Division Manager; Steve Earl, Deputy City Attorney; Ryan Clark, Economic Development Division Manager; Reed Price, Maintenance Division Manager; Steven Downs, Assistant to the City Manager; and Jackie Lambert, Deputy City Recorder

INVOCATION /

INSPIRATIONAL THOUGHT Marie Ridge

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE Sarah Bateman

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

MAYOR'S REPORT/ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL

Upcoming Events

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

Appointments to Boards and Commissions

There were no appointments to boards and commissions.

Recognition of New Neighborhoods in Action Officers

Mr. Macdonald **moved** to appoint Jed C. Christensen as the Geneva Heights neighborhood chair. Mrs. Black **seconded** the motion. Those voting aye: Hans Andersen, Margaret Black, Richard F. Brunst, Tom Macdonald, Mark E. Seastrand, David Spencer, Brent Sumner. The motion **passed** unanimously.

PROCLAMATION – Arbor Day

Mayor Brunst read the proclamation for Arbor Day, designating April 24th as a day to encourage citizens to plant trees in Orem to beautify the landscape, enhance property values, moderate the temperature, clean the air, reduce erosion, and provide habitat for wildlife.

Reed Price, Maintenance Division Manager, said Orem was proud to have been recognized as a Tree City USA for nearly twenty consecutive years. The City had embraced having trees in the community to beautify Orem for residents and visitors, and would continue to strive to maintain the qualifications to be distinguished as a Tree City USA.

RECOGNITION – 2015 Utah State Mother of Achievement – Gladeeh Begaye

Mayor Brunst recognized Orem resident Gladeeh Begaye, who was named the 2015 Utah State Mother of Achievement by the American Mothers, Inc., Utah Association. Mayor Brunst

DRAFT

1 highlighted some of Ms. Begaye’s many accomplishments and contributions to the community,
2 and thanked her for all of her efforts to improve the lives of those around her.

3 4 **CITY MANAGER’S APPOINTMENTS**

5 6 Appointments to Boards and Commissions

7 There were no appointments to boards and commissions.
8

9 **PERSONAL APPEARANCES**

10
11 Time was allotted for the public to express their ideas, concerns, and comments on items not on
12 the agenda. Those wishing to speak should have signed in prior to the meeting, and comments
13 were limited to three minutes or less.
14

15 Alanna Hunter, resident, said she was concerned about the new website set up for the
16 Neighborhood Preservation Unit. The landscaping portion was too general in the code. She said
17 she thought that left the website open to overuse and abuse. There should be clarification on
18 what constituted a legitimate complaint to avoid overzealous neighbors making unfounded
19 reports. She said she appreciated that the website asked what steps had already been taken before
20 turning things over to City officials.
21

22 Alysha Milligan, resident, said she wanted to advocate for a dog park in Orem. She referenced a
23 recent survey where many respondents had noted they would be interested in a dog park in
24 Orem, especially for those who did not have spacious yards where dogs could play off the leash.
25 Ms. Milligan said she had a Facebook group called Orem’s Bark Park as a forum for dog owners
26 to share ideas and post information.
27

28 Mayor Brunst gave a brief update on the Utah League of Cities and Towns midyear conference.
29 He said a main topic of discussion was adopting the local option sales tax for motor fuel, which
30 had been passed by the state legislature and would now go to the county commissioners for
31 adoption. It allowed for tax to be based on a whole sale rate and to be added as a \$0.25 sales tax
32 that would go toward BNC roads, mass transit, and county roads. Mayor Brunst said it was
33 important to improve and maintain roads and transportation for this generation and generations
34 to come.
35

36 **CONSENT ITEMS**

37
38 There were no Consent Items.
39

40 **SCHEDULED ITEMS**

41
42 6:20 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING – General Plan and Rezone – 1027 & 1045 E 800
43 RESOLUTION – Amending the General Plan by changing the land use designation from
44 Low Density Residential (LDR) to Community Commercial (CC) on 0.69 acres located
45 generally at 1027 and 1045 East 800 North

DRAFT

1 ORDINANCE – Amending Article 22-3-5(A) and the Zoning Map of the City of Orem by
2 changing the zone from R8 to C1 on approximately 0.69 acres at 1027 and 1045 East 800
3 North

4
5 Mr. Bench reviewed the applicant’s request that the City Council, by resolution, amend the
6 General Plan land use map of the City of Orem from Low Density Residential (LDR) to
7 Community Commercial (CC) and amend, by ordinance, Article 22-3-5(A) and the Zoning Map
8 of the City of Orem by changing the zone from R8 to C1 on approximately 0.69 acres at 1027
9 and 1045 East 800 North.

10
11 The applicant owned two parcels of property on the north side of 800 North at 1027 East and
12 1045 East 800 North. The two parcels combined contained a total of approximately .567 acres.
13 There was an existing structure on each parcel which had both been used as assisted living
14 facilities since 1995. The building on the east continued to be occupied by Canyon View
15 Assisted Living and the building on the west was currently vacant. The property was currently
16 zoned R8 which allowed assisted living facilities for elderly persons as a permitted use. The
17 combined properties were also bordered by residential dwellings on the west, east and north.

18
19 The applicant was requesting that the property be rezoned to the C1 zone. The C1 zone allowed a
20 number of office-type uses, but did not allow retail uses. The C1 zone allowed buildings to be
21 constructed to an overall height of forty-eight (48) feet and had no architectural or finishing
22 material requirements.

23
24 The applicant also requested that the City Council amend the General Plan to apply the
25 Community Commercial (CC) designation to the subject properties. The General Plan currently
26 designated the properties as Low Density Residential (LDR). The Community Commercial
27 designation would allow the property to be rezoned to either the C1, C2, or BP zone.

28
29 The Planning Commission considered this request at a public hearing on March 18, 2015.
30 Among other things, the Planning Commission discussed the implications of rezoning the
31 property to the C1 zone versus the PO zone.

32
33 The Planning Commission believed that the PO zone would be preferable to the C1 zone because
34 the PO zone was specifically created for the 800 North corridor and contained standards that
35 were intended to make buildings more compatible with adjoining residential uses. For example,
36 the PO zone required that buildings be designed with a residential style. It required pitched roofs,
37 limited the types of finishing materials that may be used, provided that no portion of any
38 structure within 100 feet of a residential zone may be more than one floor above the natural
39 grade, limited the total height to thirty-five feet, and limited the footprint of buildings on a site of
40 less than three acres to no more than 7500 square feet. All of these standards were intended to
41 make the PO zone a zone that could be compatibly located adjacent to residentially zoned
42 properties behind the frontage of 800 North. These standards were not included in the C1 zone.

43
44 The new owner would like to operate a detox and short-term drug and alcohol rehabilitation
45 facility on the property. This particular use would likely be classified as either a medical service
46 use (SLU Code 6510) or as a transitional treatment facility (SLU Code 1283) depending on the
47 specifics of the proposed use. Neither of these uses were permitted in the R8 zone. The C1 zone

DRAFT

1 would allow the applicant to operate the type of facility he desired since both transitional
2 treatment facilities and medical services were permitted uses in the C1 zone. If the property were
3 rezoned to the PO zone, the applicant could operate a detox facility on the property as a medical
4 use, but a transitional treatment facility would not be permitted.

5
6 The applicant held a neighborhood meeting related to his request on January 21, 2015. Eight
7 people were in attendance. Some of the attendees had concerns about the future uses of the
8 property, the security of the facility, and encroaching commercial zoning in a residential area.

9
10 If the City Council chose to rezone the property to a commercial zone, Staff recommended that
11 the City execute a development agreement with the owner that would require the owner to install
12 a seven-foot masonry fence around the property to buffer the adjoining residential properties
13 from commercial uses on the property. A seven foot masonry fence was required for all
14 developments in a commercial zone along the boundaries of adjoining residential property.

15
16 Mike Jorgensen, applicant and owner of HDMJ and Steps Recovery Center, said his business
17 operated residential outpatient and sober house facilities in the state and was affiliated with two
18 facilities in Orem. Mr. Jorgensen said he believed the Planning Commission was not supposed to
19 be swayed by public opinion but thought that the outcry of the public at the meeting had
20 influenced the recommendation. Zoning was the issue, not the specific function, he wanted the
21 property to serve, and said the majority of comments at the Planning Commission meeting had
22 negative comments from neighbors about the intended use. Mr. Jorgensen said his understanding
23 was that his intended use for the property would likely be classified as medical service use which
24 could operate in a PO zone. He did not see the area as a residential zone when thousands of cars
25 passed the front door every day on 800 North. Mr. Jorgensen said he believed public outcry came
26 from ignorance of what took place in facilities like the ones he was hoping to establish. He
27 offered to have his medical director address that topic.

28
29 Mayor Brunst said he would prefer to hear only comments about the proposed zone change.

30
31 Mr. Jorgensen said the actual use of the property would be determined by the outcome of this
32 discussion, whether the property be used as a medical detox center or as a sober living home. If
33 the zone amendment was approved to be a C1 or PO zone, the property would be used as a
34 medical detox center where residents were mostly sickly and not active and were under constant
35 supervision. If it was denied, the property would be used as a sober living home which was
36 transitional housing with limited supervision where resident were allowed to smoke and come
37 and go as they wanted. Mr. Jorgensen said a concern the Planning Commission had was that the
38 C1 zone allowed for buildings over forty-eight feet and had no architectural or finishing material
39 requirements, but he would comply with the requirements on height. He said he believed his
40 intended use was the best chance the neighborhood had to keep the “neighborhood” look and
41 feel. He also stated that it was pocket or spot zoning, and those were the only properties left that
42 were not torn down and were not already commercial properties.

43
44 Mr. Macdonald asked if the buildings immediately surrounding the applicant’s property to the
45 east, the south, and the west were all residential, and Mr. Seastrand asked if the zoning in the
46 area was all residential with the exception of the applicant’s property.

DRAFT

1 Mr. Bench said those buildings were all residences in a residential zone.

2
3 Mr. Jorgensen said he thought a business might be operating out of the farthest east residence but
4 was not certain.

5
6 Mayor Brunst opened the public hearing.

7
8 Paula Berguson, resident, said she had sent an email expressing her concerns to the City Council.
9 She said it seemed clear that a C1 zone did not belong in the area. The City had invested in the
10 trail in that neighborhood, and the sidewalk expansion was very nice. The C1 zone would
11 compromise the safety of pedestrians and cyclists along the path. Something to keep in mind was
12 that the canal used to run through the area and now there was a trail, but there were no roads that
13 went through except for 800 and 1200 North. Children walking through to schools would need to
14 walk along those paths. It would increase the traffic in the area and endanger child pedestrians.

15
16 Blake Tierney, resident, said it was a residential zone and the property directly neighbored five
17 or six residential homes. The property was also near an elementary school. He encouraged the
18 Council to listen to or read the public comments from the Planning Commission meeting, which
19 he believed had been primarily focused on zoning issues and, not as Mr. Jorgensen had said, only
20 on the intended use. Mr. Tierney said there were dozens of Orem residents opposed to the zoning
21 change in their neighborhood, and the opposition was not to the use intended. He said for an
22 ordinance to change the zoning, the applicant had to prove four things: (1) it was reasonably
23 necessary to change, (2) the change was in the interest of the public, (3) the change was in
24 harmony of the master plan, and (4) it would more fully promote the objectives and purposes of
25 the ordinances. Mr. Tierney said he did not see that the applicant had satisfied any of the
26 requirements, let alone all four. There were other locations better suited to accommodating them.

27
28 Dr. Jean Ann Johnson-Talbert, medical director for Steps Recovery Center, said she did not fully
29 understand the zoning issue but in reading the minutes and hearing from the community she
30 understood better. From her perspective, the zoning issues were not what she heard people
31 comment on. Dr. Johnson-Talbert did not expect the recovery center to produce much traffic, as
32 clients would stay in the home under medical supervision for five to seven days. She said she
33 believed if the zoning were not amended to allow for the detox recovery center, the alternative
34 was a sober living home where clients with a history of addiction problems would be under
35 minimal or no supervision. She said a detox recovery center would not change the traffic, and
36 they anticipated making minor improvements to the existing, residential-style buildings they had
37 purchased.

38
39 Tom Sitake, resident, had home on the north side of the property. He believed in safety first and
40 foremost. He and his wife were empty-nesters who saw their children and grandchildren
41 frequently and spent time in their yard. While facilities like the one proposed helped people, he
42 was concerned about the safety of his family, the elementary school children who passed through
43 the neighborhood, and the neighbors that he loved.

44
45 John Williams, resident, said he was concerned about changing the zoning for a current owner
46 when there was no guarantee the current owner would stay in business there for long. Mr.
47 Williams did not believe C1 and PO uses were appropriate for the neighborhood. He said, for

DRAFT

1 lack of a better word, the neighborhood was being blackmailed. Mr. Jorgensen's attitude toward
2 the zoning request was, "If you don't give me what I want, I'll give you something worse." Mr.
3 Williams said he took that as a threat.

4
5 Bob Wright, resident, said he had been involved with some of these questions over the years for
6 locations of similar facilities. He understood the use of such a facility and its necessity, residents
7 of the area should have influence on that decision. Mr. Wright suggested the Council ask
8 themselves if they would like this facility in their own neighborhood.

9
10 Cathy Smolier, Steps Recovery employee, said that, instead of looking at Mr. Jorgensen's
11 comment as a threat, they should look at it as an opportunity to have more choice in the
12 neighborhood. Having the detox recovery center in that location would not change the fact that
13 Harmons was across the way, and other commercial businesses were in the area on the busy
14 road. She said they were asking for the most conservative zoning that they could to offer a high-
15 end detox facility that would cater to the patients who were generally not a threat to the
16 community. Ms. Smolier said it was best to take the emotion out of the decision-making process.

17
18 Linda Larsen, resident, said when Beehive homes were initially built they were well managed
19 and taken care of, but over the years different owners and managers had brought deterioration to
20 those same buildings. The elderly residents of those facilities were not cared for as promised.
21 Ms. Larsen said she wanted to be clear that the area of concern would not be about the first
22 owners running the facility, but the potential future owners or managers who could let the
23 property change or deteriorate. The neighbors would appreciate consideration for not just
24 immediate plans, but for future plans in those buildings.

25
26 Mayor Brunst closed the public hearing.

27
28 Mr. Seastrand said he could not speak to how other City Council members felt, but if he looked
29 across the street from the applicant's property he could see what a typical PO zone would be, an
30 area that was clearly commercial. The spot zone in question did not seem clear for commercial.
31 His history had been that spot zone requests could start to encroach on residential zoning. He
32 said he believed the reasons for the variety of zoning applications available was there were
33 permitted uses that tended to cluster and attract similar uses in a zone. Mr. Seastrand said his
34 feeling was the particular spot zone seemed to be an isolated area carved out for a specific
35 purpose. He did not see the uses of a C1 zone being compatible in the future for the zone.

36
37 Mrs. Black said she agreed with Mr. Seastrand's assessment. She thought all the residents in the
38 area would consider the area to be residential. She did not see a reason to change to a different
39 zone at this time.

40
41 Mayor Brunst said his personal feeling was that the current zoning fit the area, and he did not
42 find a compelling reason to change the zone. Those who purchased property were typically
43 aware of the zoning of the property and should have figured the zoning into their plans.

44
45 Mayor Brunst **moved** to deny the request to amend the General Plan by changing the land use
46 designation from Low Density Residential (LDR) to Community Commercial (CC) on 0.69 acres
47 located generally at 1027 and 1045 East 800 North. Mr. Seastrand **seconded**. Those voting aye:

DRAFT

1 Hans Andersen, Margaret Black, Richard F. Brunst, Tom Macdonald, Mark E. Seastrand, David
2 Spencer, Brent Sumner. The motion **passed** unanimously.

3
4 6:20 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING – Standard Land Use (SLU) Codes

5 ORDINANCE – Amending Appendix A of the Orem City Code pertaining to certain
6 Standard Land Use (SLU) Codes in the CM, M1, and M2 Zones

7
8 Mr. Bench reviewed the Department of Development Services request that the City Council
9 amend, by ordinance, a portion of Appendix A of the Orem City Code pertaining to certain
10 Standard Land Use Codes in the M1, M2, and CM zones

11
12 The purpose of this application was to make several heavy industrial uses non-permitted in the
13 M1, M2, and/or CM zones. Most of the uses proposed to be eliminated were not currently
14 located within the City and the proposed amendment would prevent them from moving into the
15 zones in the future.

16
17 The M1, M2 and CM zones were generally located west of the I-15 corridor in Orem in the
18 vicinity of Geneva Road. There was also a small area zoned CM on 800 North at the mouth of
19 Provo Canyon. The uses currently allowed in these zones were industrial uses such as
20 manufacturing, shipping, storage, warehousing, and recycling among and other similar types of
21 uses. This request would limit certain types of heavy industrial uses that could locate within the
22 City; however, many of the uses to be eliminated were not currently located within the City.

23
24 With the expansion and rebuild of Geneva Road, the growth currently taking place in Vineyard
25 and the anticipated growth in Orem, certain several heavy industrial uses that were currently
26 permitted no longer appear to be compatible with the current and anticipated future uses in the
27 vicinity of the Geneva Road corridor, and were not projected to be the best use for the properties
28 located within the M1, M2 and CM zones.

29
30 Much of these zones were located generally along the Geneva Road corridor and the proposed
31 changes would facilitate future redevelopment along the corridor. The Geneva Road corridor in
32 Orem was anticipated to undergo major changes in the future with the continued development of
33 Vineyard and the potential redevelopment of areas in Orem.

34
35 Staff believed that other the types of development that would be appropriate in the Geneva Road
36 corridor include uses such as more consistent with business parks, and light industrial types of
37 development as well as and retail uses were perceived to become more fitting for this area. In
38 order to encourage this type of development, Staff believed that it was appropriate to remove
39 certain heavy industrial uses from the list of permitted uses in these zones. If these heavy uses
40 were not eliminated, it was likely that without these and other changes the area along the Geneva
41 Road corridor would continue to be a heavy industrial area for many years to come.

42
43 The proposed amendments to Appendix A would not affect any current businesses in the City.
44 Of the six (6) uses affected, only SLU 5193 Scrap & Recycling Materials and SLU 4841 Sewage
45 Treatment Plants currently exist in Orem. The amendments to Appendix A did not affect the
46 locations where these existing uses currently operated, but would prohibit them from going in
47 any new locations.

DRAFT

1 In addition to changing these six SLU codes from permitted to not permitted, SLU code 4851
2 Green Waste Composting and Recycling was proposed to be enacted and listed in all zones as
3 not permitted. Green Waste Composting was not an appropriate use in the City due to extreme
4 odor issues associated with this type of businesses.

5
6 The Orem General Plan stated, “Heavy industrial uses should be reduced in the future by
7 developing more light and controlled manufacturing areas to encourage high-tech jobs.” This
8 proposal was consistent with the General Plan.

9
10 During the public hearing on March 18, 2015 the Planning Commission recommended that the
11 permitted Sewage Treatment Plants be classified as ‘Public Only.’ This change was reflected in
12 the proposed amendments.

13
14 Mr. Andersen asked about green waste composting and recycling. He wondered what recycling
15 meant in that context.

16
17 Mr. Bench said strictly green waste was recycled, no scrap metal or other materials. Businesses
18 where materials decompose have odor problems, and surrounding businesses have problems with
19 the smell.

20
21 Mr. Andersen said his recollection was the Council did not want to alter the land use codes
22 without speaking to the businesses in the area first. He wondered what the compelling reason
23 was for doing so now.

24
25 Mr. Bench said what Mr. Andersen was referring to was a change in land use codes that would
26 make certain businesses legal nonconforming uses. Currently, Orem did not have any businesses
27 with these uses in these zones. No businesses would be affected by the proposed change. It was
28 just a first step in looking at the land use and zoning in the corridor.

29
30 Mr. Sumner asked if notices were sent to the existing businesses in the corridor. He said he
31 agreed with eliminating the option for these undesirable businesses, but he was concerned about
32 the perception.

33
34 Mr. Bench said they had done a general notice to the newspaper, not specific notices to the
35 businesses because there were no businesses that would be affected by this change. He said this
36 was the beginning of the process, and there were two meetings scheduled in May where all the
37 businesses in the area would get individual notice to come to the meetings and address these
38 issues. They were not trying to hide the process; this was simply a way to start the process to
39 eliminate undesirable uses while there were no businesses in operation.

40
41 Mr. Davidson said if the City were to change something in an R8 zone, which had broad
42 application, a notice would not go to every property owner. They would follow requirements as
43 noted for proper noticing, and that was why no specific property owners had been contacted
44 individually. No property owners would be directly impacted by the change.

DRAFT

1 Mrs. Black said it would be hard to notify people of a potential slaughterhouse that did not
2 exist and was not proposed. She thought moving forward in this manner here was a good start on
3 the process.

4
5 Mayor Brunst opened the public hearing. There were no public comments so Mayor Brunst
6 closed the public hearing.

7
8 Mr. Seastrand said he owned property in an M2 zone and was concerned about weighing in, but
9 he had spoken to the city attorney who said the change was general enough to not be a conflict of
10 interest, so he felt comfortable participating. He said he was active in discussions with business
11 owners, and none were requesting to have any of the businesses specified and in fact said they
12 did not want these businesses to come into the area.

13
14 Mayor Brunst said that, on a personal note, years ago a business that processed chicken manure
15 had moved in near his own business, which caused a terrible odor even half a mile away. The
16 proposed changes would keep similar issues from arising in Orem.

17
18 Mrs. Black **moved**, by ordinance, to amend Appendix A of the Orem City Code pertaining to
19 certain Standard Land Use (SLU) Codes in the CM, M1, and M2 Zones. Mayor Brunst
20 **seconded**. Those voting aye: Margaret Black, Richard F. Brunst, Tom Macdonald, Mark E.
21 Seastrand, David Spencer, Brent Sumner. Those voting nay: Hans Andersen. The motion **passed**,
22 **6-1**.

23
24 RESOLUTION – To Appropriate Certain Property to the Orem City Police Department for
25 Public Interest Use

26
27 Orem Police Chief Gary Giles asked that the City Council, by resolution, appropriate to the
28 public interest use the following items of property. The Orem City Police Department (OPD)
29 acquired the property as follows:

- 30 • The Remington 870 Wing Master Shotgun, Serial Number 4961904V came into the
31 custody of the OPD after it was used in the commission of a suicide. See Case No.
32 08OR45990. The rightful owners of the property have been given notice that the shotgun
33 is still in the custody of the OPD but have refused to claim the shotgun. The OPD would
34 like to appropriate the shotgun for use as an entry gun by the SWAT team.
- 35 • The OPD found the motorized scooter/skateboard inside a garage after a suspect was
36 arrested for vehicle burglary. See Case No. 13OR16739. The suspect indicated that the
37 scooter/skateboard was stolen, and OPD (after reasonable attempts) has been unable to
38 locate its owner. OPD would like to use the scooter/skateboard as decoy in high-theft
39 areas.
- 40 • A resident turned the Husqvarna Model 435 Chainsaw, Serial Number 20113700161 over
41 to OPD after finding it. See Case No. 13OR39680. The chainsaw has not been reported as
42 stolen. The OPD has made reasonable efforts to locate the owner of the chainsaw, but has
43 been unsuccessful. The resident who found and turned over the chainsaw has been
44 contacted and has been asked to retrieve the property pursuant to Utah Code § 77-24a-5.
45 He has failed to do so. The OPD would like to appropriate the chainsaw to use as a decoy
46 in high-theft areas.

DRAFT

1 Before the lost or mislaid property may be appropriated, the OPD was required to obtain
2 permission from City Council to apply the property to a public interest use. See Utah Code § 77-
3 24a-1 et seq. Pursuant to this statute, the OPD sought the approval of the City Council of (1) the
4 appropriation, and (2) that the above-described uses were for the public interest. Chief Giles
5 specified that property owners either could not be identified or had been contact but had failed to
6 retrieve the property after several years.

7
8 Mayor Brunst **moved**, by resolution, to appropriate certain property to the Orem City Police
9 Department for public interest use. Mr. Macdonald **seconded**. Those voting aye: Hans Andersen,
10 Margaret Black, Richard F. Brunst, Tom Macdonald, Mark E. Seastrand, David Spencer, Brent
11 Sumner. The motion **passed** unanimously.

12 13 **COMMUNICATION ITEMS**

14
15 There were no communication items.

16 17 **CITY MANAGER INFORMATION ITEMS**

18
19 There were no city manager information items.

20 21 **ADJOURN TO A MEETING OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY** 22 **OF OREM**

23
24 Mayor Brunst **moved** to adjourn to a meeting of the Redevelopment Agency. Mr. Seastrand
25 **seconded** the motion. Those voting aye: Hans Andersen, Margaret Black, Richard F. Brunst,
26 Tom Macdonald, Mark E. Seastrand, David Spencer, Brent Sumner. The motion **passed**
27 unanimously.

28
29 The meeting adjourned at 7:13 p.m.

PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS, April marks the 47th anniversary of the passage of the Federal Fair Housing Law, Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended, which enunciates a national policy of fair housing without regard to race, color, national origin, religion, sex, familial status, or disability, and encourages fair housing opportunities for all citizens; and

WHEREAS, this year's theme, **Fair Housing: Together We Build our Neighborhood**, indicates a new day when the collaborative efforts of HUD and its housing partners realize increased housing opportunities for every individual; and

WHEREAS, we must, as individuals and as a people, take our stand to make equal opportunity for all, including equal opportunity in housing a reality in our community; and

WHEREAS, the state of Utah passed its own Fair Housing Act in 1989, recognizing the right of all residents of this state to be free from discrimination in the sale, rental and financing of their homes based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, familial status, disability and source of income; and

WHEREAS, City of Orem welcomes this opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to provide equal housing to all people and support the right of every citizen to live where they choose without fear of discrimination;

NOW THEREFORE, I, Richard F. Brunst Jr., Mayor of the City of Orem, Utah, do hereby proclaim the month of April 2015, as

FAIR HOUSING MONTH

In City of Orem we urge all citizens to recognize this celebration for the purpose of improving the quality of life for all residents.

Dated this 28th day of April 2015

Richard F. Brunst Jr., Mayor



ATTEST:

Jacqueline J. Lambert, Deputy City Recorder

CITY OF OREM
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
APRIL 28, 2015



| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| REQUEST: | 6:00 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING RESOLUTION – Adopt Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Final Statement of Projected Uses of Funds – 2015-2016 |
| APPLICANT: | City of Orem Community & Neighborhood Services |
| FISCAL IMPACT: | Estimated to be \$638,190 including program income |

NOTICES:

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

SITE INFORMATION:

- General Plan Designation:
N/A
- Current Zone:
N/A
- Acreage:
N/A
- Neighborhood:
N/A
- Neighborhood Chair:
N/A

PREPARED BY:
Asst. to the CM

RECOMMENDATION:

The Assistant to the City Manager recommends the City Council, by resolution, adopt the updated Final Statement of Projected Uses of Funds for Orem’s 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 presented its recommendations to the City Council in the first of two public hearings on March 24, 2015. Tonight’s public hearing is the final opportunity for public comment on the recommendations before the City Council officially adopts the Final Statement of Projected Uses of Funds for Orem’s 2016-2015 Community Development Block Grant. Please see the allocation recommendations below:

Public Services – limited by HUD to 15% of new entitlement funding

- Family Support & Treatment - \$10,000
- Project Read - \$2,000
- PERC - \$2,000
- Center for Women & Children in Crisis - \$7,500
- Community Actions Services - \$14,500
- Mountainland Community Health - \$4,000
- House of Hope- \$5,000
- Big Brothers Big Sisters - \$1,000
- Literacy Resources - \$2,000
- RAH - \$7,000
- Friends of the Children's Justice Center - \$10,000
- Friends of the Food and Care Coalition - \$6,730
- Utah County 4-H - \$1,500
- Community Health Connect - \$4,000
- Kids on the Move - \$5,000
- People Helping People - \$4,000
- Centro Hispano - \$3,000
- Mountainland Association of Governments - \$2,000

Other

- Habitat for Humanity - \$35,000
- Code Enforcement (Neighborhood Preservation) - \$120,000
- Infrastructure - \$151,960
- Administration - \$115,000
- Section 108 Loan Repayment - \$105,000
- Housing Rehabilitation - \$20,000

DRAFT

RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
BLOCK GRANT STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
OBJECTIVES AND USE OF FUNDS AS REQUIRED BY THE U.S.
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT FOR
FISCAL YEAR 2015-2016

WHEREAS the City of Orem qualifies as an Entitlement Community under the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Community Development Block Grant Program and has been allocated \$608,190 for the 2015-2016 program year; and

WHEREAS the City of Orem is required by the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to submit a formal request for funding entitled a STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES AND PROJECTED USE OF FUNDS for new and reprogrammed funding; and

WHEREAS the City Council of the City of Orem has established a Community Development Block Grant Citizen Advisory Commission to gather citizen input on project proposals; and

WHEREAS the Citizen Advisory Commission has gathered such input and has prepared a STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES AND PROJECTED USE OF FUNDS for review and approval by the City Council; and

WHEREAS the City Council held public hearings on March 24, 2015, and April 28, 2015, to consider citizen comments regarding CDBG expenditures and has reviewed these suggestions and proposals in a manner fair to all residents of Orem and pursuant to law.

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

1. The Community Development Block Grant Statement of Community Development Objectives and Projected Use of Funds, which is attached hereto as "Exhibit A" and incorporated herein by this reference, is hereby adopted and shall be submitted to the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development as part of Orem's formal request for the 2014-2015 grant amount of \$608,190 as well as Housing Rehab program income estimated to be \$30,000:
2. This resolution shall take effect immediately upon passage.
3. All other resolutions, ordinances, and policies in conflict herewith, either in whole or in part, are hereby repealed.

DRAFT

PASSED AND APPROVED this 28th day of April 2015.

Richard F. Brunst, Jr., Mayor

ATTEST:

Donna R. Weaver, City Recorder

COUNCIL MEMBERS VOTING "AYE"

COUNCIL MEMBERS VOTING "NAY"

DRAFT

EXHIBIT A

**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 |

DRAFT

**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 (NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION) | 120,000 | 1 | SL-3 |
| CITY OF OREM – HOUSING REHAB* *NO NEW FUNDS, BUT UNSPENT FUNDS WILL ROLL FORWARD | 20,000 | 2 | DH-2 |
| 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 | | |

DRAFT

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
BUDGET REPORT FOR THE MONTH ENDED MARCH 2015

Percent of Year Expired: 75%

| Fund | Current Appropriation | Monthly Total | Year-To-Date Total | Encumbrances | Balance | % To Date FY 2015 | % To Date FY 2014 | Notes |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------|
| 10 GENERAL FUND | | | | | | | | |
| Revenues | 45,299,104 | 3,103,153 | 33,903,848 | | | 75% | | |
| Appr. Surplus - Current | 3,792,170 | | 3,792,170 | | | 100% | | |
| Appr. Surplus - Prior Year | 1,754,572 | | 1,754,572 | | | 100% | | |
| Std. Interfund Transactions | 4,646,102 | | 4,646,102 | | | 100% | | |
| Total Resources | 55,491,948 | 3,103,153 | 44,096,692 | | 11,395,256 | 79% | 76% | |
| Expenditures | 55,491,948 | 4,370,763 | 38,094,559 | 1,395,830 | 16,001,559 | 71% | 69% | |
| 20 ROAD FUND | | | | | | | | |
| Revenues | 2,305,000 | 434,077 | 1,585,549 | | | 69% | | |
| Appr. Surplus - Prior Year | 953,808 | | 953,808 | | | 100% | | |
| Total Resources | 3,258,808 | 434,077 | 2,539,357 | | 719,451 | 78% | 79% | |
| Expenditures | 3,258,808 | 53,898 | 1,928,614 | 290,511 | 1,039,683 | 68% | 64% | |
| 21 CARE TAX FUND | | | | | | | | |
| Revenues | 1,710,000 | 135,204 | 1,107,200 | | | 65% | | |
| Appr. Surplus - Prior Year | 1,881,958 | | 1,881,958 | | | 100% | | |
| Total Resources | 3,591,958 | 135,204 | 2,989,158 | | 602,800 | 83% | 91% | |
| Expenditures | 3,591,958 | | 1,047,429 | 5,450 | 2,539,079 | 29% | 42% | 1 |
| 30 DEBT SERVICE FUND | | | | | | | | |
| Revenues | 20,451,905 | 1,356,110 | 18,364,717 | | | 90% | | |
| Appr. Surplus - Prior Year | 13,221 | | 13,221 | | | 100% | | |
| Total Resources | 20,465,126 | 1,356,110 | 18,377,938 | | 2,087,188 | 90% | 70% | 2 |
| Expenditures | 20,465,126 | 833,951 | 15,296,798 | | 5,168,328 | 75% | 48% | 2 |
| 45 CIP FUND | | | | | | | | |
| Revenues | 4,029,170 | 18,232 | 4,017,155 | | | 100% | | |
| Appr. Surplus - Prior Year | 875,159 | | 875,159 | | | 100% | | |
| Total Resources | 4,904,329 | 18,232 | 4,892,314 | | 12,015 | 100% | 104% | |
| Expenditures | 4,904,329 | -868,432 | 507,599 | 288,561 | 4,108,169 | 16% | 19% | |
| 51 WATER FUND | | | | | | | | |
| Revenues | 12,611,377 | 846,159 | 10,312,777 | | | 82% | | |
| Appr. Surplus - Current Year | 300,000 | | 300,000 | | | 100% | | |
| Appr. Surplus - Prior Year | 4,427,227 | | 4,427,227 | | | 100% | | |
| Total Resources | 17,338,604 | 846,159 | 15,040,004 | | 2,298,600 | 87% | 81% | |
| Expenditures | 17,338,604 | 1,203,209 | 8,841,369 | 1,590,306 | 6,906,929 | 60% | 53% | |
| 52 WATER RECLAMATION FUND | | | | | | | | |
| Revenues | 7,027,851 | 584,373 | 5,875,760 | | | 84% | | |
| Appr. Surplus - Prior Year | 1,666,509 | | 1,666,509 | | | 100% | | |
| Total Resources | 8,694,360 | 584,373 | 7,542,269 | | 1,152,091 | 87% | 84% | |
| Expenditures | 8,694,360 | 772,075 | 5,176,491 | 460,288 | 3,057,581 | 65% | 64% | |
| 55 STORM SEWER FUND | | | | | | | | |
| Revenues | 3,110,500 | 265,071 | 2,384,205 | | | 77% | | |
| Appr. Surplus - Prior Year | 386,367 | | 386,367 | | | 100% | | |
| Total Resources | 3,496,867 | 265,071 | 2,770,572 | | 726,295 | 79% | 84% | |
| Expenditures | 3,496,867 | 82,122 | 1,933,020 | 88,311 | 1,475,536 | 58% | 77% | 3 |
| 56 RECREATION FUND | | | | | | | | |
| Revenues | 1,667,200 | 75,726 | 1,197,963 | | | 72% | | |
| Appr. Surplus - Current Year | 158,888 | | 158,888 | | | 100% | | |
| Appr. Surplus - Prior Year | 4,857 | | 4,857 | | | 100% | | |
| Total Resources | 1,830,945 | 75,726 | 1,361,708 | | 469,237 | 74% | 52% | 4 |
| Expenditures | 1,830,945 | 112,890 | 1,374,229 | 59,673 | 397,043 | 78% | 70% | |
| 57 SOLID WASTE FUND | | | | | | | | |
| Revenues | 3,397,000 | 290,057 | 2,530,525 | | | 74% | | |
| Appr. Surplus - Prior Year | 24,450 | | 24,450 | | | 100% | | |
| Total Resources | 3,421,450 | 290,057 | 2,554,975 | | 866,475 | 75% | 74% | |
| Expenditures | 3,421,450 | 196,535 | 2,179,690 | | 1,241,760 | 64% | 67% | |

CITY OF OREM
BUDGET REPORT FOR THE MONTH ENDED MARCH 2015

Percent of Year Expired: 75%

| Fund | Current Appropriation | Monthly Total | Year-To-Date Total | Encumbrances | Balance | % To Date FY 2015 | % To Date FY 2014 | Notes |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------|
| 58 STREET LIGHTING FUND | | | | | | | | |
| Revenues | 1,485,000 | 74,856 | 1,285,303 | | | 87% | | |
| Appr. Surplus - Prior Year | 231,180 | | 231,180 | | | 100% | | |
| Total Resources | 1,716,180 | 74,856 | 1,516,483 | | 199,697 | 88% | 87% | |
| Expenditures | 1,716,180 | 35,622 | 518,963 | 61,404 | 1,135,813 | 34% | 31% | |
| 61 FLEET MAINTENANCE FUND | | | | | | | | |
| Std. Interfund Transactions | 652,000 | | 652,000 | | | 100% | | |
| Total Resources | 652,000 | | 652,000 | | | 100% | 100% | |
| Expenditures | 652,000 | 37,151 | 497,825 | 5,392 | 148,783 | 77% | 73% | |
| 62 PURCHASING/WAREHOUSING FUND | | | | | | | | |
| Revenues | | 15 | 135 | | | 100% | | |
| Appr. Surplus - Current Year | 33,000 | | 33,000 | | | 100% | | |
| Std. Interfund Transactions | 330,000 | | 330,000 | | | 100% | | |
| Total Resources | 363,000 | 15 | 363,135 | | -135 | 100% | 100% | |
| Expenditures | 363,000 | 21,374 | 272,828 | | 90,172 | 75% | 74% | |
| 63 SELF INSURANCE FUND | | | | | | | | |
| Revenues | 500,000 | 37,022 | 362,672 | | | 73% | | |
| Std. Interfund Transactions | 1,175,000 | | 1,175,000 | | | 100% | | |
| Total Resources | 1,675,000 | 37,022 | 1,537,672 | | 137,328 | 92% | 92% | |
| Expenditures | 1,675,000 | 24,843 | 1,197,509 | 35,483 | 442,008 | 74% | 67% | |
| 74 CDBG FUND | | | | | | | | |
| Revenues | 998,408 | 27,316 | 413,370 | | | 41% | | |
| Appr. Surplus - Prior Year | 471,313 | | 471,313 | | | 100% | | |
| Total Resources | 1,469,721 | 27,316 | 884,683 | | | 60% | 38% | 5 |
| Expenditures | 1,469,721 | 61,216 | 549,897 | 485,573 | 434,251 | 70% | 33% | 5 |
| CITY TOTAL RESOURCES | 126,654,116 | 7,172,515 | 105,602,477 | | 20,466,601 | 83% | 78% | |
| CITY TOTAL EXPENDITURES | 126,654,116 | 6,901,595 | 78,897,857 | 4,705,378 | 43,050,881 | 66% | 62% | |

NOTES TO THE BUDGET REPORT FOR THE MONTH ENDED MARCH 2015:

- 1) The current year expenditures are lower in comparison to the prior year due to the current year encumbrances (\$0) being much less than in the prior fiscal year (\$436,861) at this date in time. Primarily due to the Fitness Center pool expansion.
- 2) Both revenues and expenditures are higher in the current year when compared to the prior year due to the accounting entries needed in the current year to record the refunding of the 2005 & 2006 General Obligation bonds.
- 3) The current year expenditures are lower in comparison to the prior year due to the current year encumbrances (\$88,311) being quite a bit less than in the prior fiscal year (\$295,353) at this date in time. Primarily due to the Williams Farm capital project.
- 4) The current year revenues are higher in comparison to the prior year due to the opening of the new pool area which appears to have had a positive impact on fitness center pass sales.
- 5) The current year revenues are higher in comparison to the prior year due to a more concerted effort to obtain reimbursement from HUD in a more timely manner. Current year expenditures are higher in comparison to the prior year due to the current year encumbrances (\$485,573) being significantly more than in the prior year (\$1,799). Primarily due to the Beverly Subdivision project.

| |
|--|
| <p>Note: In earlier parts of a fiscal year, expenditures may be greater than the collected revenues in a fund. The City has accumulated sufficient reserves to service all obligations during such periods and does not need to issue tax anticipation notes or obtain funds in any similar manner. If you have questions about this report, please contact Richard Manning (229-7037) or Brandon Nelson (229-7010).</p> |
|--|