

CITIES OF OREM AND PROVO
SPECIAL JOINT MEETING
56 North State Street, Orem, Utah
May 7, 2015

This meeting was for discussion purposes only. No action was taken.

CONDUCTING	Mayor Richard F. Brunst, Jr.
OREM ELECTED OFFICIALS	Mayor Richard F. Brunst, Jr. and Councilmembers Margaret Black, Mark E. Seastrand, and Brent Sumner
PROVO ELECTED OFFICIALS	Councilmembers Gary Garrett, Calli Hales, Hal Miller, Kim Santiago, Dave Sewell, and Gary Winterton
OREM STAFF	Jamie Davidson, City Manager; Brenn Bybee, Assistant City Manager; Steven Downs, Assistant to the City Manager; and Jackie Lambert, Deputy City Recorder
PROVO STAFF	Wayne Parker, Chief Administrative Officer; Cory Norman, Mayor's Office; and Matt Taylor, Council Director
EXCUSED	Councilmembers Hans Andersen, Tom Macdonald, and David Spencer

Call to Order

Mayor Brunst called the meeting to order at 12:08 p.m.

Items of Common Interest

Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) – Janelle Robertson, Utah Transit Authority (UTA)

Mayor Brunst invited Janelle Robertson, Project Manager with UTA, to give a presentation on the Provo-Orem Transportation Improvement Partnership.

Ms. Robertson gave a status update on the BRT project.

- Project Status
 - Small Starts Grant Application
 - Recommended in the President's budget – \$4 million for year 2015 and \$71 million for year 2016
 - Compiling documentation to execute grant agreement
 - Environmental Assessment
 - Public Comment period January 5-7, 2015
 - FONSI signed March 27, 2015
 - Design
 - Selected final designer and negotiating contract
 - Final design kick off meeting to be scheduled in the next couple of weeks

- Working groups would begin again once designer contract is signed
- Agreements
 - Agreements with cities would be advanced
- Construction
 - The request for proposal (RFP) for the construction contractor would be issued this Sunday – work anticipated to begin by late summer
 - Proposals for the Timpanogos facility are due May 12, 2015

Mrs. Black asked where the Timpanogos facility would be located, and what it would be used for.

Ms. Robertson said it would be located in Orem along Geneva Road, across from Wolverine Crossing. It would be a storage and maintenance facility and would be expanding on existing property. UTA was coordinating with Orem City to ensure the project met all requirements. They were hoping to start early construction items this coming summer.

Mayor Brunst asked if different kinds of buses—meaning hybrids, natural gas, electric, etc.—were being looked at.

Ms. Robertson said the specs would need to be compiled and BYD Auto did not have an electric bus that had been tested and proved. The battery did not run quite as long as anticipated because of heat usage during cold months. They were leaving options open for hybrids and other possibilities once they had been proven.

Grey Turner, UTA, said they had tested an electric bus in Orem, and the hill near Utah Valley University (UVU) was the most challenging area for the bus, but the technology was still evolving. The timing was about two years away from having a true sixty-foot articulated electric bus. They had the technical specifications, and were ready to go to manufactures to see what they could build. They were hoping for some kind of hybrid, clean diesel or something similar. Power was a main concern, as well as having doors on both sides of the bus.

Mrs. Black asked for clarification on what a sixty-foot articulated bus meant, and whether there would be a rack for bicycles. She said being located between two universities was likely to result in a number of bike riders using BRT.

Mr. Turner said articulated meant it had the accordion center to allow the bus to flexibly go around the corners more easily. As far as bike racks, Mr. Turner said they were looking at improving that system because current bike racks allowed for three bikes. Adding more bike rack space would take out seats.

Ms. Robertson added that the sixty-foot bus allowed for bike racks whereas a forty-foot bus did not.

Mr. Turner said they were also looking into the possibilities of bike lockers and bicycle repair stations at BRT stations, as well as examining options like the GREENbike bicycle sharing program currently offered in Salt Lake City. He thought Orem was a prime location to test such a program. Mr. Turner said the funding for these projects had raised some questions with the public. He said bonding had a certain connotation, but this would be a revenue bond and not a

general obligation bond. The revenue bond would be used against the third quarter-cent sales tax, which was the tax specifically set aside to fund transportation projects. The bond would be against the quarter cent and would be paid back incrementally thereafter, similar to paying a mortgage on a home.

Chad Eccles, Transit Program Manager with Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG), said this same process of a revenue bond had been followed for other projects, like North County Boulevard and Pioneer Crossing. Bond rates were currently low, so they had been able to capitalize on that. He gave some detail on the quarter-cent tax uses, and said that the third quarter-cent would essentially be set aside for roads and the first quarter-cent would be set aside for transportation. There would be no new taxes generated. Mr. Eccles gave an overview of the timeline for the bond and said that any *identified* projects would remain funded.

Mayor Brunst observed that there would be a matching grant in conjunction from UDOT. It was contributing \$36 million toward the route on University Parkway.

Mr. Eccles said UDOT was planning to widen the Parkway anyway. By doing the two projects concurrently, there would be less impact on businesses as well as allowing them to take advantage of opportunity costs.

Mr. Turner said there have been some concerns raised that, if the County bonded for the money, it would put them at their bond limit. However, the County has a General Obligation bonding capability of \$900 million and none of that has been utilized. If there were some kind of natural disaster requiring the County to bond for reconstruction, it has plenty available. Mr. Turner said if he was a general taxpayer today, and the County went out and bonded for BRT tomorrow, the following week he would not notice any difference because the bond payments would be paid from an existing revenue source that would not impact him as an average taxpayer.

Mayor Brunst noted that the voters had already voted for the first and second quarter-cent taxes.

Ms. Santiago asked if UTA had anything in mind for the fourth quarter-cent tax portion.

Mr. Eccles said it would need to be voted on first. If approved, one thing UTA was considering was advancing commuter rail south sooner. That would depend upon if the residents wanted it. Salt Lake County really lobbied for it.

Mr. Davidson said through the 2040 plan potential projects into the future had been identified that it could dedicated for.

Gary Winterton wondered, if Salt Lake had lobbied for it, how to guarantee Utah County got its share of the money.

Mr. Turner said anything generated in Utah County would stay in Utah County.

Mr. Eccles said the ability to raise another quarter-cent was available. If the voters in Utah County are not ready to do that yet, they do not have to. They can do it in the future, if circumstances change.

Mayor Brunst said that, at the city level, there was a great need for the project to go forward this year to help improve roads. He said he would advise and push for it to be on the ballot this year.

Mrs. Black noted there was a lot of misinformation being spread about BRT. She wondered if there was a frequently asked questions (FAQ) page for people to refer to and asked if it was being advertised.

Mr. Eccles said there was a transportation coalition putting a web page together at wenedbrt.com. It was being headed up by Salt Lake and Utah County chambers. They were doing the webpage, sending out mailers, along with some phone calls and emails. Tuesday was a public hearing for County Commissioners. They would have some boards available in the lobby.

Mr. Turner said some people, for example, from outside of Orem and Provo question why they should pay a tax to benefit the two big cities. It was a matter of informing them that Orem and Provo residents have paid that tax as well, and some of those funds had already been used to construct roads in Lehi. Mr. Turner said they were moving ahead with the project, but the referendum movement could delay the project, seriously jeopardizing the federal funding. This BRT project was only one of six to receive a small startup grant. They could use the help of the Orem and Provo councils to get the word out.

Mr. Eccles said to feel free to contact them with questions and to consider them a resource.

Mr. Parker noted that Doug Wright had taken interest in the BRT issue and would be discussing it on his radio show.

Mr. Downs inquired about the timing on the petition.

Mr. Eccles said they had forty-five days to gather the needed 17,900 signatures. Those signatures would have to be verified as registered voters.

High Density Development on Geneva Road

Mr. Parker said some high-density projects had been proposed for the south part of Geneva Road. Those would play into Provo's transportation master plan in that area.

Mr. Davidson said there had been a lot of conversation about the southwest annexation area over the past year. There was little if any infrastructure in that area. They had cautiously approached the development community and the developers wishing to annex into Orem that they would bear the brunt of the costs for infrastructure. Mr. Davidson said they had contracted for an impact fee study for that exclusive part of the community. Some developers had stayed while others have pulled back. Property owners in the area had varying interests. They have considered a variety of densities. The lower the density, the more expensive to put in the infrastructure because there would be fewer doors to share the cost. The area would be complicated to develop because of conservation and agricultural easements. Orem had been working with Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG) and Provo about a number of transportation issues in that area. Conversations had taken place, but there were no definitive plans. Most of the conversations had been with developers who desire higher density residential projects. The Council had not decided on the issue. Mr. Davidson reviewed the history and current status of the annexation petition, noting that Provo had been the only agency to file a protest.

Ms. Santiago asked about plans to increase the bus service on Geneva Road, and Mr. Eccles said they would look into it.

Mr. Davidson said there were projects with substantial densities being proposed along both sides of 2000 South. One of the big questions at the conclusion of the Geneva Road project was what would the future be south of University Parkway, considering the number of historic homes along that stretch. That was when discussions about the Lakeview Parkway began in earnest. Whatever happened, the issues relating to the conservation and agricultural easements would still have to be worked through.

Gary Winterton asked about current construction happening in Orem. Mr. Davidson said it was all market based, so there was no low to moderate income housing. Mayor Brunst added that most of it was Class A business complexes, with one Class B.

Mr. Seastrand observed there were three Habitat for Humanity homes being constructed in the area.

Mr. Eccles noted that, speaking of the the future of Geneva Road, he had been working with Provo City to look at 820 as an interchange. They were about to award a contract to study that. It would help alleviate some of the congestion on University Parkway. He reviewed the history of the process and said the study would last about nine months.

Safety

Mayor Brunst asked about the bomb threat in Provo.

Ms. Santiago said it was a very short meeting, and they went about their usual business. Officers did everything according to procedure and had bomb dogs do sweep. The council was back in about an hour.

Mr. Winterton said they learned a few things on their emergency action plan. They would be starting an employee police academy to learn some of the things the police do.

Mr. Parker said they hold a special session of the citizens academy for employees to encourage cross-departmental collaboration.

Ms. Santiago said they also did an evening course. It gave attendees confidence in the officers and everything they did for the community.

Mr. Parker said the bomb threat had been a Skype phone call, which made it difficult to trace.

Set Date and Time for Next Meeting

The next meeting was scheduled for July 16, 2015, at noon in Provo.

The meeting adjourned at 1:21 p.m.

Donna R. Weaver, City Recorder

Approved: May 26, 2015