

CITY OF OREM  
CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
56 North State Street Orem, Utah  
October 27, 2015

**4:45 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; Richard Manning, Administrative Services Director; Bill Bell, Development Services Director; Karl Hirst, Recreation Director; Chris Tschirki, Public Works Director; Scott Gurney, Fire Department Director; Lt. from police, Police Department Director; Charlene Crozier, Library Director; Jason Bench, Planning Division Manager; Neal Winterton, Water Division Manager; Reed Price, Maintenance Division Manager; Steven Downs, Assistant to the City Manager; and Jackie Lambert, Deputy City Recorder

**DISCUSSION – Sewer Base Rate**

Mr. Tschirki spoke of a sewer line failure at the Orem Fitness Center and reported that they were working with Public Works staff to hire a contractor to make the repair. He said they would have to hand dig because a backhoe could not fit inside. The center would need to close for a few days to do the repair.

Mr. Winterton acknowledged the presence of the Public Works Advisory Commission (PWAC) members Tai Riser, Val Hale, and Carol Walker, as well as Mike Collins with Bowen and Collins.

Mr. Winterton noted the Council had heard the sewer base rate presentation before, but indicated there had been modification.

- There was a base rate and a production rate for sewer charging.
- Currently there was one base rate per utility account.
- The commission recommended charging one base rate per residential unit.
  - Charge nonresidential units a different rate based on an American Water Works Association (AWWA) multiplier which would provide a net revenue of \$1.1 million without changing the rate to single-family dwellings.
  - PWAC recommended that the change take effect January 2016.

- Each account was looked at, and they determined that 7,331 residential units in apartments, fourplexes, etc., did not pay a sewer base rate because they were lumped in with a base rate account.
- Every July the meter reading determined the average usage which was applied to the nearest thousand for the rate applied for the whole year. They recommended:
  - The City keep the base rate the same for residential.
  - Nonresidential would be based on the AWWA multiplier
  - Keep the volume charge the same.

Mr. Sumner asked for examples of the multiplier. Mr. Winterton explained that it was based on meter size. Mr. Sumner asked if businesses then would pay less. Mr. Winterton said they would pay according to a different fee schedule.

Mr. Macdonald said it was not just apartments and fourplexes, but some housing developments as well. Mr. Winterton agreed, saying Northridge was an example. He said there were eighty-two single-family homes but the HOA paid only two base rates. He cited a case of sixty-two trailer homes that paid one sewer base rate. Those trailers had the same impact as any other home. The current system was not fair.

Mrs. Black asked for clarification on how businesses were charged. Mr. Winterton said they were charged \$9.32 times whatever meter size they had.

Mrs. Black asked if businesses were separated, like at a strip mall. Mr. Winterton said they had no way of doing that.

Mr. Sumner then asked if the businesses paid less than residential. Mr. Winterton said they might pay more or less, depending on the meter size.

Mr. Sumner said that all doors needed water and questioned why each door was not billed the \$9.32. Mr. Winterton said the account holder was billed, not the individual business door.

Mayor Brunst asked about the wide variety of sewer base rates within Utah cities.

Mr. Davidson said that, typically, base sewer rates were figured from overall system costs in terms of capital expenses and day-to-day operation costs, as well as other factors like the involvement of special service districts. He said Ogden put off reinvesting in infrastructure for many years and eventually had to look at all systems at once. As a result, Ogden residents paid a higher base rate because nothing had been done for their infrastructure in decades.

Mr. Winterton said the staff recommended that the \$0.21/1,000 gallon increase be eliminated in Year 1 of the new plan. This would result in a \$1.68/month reduction of the monthly bill for an average home in Orem. He then shared a sample of the notice that would be sent to account holders, identifying the changes in billing. He said the notice could be sent in January 2016, if the Council approved.

Mr. Macdonald asked about units with separate addresses, like accessory apartments. Mr. Winterton said the account holders would be subject to two units in their homes. He said only approved accessory apartments were included in the numbers.

Mr. Winterton then focused on the question of how other cities applied the sewer base rate. He said Orem surveyed several nearby cities. Only Provo currently billed similar to Orem but was very interested in changing its billing structure to what Orem was proposing.

Mr. Riser asked if the number of duplexes and fourplexes was included. Mr. Winterton said they were.

Ms. Walker said it was important to make the change so the billing system was fairer and so the lost revenue could be returned.

Mayor Brunst said with 2,200 new apartments going in, that would be a lot of units accessing the system but not paying, if the current plan was not updated.

Mr. Seastrand said it was important to get the information to the public in a manner that was clear and easy to understand.

Mr. Winterton said they were working on a calculator that residents could use online to see what the rate would be. Nothing had been approved yet, so they had not brought that forward, but they were ready to do that. He said multiunit utility account holders needed to be targeted with outreach that was clear and staff was open to holding open houses.

Mayor Brunst said the information to the public needed to include the reasoning behind the changes.

Mr. Winterton said they would prepare that language for the proposed changes. Mrs. Black said that was the most critical part.

Mr. Davidson said it was important to see the correlation today with the rest of the utility infrastructure. He noted there were inherent inequities in the system that needed to be addressed first and then they could prospectively move forward with the adjustments in the fees.

Mr. Spencer asked about the effective date. Mr. Winterton said PWAC suggested January 1, 2016. Mr. Davidson said they should develop a calendar to allow landowners time to plan for future implementation. He said it should not be too long in the future because it impacted other things.

Mr. Davidson said PWAC should bring the proposed ordinance in three weeks. Mr. Winterton said January 1 was the date PWAC recommended for implementation of the new system, but they were open to discussion.

Mr. Riser said it was the commission's opinion that the corrections should be made sooner than later, as the current system was inequitable.

Mayor Brunst said he felt six months was a good timeframe.

Mr. Sumner asked about the rates for the Midtown 360 development. Mr. Tschirki said it would be \$9.32 by the door, and then equivalent meter size with multiplier to meet the nonresidential rate.

Mrs. Black wondered if, for accounts just coming online, the City would wait six months to apply the new plan to them. Mr. Winterton said it would need to be applied uniformly.

Mr. Stephens said they needed to be careful that all similarly situated users changed at the same time. For example, all multiunits would need to change on the same date.

Mr. Andersen said it should go into effect in September, but notice had not been given. He said he thought it critical that notice be done as soon as possible.

Mr. Spencer said he also had concerns that no notice had been given. With noticing, he was inclined to implement the plan in six to nine months.

Mr. Sumner asked how fast the notice could be sent out. Mr. Winterton said that, with approval, the notice could be sent out within days of passage. Mr. Tschirki added that they would send multiple fliers and letters.

Mr. Sumner suggested the implementation date be July 1, 2016.

Mr. Seastrand said he wanted to make sure the landlord voice had been heard, that all involved had the opportunity to know of the changes in advance. When Mr. Davidson said the City was happy to put out a stand-alone mailer for the issue, Mr. Seastrand said he felt six or nine months was okay.

Mrs. Black said she preferred six months maximum and July 1, 2016, was the furthest she would go.

Mr. Macdonald agreed that July 1, 2016, was fair.

### **5:30 P.M. STUDY 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; Richard Manning, Administrative Services Director; Bill Bell, Development Services Director; Karl Hirst, Recreation Director; Chris Tschirki, Public Works Director; Scott Gurney, Fire Department Director; Ned Jackson, Police Captain; Charlene Crozier, Library Director; Jason Bench,

Planning Division Manager; Paul Goodrich, Transportation Engineer; Sam Kelly, Engineer; 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 City Council new business.

Mrs. Black said that, for the Lights On! event, Santa Claus would pass out candy, and the Council would help with hot chocolate and donuts.

Mr. Hirst reported on pipe break at the Orem Fitness Center (OFC). He said he was grateful how everyone mobilized on Friday to fix the leak and now the extended problem needed to be handled.

Mr. Macdonald asked if the work could be done at night so the OFC could still be used during the day. Mr. Hirst said they were looking at the companies and their willingness to accommodate staying open while fixing the problems. Ideally the work would be done over the Thanksgiving weekend, but most did not want to work over the holiday.

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

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; Richard Manning, Administrative Services Director; Bill Bell, Development Services Director; Karl Hirst, Recreation Director; Chris Tschirki, Public Works Director; Scott Gurney, Fire Department Director; Ned Jackson, Police Captain; Charlene Crozier, Library Director; Jason Bench, Planning Division Manager; Paul Goodrich, Transportation Engineer; Sam Kelly, Engineer; Steven Downs, Assistant to the City Manager; and Jackie Lambert, Deputy City Recorder

## **INVOCATION /**

**INSPIRATIONAL THOUGHT** Debby Lauret  
**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** Corbin Bartlett

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Seastrand **moved** to approve the August 25, 2015, City Council meeting minutes. Mr. Spencer **seconded** the motion. Those voting aye: Margaret Black, Richard F. Brunst, Tom Macdonald, Mark E. Seastrand, David Spencer, Brent Sumner. Those voting nay: Hans Andersen. The motion **passed, 6-1**.

## **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

There were no new neighborhood officers recognized.

### REPORT – Recreation Advisory Commission

Mr. Hirst and Phil Patten, commission chair, gave a report of the Recreation Advisory Commission (RAC). Mr. Patten reviewed the following:

- Resurfacing of the tennis courts at Cherry Hill was complete.
- Lewis Young Robinson & Burningham was doing a feasibility study on a multisport court and would report to the committee on November 5.
- The All-Accessible Playground would be a community project with separate committees gathering donations. It would be the first All-Accessible Playground in Utah County.
- There were three options for water filtration systems for a splash pad. Groups would come to make presentations to the committee on those options.
- They were exploring options for remodeling the Orem Fitness Center and would have recommendations by early February on what to do with the next round of CARE tax dollars.

## **CITY MANAGER'S APPOINTMENTS**

### Appointments to Boards and Commissions

There were no appointments to boards and commissions.

## **PERSONAL APPEARANCES**

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

Mark Tippetts, resident, said he was a member of Sunset Heights neighborhood and he opposed the proposed PD zone at 800 South. The top concern in his neighborhood was about apartments, and they felt the City did not listen to them. He expressed concern that the Planning Commission did not evenly represent all areas of the city, nor did the Council. He suggested that Orem use the process Provo used to present projects to a neighborhood committee before they went to the city. Before a project was submitted, it was presented to the affected neighborhood committee. He volunteered to serve on such a committee.

Jim Fawcett, resident, said he would like to be able to watch a video or listen to an audio of City meetings without having to fill out a GRAMA request, like other cities did. He said he would like verbatim minutes because he did not feel the minutes reflected what he saw in the meetings. He said the form-based code being proposed for the State Street Master Plan was not advisory, but a regulation. It would take away property rights.

Michael Lee, resident, said development was his business, and he expressed concern over student housing being proposed in the Sunset Heights neighborhood. He said he wanted to allow the right type of growth for the university but simultaneously protect the neighborhoods. He suggested there were ways other than the housing complex to meet the mushrooming student load at Utah Valley University (UVU). He said the proposal was riddled with problems.

Sharon Anderson, resident, voiced concern about apartments going up around Orem and wondered who would live in those apartments. She suggested that, according to the book *Spreading the Wealth*, HUD was controlling communities. She said that a program called Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing had been implemented and it subjected all communities who received federal grants, such as CDBG grants, to meet HUD racial and income guidelines. She said HUD had gone into a county in New York and taken control of local planning. She said she concerned because Orem used federal funds that came with strings attached. She asked the Council to consider the hazards of federal mandates. She said the federal government could require the City to bring in people of certain races and incomes from outside areas to live in the many apartments.

## **CONSENT ITEMS**

There were no Consent Items.

## **SCHEDULED ITEMS**

There were no Scheduled Items.

## **COMMUNICATION ITEMS**

### MONTHLY FINANCIAL SUMMARY – September 2015

The Monthly Financial Summary was included in the packets distributed to the City Council.

## **CITY MANAGER INFORMATION ITEMS**

There were no City Manager information items.

## **ADJOURN TO WORK SESSION**

Mr. Andersen **moved** to adjourn a work session. Mr. Sumner **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.

The meeting adjourned at 6:21 p.m. to a work session held in the Council Chambers.

## **6:30 P.M. WORK SESSION – COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

### CONDUCTING

Mayor Richard F. Brunst

### ELECTED OFFICIALS

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

### APPOINTED STAFF

Jamie Davidson, City Manager; Brenn Bybee, Assistant City Manager; Greg Stephens, City Attorney; Richard Manning, Administrative Services Director; Bill Bell, Development Services Director; Karl Hirst, Recreation Director; Chris Tschirki, Public Works Director; Scott Gurney, Fire Department Director; Ned Jackson, Police Captain; Charlene Crozier, Library Director; Jason Bench, Planning Division Manager; Ryan Clark, Economic Development Division Manager; Brandon Stocksdale, Long Range Planner; Steven Downs, Assistant to the City Manager; and Jackie Lambert, Deputy City Recorder

### DISCUSSION – Draft State Street Master Plan

Mr. Stocksdale and IBI Group representatives Dave Nicholas and Ray Whitchurch presented the plan.

Mr. Bench gave a brief background of how they had gotten where they were.

- In 2014 an ordinance was approved to not allow PD zones on major arterials.
- The intent, as the planning of State Street moved forward, was for it to plan it as an overall corridor.
- They decided to eliminate PD zones within 800 feet of Center Street, 800 North, 800 South, etc.
- The City hired IBI to present a plan, an advisory document to aid with decision-making but that would not be mandatory.
- It would be a guide for what might be possible outcomes in twenty-five years.
- The Council would still be the legislative body, and applicants would still go through the proper channels for project approval.

Mr. Bench then presented a demographic sheet which included the 2015 economic report to the governor.

- Of Orem's growth, 77.8 percent was internal with residents' children and grandchildren choosing to stay in the city.
- The report projected that the City would increase by approximately 25,000 people by the year 2040, while all of Utah County was projected to increase by an additional 425,000 people.
- The State Street Master Plan was designed to help manage growth and still keep family residential neighborhoods.
- It would include some high density housing, but that would be managed.

Mr. Bench pointed out on the map that Orem only had the capacity for 1,160 single-family lots in the remaining open parcels. The city was growing at about 374 residential units a year. Once those lots were built on, that was it for residential. If the Council wanted to encourage office and retail development, they needed to include a housing element. He questioned if the Council wanted people to work in Orem but live in other cities and take their sales tax revenues to those.

Mr. Davidson said people wanted to know what was driving the State Street effort. He said that, in order to maintain the long-term health of our community, something different needed to happen along State Street. The City conducted surveys on a regular basis, and recently completed one with 1,300 residents participating. There were asked how they felt about Orem, including commentary and not just to fill out a survey. Some comments associated with State Street included:

- Let us have a family-friendly environment without the look of State Street.
- State on Friday evening is the worst.
- Ugliest eyesore in Utah: Orem State Street.
- Would be nice to develop a downtown area like Provo.

Mr. Davidson said the goal was to fix State Street, support local businesses, and improve local neighborhoods. The City was not pushing an agenda different than the will of the citizenry but rather issues identified by the residents.

Mr. Bench turned the time over to IBI Group project manager, Dave Nicholas. He commented that he had appreciated working with the Planning Commission, the City Council, staff, residents, business owners and others. He said the resulting plan was a smart growth plan and something commendable to create a vision for the future of State Street.

Mr. Nicholas started with an overview of the public input over the past year.

- Several platforms were used to get input from the citizens, including public workshops and open houses and the online platform.
- They had received tremendous results through the online platform, MindMixer, with over 30,000 page views.
- There were more than 800 active participants in over 25 different topics, including mobility, land use, image identity, transportation issues, etc.
- The responses were overwhelmingly consistent to what Mr. Davidson had shared.
- Staff had reached out to neighborhood and interest groups, providing updates along the way.

Mr. Nicholas said the initial input from citizens helped form the Vision Statement which was important because it provided a common goal.

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

Mr. Nicholas said transportation issues were a big part of the plan, and those needs, demands, and trends would change over time. The plan also addressed the issue of what might be considered “downtown” and where people could bring visitors.

He said about 75-80 percent of the master plan goals were typical of most cities, and about 25 percent were catered specifically to the character, image, and demographic of Orem. State Street was a typical suburban arterial that grew up in the urban sprawl era. He said one of their most important goals was to preserve existing single-family neighborhoods.

Mr. Nicholas said the group created plan objectives organized around key ideas that had been identified. The first included mobility, such as creating a boulevard on State Street that would provide flexibility to incorporate future transit. The other plan objectives centered on land use, urban design and culture. He said the importance of keeping things family-friendly was specified many times.

Mr. Nicholas explained that the purpose of the boulevard was to (1) maintain current traffic capacities, (2) make the area more walkable and beautiful, and (3) increase the safety of the street. He said 79 percent of respondents believed State Street needed improvements, and if they could change one thing it would be to make it more attractive, followed by improving pedestrian access, mobility, etc.

Mr. Nicholas said Objective 2 was to provide an option for BRT, light rail, and other modes of transit. This would further the goals of the master plan by encouraging density around identified growth areas, thus linking transportation to land use. He said when those were linked it was a powerful equation for economic development. The objective provided flexibility with regional transportation plans. It also supported the establishment of east/west transportation solutions. He said it was important to existing adjacent neighborhoods and to the mixed use approach for State Street.

Mr. Andersen asked about a picture with a bus line down the middle and wondered if it had been discussed. He asked what respondents said about removing the middle turn lane.

Mr. Nicholas said it would not eliminate travel lanes. It would remove on-street parking but there would be enough width to have the three travel lanes. Mr. Andersen asked how people had responded to that, and Mr. Nicholas said the survey results showed 69 percent supported future light rail.

Mr. Sumner asked if light rail would require the removal of all on-street parking, and Mr. Nicholas said it would.

Mr. Nicholas then said Orem Boulevard could be a great support to the activities and amenities of State Street. Many respondents had reported they would avoid State to walk or bike. He said that, at this point, State Street was not very pedestrian-friendly, but it should and could be. Part of the plan was to create a finer-grain network of streets between State and Orem Boulevard.

Mayor Brunst noted that State Street was 132 feet wide for usable capacity and asked how that compared to other major roads, such as those in Sandy.

Mr. Whitchurch said that while not the same width it was still very similar.

Mr. Nicholas said improving vehicular and pedestrian flow and creating building frontage to be more pedestrian friendly would improve land values and the tax base. As for land use, he said developing unique and strategic growth areas was most appropriate and opportunistic. He said it helped create a sense of place, identity, and destination. Having complementary uses in the area provided more options. He said the goal was to develop growth areas with a targeted, strategic mix of land uses and to allow areas to maintain existing or traditional development patterns. He said 58 percent of the respondents wanted enhanced mixed uses along State Street.

He said people needed an identifiable downtown or center as a destination. They focused primarily on Center Street to University Parkway for this. He said they had created different districts with unique mixes of arts and culture, shopping and entertainment, etc., tying it all together with the SCERA district.

Mr. Nicholas said they had also worked to develop an open space network, leveraging the assets of large and active parks now and creating a network within those to diversify. He said they would look to utilize public- and privately-owned open space. He reiterated the importance of preserving existing neighborhoods and channeling growth in the districts to handle high-density developments, retail, and office. These districts would be places for people in the neighborhoods to go and spend nights and weekends. In 2015, the density was fairly well spread out through the community. In this plan, the density became focused on State Street and at major growth intersections.

Mr. Seastrand asked if the map reflected the additional population growth, not just on State but throughout Orem. Mr. Nicholas said it did.

Mr. Nicholas said they were creating centers and gathering places, and options for high-quality multifamily living environments. He said future trends indicated the need for creating inclusive and friendly neighborhoods for people with a variety of backgrounds. Keeping neighborhoods family-friendly and safe was a key element. They also needed to make the corridor attractive for private investment. He said private developers would be key partners in helping Orem compete for premiere jobs, retail, etc. The goal was to keep great start-up businesses and give them a place to grow. He said the plan would also integrate bikeway improvements.

Mayor Brunst asked if the communities used as comparisons had comparative traffic volumes.

Mr. Nicholas said case studies were consistent in their volumes, so they only looked at relevant and similar corridors in terms of capacity and such. He said that there was a big movement to repurpose suburban arterials throughout the country. For suburbs to compete and be viable, the

arterials needed to be revived. Mr. Whitchurch said that was the challenge for most cities through the next fifteen years.

Mayor Brunst said the main purpose for State Street was to move traffic, and it had a tough time doing that. He expressed concern about doing away with on-street parking. He said Provo had done some beautification had not handled traffic flow well. Orem needed to do both.

Mr. Nicholas said there was no recommendation to add diagonal parking on State Street. Part of the purpose was to reduce friction in the future, but removing on-street parking, installing raised medians and limiting left turns improved safety and capacity. There were many things that would add to the boulevard feel, diversify the corridor, and not pay homage only to the vehicle. He said they had considered transportation trends.

Mr. Whitchurch said they had extensive traffic projections and models that were run in conjunction with UDOT.

Mayor Brunst inquired about projected traffic volumes into the future, and Mr. Whitchurch said they were in the study.

Mr. Nicholas then reviewed artistic depictions of various solutions to the corridor. He noted that projections for the future showed a significant change, from 9 percent office to about 22 percent in the future which was closer to some standard, transit-oriented developments. With certain ratios of residential, office, and retail, people could utilize transit and would not need to a car. They anticipated about a 190 percent increase in property tax revenue generation.

Mr. Davidson said it was interesting to note that the housing projections for the next twenty-five years continued the growth trend of the last fifteen. Mr. Nicholas added that they had focused the high density growth around transit stations.

Mr. Stocksdale said the plan would be a guiding document based on studies that indicated the capacity. As redevelopment happened, the City Council and the public would be involved in the plan.

Mr. Sumner said there needed to be representation from property owners on the corridor, noting he had not received an invitation. Mr. Stocksdale said they had received some input from business owners.

Mrs. Black asked who Mr. Sumner wanted on the committee, and the said there was no representation. Mr. Bench and Mr. Bell said they had invited many, but they could not force them to participate on a committee.

Mr. Andersen said on page fifty the report called for a 40 percent reduction of retail square footage. When he looked at the developments coming, he figured he would be part of the 40 percent that would be pushed out.

Mr. Macdonald said the report showed a 35 percent reduction. Mr. Bench said if it grew the way it was planned, the corridor would get more office and some residential. He said market forces

would reduce some retail. The City would not clear out 40 percent. It was still market- and property-owner-plan driven.

Mr. Stocksdale said the mall had seen a reduction off square footage, but higher performance.

Mr. Andersen said he was surprised that there were not more State Street owner participants, reflecting that the closer they were to the bullseye the more likely they would not be there in the future.

Mr. Bench said there would still be zones, and the City was not closing businesses.

Mr. Macdonald said this group would not still be here, and the plan would not be an exact following, changing over times as people and businesses changed. He said they did not know how quickly the plan would development, but he thought there could be more outreach.

Mr. Nicholas said the plan would not be implemented overnight; it was a guide for a vision of the future growth. As had been pointed out, it would not happen exactly like the plan, which was a theoretical approach. He said it was about creating great pedestrian experiences, allowing businesses to thrive, and people to live. From an urban design standpoint, safety and beautification as well as experiential improvements were critical.

Mayor Brunst said landscape character was lacking along State Street. So much could be done with coordination of landscaping, trees, water features, etc., to create a sense of space and beauty along the corridor. He said St. George had done a great job with that. He noted that 800 North had changed dramatically. Districts or nodes could be developed in beautiful ways, while still being economically feasible. He said he thought there were distinct characters that made it beautiful, and the City needed to enhance those assets.

Mr. Nicholas reviewed the implementation section of the plan, noting it contained the marching orders, action items, and check lists—things that needed to happen to implement the plan. It included a preliminary timeline for implementing ordinances and such.

Mr. Macdonald observed that in Salt Lake City some areas which had been blighted, such as 400 South, had been improved. He said it was not done by accident and had taken place over ten to fifteen years.

Mr. Nicholas said the timeline had overall initiatives, and then specific master plans for specific areas. There would be more opportunities available for State Street business owners to get involved and be a part of the plan and understand their options. He said the action plan for each growth node was set to a timeline and had some benchmarks consistent with five-, ten-, fifteen-, and twenty-five-year plans.

Mrs. Black said this part of the plan encouraged her, and she appreciated that the “how to get things accomplished” was broken down into attainable goals. Once things were started, it created a synergy and excited people. Mr. Nicholas agreed, saying the private investment community would take note and be more inclined to be a part of it. Mrs. Black said some simple things could have a big impact and lead people to ask what more they could do.

Mr. Nicholas noted that there were three appendices with the supporting data behind the economic charts.

Mr. Fawcett said Mr. Andersen had different information. He asked where citizens could the plan. Mr. Stocksdale said it was on the mySidewalk site ([cityoforem.mysidewalk.com](http://cityoforem.mysidewalk.com)). Mr. Fawcett said the information was not up-to-date.

Mrs. Black said the information was hard to access. She felt that people needed to have the access right on the City's webpage. Mr. Stocksdale said they could do that.

An unidentified resident asked if the project would add more debt.

Mayor Brunst said they did not know, as it was a vision document. Nothing would be improved without a cost to it, but there would be a benefit.

Mr. Davidson said it was a market-driven plan. The market and private development would add to it. Mr. Davidson said it was a State road, so the State would be cooperating with it.

Mr. Reinhard asked if, in places where this kind of thing had happened before, the city had jumpstarted the growth with the connector roads.

Mr. Nicholas said they had seen a combination of development, some driven by cities building new roads and improving infrastructure, etc. To create the new development, a vision plan was needed to manage the future growth. When a developer presented a project, they City could ask if it was consistent with the vision.

Mr. Reinhard asked if the developers would participate in putting in the connectors, and Mr. Nicholas said they would.

A resident inquired about the main barriers in executing the plan.

Mayor Brunst said there would be barriers such as zoning, mixed use facilities, how the road was treated, etc. He said it was a tremendous work in progress.

Mr. Davidson said there were hundreds of property owners with an interest in the corridor. After the adoption of the plan, it would be important to help others embrace the vision. The Council was considering the core idea on which to build. He said they were looking at best practices and what had worked in communities of like size and circumstance, and learning from those already investing in the process. The Council had goals for aesthetics and mobility, and all those pieces were part of the plan.

Mayor Brunst said it was interesting to see what St. George and SLC had done, and Mrs. Black added that they had all started with a plan.

Mr. Davidson said Ogden, Sandy, St. George, Salt Lake City, etc., were areas with similar traffic counts and circumstances. He said Orem should learn from others, but they also wanted to remain uniquely Orem.

Mr. Stocksdale observed that all objectives identified were publicly supported through hundreds of responses from surveys, public input from open houses, and best practices.

An unidentified resident wanted to know if there was a way the plan could backfire.

Mayor Brunst said nothing was set in stone, but similar plans in other cities had been successful. He thought the place would be a great asset to the city.

Mr. Whitchurch added that there was also a cost to doing nothing, which would be its own issue.

Bob Wright said he liked State Street as it was. He thought putting more lanes each way with a bus lane and a bicycle lane would require widening State Street. It was a lot on one road.

Mrs. Black asked what the next step was.

Mr. Stocksdale said it would be adoption of the plan. Mr. Bench said the Planning Commission would consider it at their November 4, 2015, meeting, and the Council would on November 17, 2015.

The meeting adjourned at 8:04 p.m.

---

Donna R. Weaver, City Recorder

Approved: December 8, 2015