CITY OF OREM
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
56 North State Street Orem, Utah
November 17, 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, 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; Gary Giles, Police Department Director; Charlene Crozier, Library Director; Jason Bench, Planning Division Manager; Paul Goodrich, Transportation Engineer; Keith Larsen, Traffic Operations Engineer; Sam Kelly, Engineer; Neal Winterton, Water Division Manager; Reed Price, Maintenance Division Manager; Steven Downs, Assistant to the City Manager; and Jackie Lambert, Deputy City Recorder
EXCUSED	David Spencer

DISCUSSION – Citizen Survey Results – Y2 Analytics

Mr. Downs introduced Kyrene Gibb with Y2 Analytics and turned the time over to Ms. Gibb to present the survey results. Ms. Gibb said Y2 Analytics had conducted a general citizen satisfaction survey toward the end of September. The survey asked respondents to assign ratings and answer a variety of multiple choice and open-ended questions. She said the survey had a response rate of just over 20 percent which was remarkably high. The typical response was between 10 and 12 percent. She said Orem had been proactive in collecting the data and informed the panel of potential respondents that the data gathered would be important to making decisions and shaping Orem going forward.

Mr. Macdonald commented that the response rate was impressive since the survey had over 100 questions.

Ms. Gibb shared some data from the Orem 2015 Citizens Survey – Public Opinion Research. She highlighted seven things to keep in mind throughout the presentation, which were:

1. Surveyed Orem residents, including a new sample of UVU students via an online survey.
2. Overall, Orem residents were happy with the way the city had been run.
3. Nearly all City services received majority approval ratings.
4. Many had not participated in or were unfamiliar with City events. Youth rec programs and the Senior Friendship Center were largely unknown.

5. The majority of citizens who interacted with City staff were satisfied with their service experiences.
6. Public transportation was not well utilized and residents wanted more options.
7. A utility fee increase was feasible and there did not seem to be a strong threshold for price.

Ms. Gibb reviewed the survey methodology which was intended to minimize error. She shared the following points about the methodology used for the survey:

- Sampling frame consisted of a combined panelists from all households in the Orem City utilities accounts and the City newsletter databases, plus a sample of 5,000 students living in Orem who attend Utah Valley University (UVU).
- Duplicate email addresses were discarded and 6,878 emailed invitations were sent.
- Of those, 1,383 residents responded with 1,322 completed online surveys. Each email address could respond only once.
- With 1,322 interviews out of an estimated adult population of 61,612, the results in a margin of error was plus or minus 2.68 percentage points. Responses were weighted to better approximate city demographic composition.

Ms. Gibb shared some of the questions and responses:

- Orem's direction
- Perceptions
- City services
- City events
- Recreation programs
- City employees
- UTOPIA use and availability in Orem
- Communication from the City
- City initiatives
- Public transportation
- Utility fee increase.

She said perceptions of Orem were down from previous surveys, but she thought that was likely due it being an election year. She said the average rating for quality of life in Orem was 76.9 percent which was about average to other cities in the valley. She said she believed Lehi was a few percentage points lower than Orem, and Provo was a few percentage points higher. She said Salt Lake City typically fell around 65 percent on quality of life.

Ms. Gibb said respondents were asked to rate the city compared to five years ago. The majority said Orem had improved in those five years, with about a quarter of respondents saying it was somewhat or much worse.

What people like most about Orem:

- Location
- Proximity of amenities
- Family-focused atmosphere
- Safety of the community.

Most important problems facing Orem:

- Growth
- Traffic.

Ms. Gibb said respondents were asked to rate the overall appearance and physical attractiveness of their neighborhoods and the city as a whole. There were high ratings overall, with the majority rating the city at a four out of five. When asked about Orem's image over time, 47 percent of respondents said the city's overall image had probably or definitely improved and 25 percent said it had probably or definitely deteriorated. She said about 82 percent would recommend Orem as a good place to live. When asked about the satisfaction of services received for their tax dollar, 65 percent rated satisfaction at "good" or "excellent."

Ms. Gibb said the next section of the survey focused on Orem City services, and asked residents to evaluate the following service categories:

- Orem Library
- Garbage collection
- Drinking (culinary) water services
- Fire protection services
- Emergency medical services
- Police/Crime prevention services
- Street lighting
- Utility billing system
- Cemetery
- Street Sweeping
- Recycling program
- Storm water drainage
- Traffic enforcement
- Sidewalk maintenance
- Animal control services
- Snow removal services
- Surface maintenance on city streets
- City code enforcement, neighborhood preservation
- Land use, planning, and zoning

Ms. Gibb said the library received the highest satisfaction ratings, and the majority of services had received somewhat or very satisfied ratings. Some had never been utilized by respondents. She said that, while there was always room for improvement, there were not large percentages of dissatisfied ratings on any service. The highest dissatisfaction rating was for land use, planning, and zoning. She said that category was very broad and residents may not have been as familiar with those.

The event ratings gave Summerfest the highest, followed closely by the Timpanogos Storytelling Festival, then library events and the Lights On! tree lighting event for overall awareness. Many City events were largely unknown to the residents, but those who attended were satisfied overall. Ms. Gibb said residents, with an 86 percent response, gave the appearance of City parks a somewhat or very satisfied rating. Trails and open space, Orem Fitness Center, and Scera Park

Pools also received high satisfaction ratings. Programs available for youth recreation and at the Orem Senior Friendship Center had overall satisfactory ratings, but had very high ratings of unfamiliarity. She said the Orem Fitness Center was brought up most often. Some people said the Orem facility did not need to compete with Provo while others said they wished Orem had a new recreation center like Provo's center.

Ms. Gibb said respondents were asked to rate the courtesy and overall performance of City employees. Courtesy of employees received a rating of 60 percent somewhat or very satisfied, and overall work performance received 59 percent somewhat or very satisfied. She said in the open-ended question there were not many stand-out comments, but the words used often were "helpful", "friendly," and "great." Sixty percent of respondents said they had contacted a City office in the past year. Of that percentage, 67 percent said they were somewhat or very satisfied with the City's response. She said having the majority of respondents say they were satisfied with their experience was not a luxury all cities enjoyed.

Ms. Gibb said they asked about UTOPIA, with 15 percent of respondents reporting they connected to the Internet through the UTOPIA network. Of those who were not currently using UTOPIA, 35 percent said they would if it was available to them, 29 percent said they would not, and 36 percent did not know or were undecided.

Ms. Gibb said the preferred channels for City information were digital mediums like the email newsletter, Facebook and other social media outlets, and the City website. Postal mail was also a highly ranked channel to receive City information. When asked to select which channel they most preferred, 58 percent of respondents preferred the emailed newsletter, 21 percent preferred postal mail, and a combined 17 percent preferred Facebook, social media, and the City website.

Respondents were given a list of eleven possible Orem City initiatives and were asked to sort the initiatives as "important" or "not important" to them, and then rank them from highest priority to lowest priority. She said all respondents sorted the initiatives as important to them, with the lowest ranked initiative still receiving a 48 percent "importance" rating. The highest ranked priority was preserving and maintaining quality neighborhoods, followed by investing in core infrastructure (i.e. utility lines, roads, sidewalks, etc.), supporting local businesses and attracting, retaining, or expanding businesses, etc.

Ms. Gibb said 10 percent of respondents said they used public transportation monthly or more often. Twenty-six percent said they strongly agreed that Orem needed more public transportation options and many pointed to lack of options for why they did not utilize the system. She said overall the message was that people wanted more options for public transportation.

Ms. Gibb said they asked if residents would support the necessary utility fee increases if they knew the money would be used for necessary water and sewer infrastructure projects. She said 65 percent of respondents said they would somewhat or strongly support monthly fee increases. They randomly asked about resident's willingness to pay specified increases over specified periods of time. The first question was a $5 increase over nine years, and 67 percent of those responding said they were somewhat or very willing to adjust to this scenario. The second question was a $6.50 increase over seven years, with 63 percent being somewhat or very willing. The final question was an $8 increase over five years, with 63 percent being somewhat or very willing to this scenario. She said there was not a lot of threshold for cost, and people expressed

roughly the same amount of support for the increase whether it was a higher amount for a shorter period of time, or vice versa.

Mayor Brunst said some other cities in Utah Valley were looking at significant increases, some as high as $14.00 a month. Ms. Gibb said she had not worked with other cities on that subject and could not compare.

Mr. Andersen asked for the presentation to be emailed to him. Mr. Downs said he would send it to the Mayor and City Council.

DISCUSSION – Bill Hulterstrom – United Way

Mr. Bybee introduced Bill Hulterstrom, president and CEO of United Way of Utah County, to speak to some of the concerns expressed about new buildings in Orem, the proposed State Street Master Plan, neighborhood plans, etc. Mr. Hulterstrom would address ways to build and strengthen a safe community with people from all different backgrounds.

Mr. Hulterstrom said that, in his thirty-two years in the human and community services industry, one of his favorite words was the word "neighbor." He referred to the work of political science author Robert Putnam who studied the influential aspects of predicting crime. While the prevalent belief was that crime would always be higher in low-income neighborhoods, Mr. Putnam found that when neighbors knew one another, crime was lower. Knowing neighbors provided a greater counter-predictor of crime than factors like income levels, politics, race, education level, owners vs. renters, etc. Mr. Hulterstrom referred also to a study conducted at Harvard by Dr. Felton Earls which presented two points on the quality of neighborhoods:

1. Neighbors knowing each other
2. If neighbors believed they had the power or ability to do something in their community.

The third principle Mr. Hulterstrom spoke to was the principle of triangulation, from Dr. Leland Kaiser. Triangulation was the concept that people wanted to be near something when gathering, rather than being exposed or out in the open. That was why office conversations took place around the water cooler or coffee machine, and why people in parks gathered near benches or picnic tables. Those inanimate objects created points of safety and connection, and made socializing more easy and open. Mr. Hulterstrom asked how to encourage neighbors to get to know using those three principles together.

Mr. Bybee commented that he had heard that Wal-Mart greeter created an instant point of connection. Mr. Hulterstrom said the greeters were in place to create those connections to help reduce shoplifting and create a more connected shopping experience.

Mr. Hulterstrom said theorists believed the automatic garage door opener had changed interactions between neighbors since people could drive right in to their garage and close the door behind them. Neighbors rarely conversed with each other at the mail box or over the fence anymore. Implementing the principle of triangulation, cities could design spaces and plan activities that created opportunities for neighbors to interact and get to know each other. Mr. Hulterstrom said bonding social capital was strong along the Wasatch Front, and there was a disproportionate amount of bonding versus bridging in the community. He said an example of strong bridging social capital could be found in the Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) group for

an elementary school, and he felt that was an untapped pipeline of community leaders from diverse backgrounds.

Mr. Hulterstrom said the City could encourage developers to design their projects in such a way as to create points of triangulation and gathering. Events could be planned in ways to bring people together, and could be done to engage on a smaller, neighborhood level. He said it was important to understand that young millennials as well as retirees were moving more than they ever had before, and those groups wanted quality housing for times before and after living in a single-family home. He said those groups needed to not be isolated, but to be used as strengths in the community instead of fearing changing demographics. When neighbors were proud of their neighborhoods and owned those identities, it allowed for natural, strengthened connections.

Mayor Brunst said Orem had strong neighborhoods and strong families, which helped keep the safety rating high and helped during times of emergency.

Mrs. Black said in some ways the Neighborhoods in Action (NIA) program had been valuable for strengthening neighborhoods and encouraging neighbors to take ownership of their neighborhoods. She said the PTA made sense as a bridge because anyone with kids in school was part of that community, regardless of religion or socioeconomic status.

Mr. Hulterstrom said he found in his research that when adults in a neighborhood knew the names of the children in the neighborhood, those children were more likely to be successful. Knowing neighbors affected poverty, education, behavioral health, etc. Connections were crucial.

Mayor Brunst said a dynamic shift moving toward apartment and condo housing would be harder in some ways to create those connection points. Mr. Hulterstrom agreed, saying it was even more important to because it was harder. He felt there was a stigma for apartment housing which needed to be overcome.

Mr. Davidson said it was important to note the difference of fostering an environment that encouraged neighborhood involvement and forcing involvement. The City tried to plan activities and events that engaged residents and created points of connection. He asked how they could maintain the enthusiasm for events without trying to force interaction.

Mr. Hulterstrom said people were not as used to the concept of bridging social capital, and it seemed to almost threaten the way things have been done before. He used the example of a dog barking in the night, and how many people these days would think to call the police or animal control before they would think to call their neighbor who owned the dog. There should be a balance between natural neighborhood interactions and City services, and the City could help facilitate neighborhoods finding their identities. He mentioned a program in Savannah, Georgia, where the neighborhood had received a $300 grant to facilitate many neighborhood events. They considered it a point of pride to have done so much with such a small budget.

Mr. Bybee said the hope was that those principles would be considered when discussing some of the issues Orem was facing. It would help with planning to consider points of triangulation and how to engage with and appeal to a wide variety of people of all ages and backgrounds.

Mr. Davidson said City staff had many points of triangulation already in place. What they they needed was points of triangulation that people wanted to be a part of. City parks and trails, recreation facilities, the Senior Center and library programming, etc. were points of triangulation residents connected with. To keep them, it was crucial to maintain and improve existing amenities as needed.

UPDATE – Siemens Energy Update

Mr. Bell said this would be the last update on this project until it came before the Council for a vote. He said the negotiations with Siemens were considerably lower without lowering the scope. The project had the potential to save the City a substantial amount of money, up to $50,000 a month in energy savings. He asked the Council to provide feedback on the scope and hoped they would reach out if they had any questions or issues they would like addressed. He turned the time over to Mark Cram for the presentation.

Mr. Cram said Trevor Mays and Kevin Brown, also with Siemens, were present to help answer any questions the Council had. He said the purpose of these types of projects was to provide savings to the cities so they could then fund facility improvement projects and slow the increase in utility costs. The City had implemented supply-side solutions and continued to negotiate better rates for water, natural gas, etc. He said there would be savings both during and after construction. If the City delayed the projects it would cost them more.

Mr. Cram explained the extra value to the City from performance contracting:

- Utility incentives assigned to subcontractors resulted in reduced first costs
- Reduced pricing negotiations had already been credited to Orem City
- Savings guarantee
- Project time frame and master schedule – 18 months
- Warranty – extended beyond standard warranty periods
- Audit, counts, scope guarantee
- No change orders – firm fixed pricing
- Annual reports to the City throughout the term of the agreement
- Siemens would be the general contractor for the City and manage all vendors, including schedule, material, labor and all documents.

Mr. Cram emphasized that Siemens would be under contract to complete those projects in the time projected, or Siemens would have to make up the difference in lost savings. He reviewed the various improvement projects and said the numbers had changed significantly from the first draft, but were now fixed.

Mayor Brunst said some neighbors had concerns about the brightness of the lighting in street lights. Mr. Cram said that LED lights would have similar light output, but the wattage would be lower.

Mr. Macdonald asked if they planned to do all the listed projects. Mr. Cram said they were because the savings allowed the City to do projects that had not been completed previously.

Mr. Bybee said if they took out the two long-term payback projects, the implementation cost would be relatively minimal.

Mr. Davidson said it would carve out $80,000 and the payback would go from 11.1 to about 10.8.

Mrs. Black asked for clarification on what this would accomplish.

Mr. Davidson said they looked at a way to do things efficiently under one project management team, in order to garner all the savings that had been mentioned. Orem staff had the capacity, but it would take much longer to complete. Siemens had (2) access to vendors, (2) project management expertise, (3) contractors lined up, and (4) could do the work relatively quickly. The sooner the projects were completed, the less likely costs would go up. He said there were warranties to guarantee the work would be done right. Mr. Cram added that it was a guaranteed savings, because Siemens would make up the difference if their work did not reach the savings.

Mr. Bybee said for every month the projects went undone, the City lost savings.

Mrs. Black asked if the City had money for the costs in the current budget. Mr. Davidson said they did not, but the City would enter into a lease arrangement backed with the guaranteed savings. Those would pay down the cost of the improvements. At the end of the lease the savings were Orem's. He said the payback timeline would need to be such that the savings would pay for the costs.

Mr. Cram said it did not impact bonding capability and would be a budget neutral approach to the project. The City was already spending on utilities, so they would do projects to reduce those costs. The guarantee was that Siemens could cover the difference if it did not come out as outlined. Some potential measures that did *not* make the list were perhaps less critical in nature and did not need the attention as quickly. For the projected cash flow for project, some assumptions had been made. One was the annual interest rate, which they would not know until the City engaged the third-party for the loan. The finance period would be approximately fifteen years.

Mr. Bybee said the City would receive the benefits if more savings were garnered than projected.

Mrs. Black asked about Siemen's track record for completing projects. Mr. Cram said they had worked with hundreds of cities, including several in Utah. Siemens had been in this business for twenty-seven years doing energy performance contracts.

Mr. Davidson said the relationship with Siemens began with an RFP, soliciting bidders under the 2010 law. Taggart Bowen added that there had been four respondents to that RFP.

Mr. Cram said they were 99.3 percent accurate in their savings projections. If they missed, they paid. The next steps would be for the Council to make decisions regarding the scope of the work. The goal was to finalize near the end of the month, get the response from the bank, and have that back to the Council for the December 8th meeting.

Mayor Brunst said he believed it was a good program. The interest rate currently was opportune.

Mr. Manning said that could change, but historically this was a good rate time.

Mrs. Black asked about the scope of the work.

Mr. Davidson said they had been discussing for several years the need to do something with the projects. The challenge was that the City would have to spend money to save money, and it was hard to spend money they did not have. With this proposal, however, they could move projects forward with the means to make this work financially for Orem in the short and long terms. If the Council was comfortable with the concept, they would meet with the City's financial advisor to negotiate the capital lease. The staff recommendation was to move ahead with the current list of projects.

Mr. Sumner said, if they had questions, who they should speak with between now and December 8th and was told the Council members should talk to Mr. Bell or Mr. Bowen.

The Council then asked and received input on some of the proposed projects.

Mr. Andersen inquired about operation saving, and Mr. Brown said it was the energy savings plus operation--capital cost avoidance. Mr. Andersen asked for the presentation to be sent to him, and Mr. Brown said it would.

The general consensus of the Council was they were comfortable with the proposed list.

Mr. Andersen asked if the City would put up any money. Mr. Davidson said they would be taking money from one pocket and putting it into another. Cash flow-wise, it took nothing from the budget.

Mr. Sumner wondered about draws. Mr. Davidson said there would be contract management team, and the City would control financing. The Development Services team would work through the retrofits and installs.

Mr. Davidson said Siemens was required by State law to provide an annual accounting.

UPDATE – Transportation Master Plan

Mr. Goodrich introduced John Dorny and Kevin Croshaw with Horrocks Engineers. He said his presentation was similar to previous ones with a few minor changes and was just a draft. If the City wanted federal, state, and county funding, they needed to adopt a master plan. It also helped with mandating setbacks for future development.

Mayor Brunst asked how projected traffic increases were determined and how it was determined to increase speed limits or to limit on-street parking.

Mr. Goodrich said that in the past the Level of Service (LOS) with a grade of A through F was assessed when a developer wanted to rezone a property. He said the grading is not exactly like school grading. For example, with a population the size of Orem a LOS of D is good. He said it was usually not cost effective to try to raise a LOS of D to a C or better. He shared a graphic which identified the roads by level of service. He said the roads that were either an E or F were approaching or at capacity. Those were the types where it would take more than one green light to get through the signal, and which caused people to eventually take a different route.

Mr. Goodrich said that, as the population grew in both Orem and the County, more roads would end up with an LOS of E or F—if there were no improvements. He said improvements might be as simple as putting in right turn lanes, such as at 400 South and State Street. He shared a map which showed some projects like that which could be accomplished with federal, county, and MAG funding. He noted that the map did not show all the project Orem needed.

Mayor Brunst asked how the LOS was ascertained as it changed each year. He also asked if the City was planning to be proactive in dealing with those changes or if they would need to wait and be reactive.

Mr. Goodrich said they were trying to be proactive by developing a plan which would show the improvements needed in the next ten years and beyond. He said they used the same traffic modeling tool as the entire Wasatch Front. It divided the Wasatch Front into traffic analysis zones (TAZ) and took into consideration the number of residences (including single-family homes and apartments), businesses, jobs, commercial, etc. The model was calibrated by taking traffic counts at hundreds of locations every year.

Mr. Davidson said the City had been studying all along but had been using a baseline study that was completed many years ago. If the TMP were adopted there would be a new baseline and a new analysis.

Mr. Dorny said Orem counted traffic more than other cities did, so they had an abundance of data.

Mayor Brunst asked projection population growth. Mr. Goodrich said they had done traffic modeling to figure out a general plan for all the cities along the Wasatch Front. He said the information in the State Street Master Plan was not included in MAG's modeling because the plan had not yet been approved

Mayor Brunst asked if there should be on-street parking on State Street, or if that space was needed for traffic.

Mr. Goodrich said there were streets throughout the City where the capacity could be increased by reducing friction factors such as parking and signal timing. He said new technology could track personal devices, and traffic counts at intersections can be updated in real time.

Mrs. Black said she had seen the video about freeways. She asked how it would work for State Street.

Mr. Goodrich reviewed the process and showed a video called "Managed Motorways" which compared vehicles in traffic lanes to pasta in a funnel. By controlling how many vehicles entered the roadway at a time they could prevent bottlenecks and delays as well as monitor the different ebbs and flows through personal devices. That would reduce guesswork. He said Orem currently had a really good traffic signal management program, recognized throughout the state. They were currently working on a time-of-day system, where they would do counts once or twice a year and set the controllers up by that data. Unfortunately, not every day was the same, so using continuous traffic counts with the new technology would be better.

Mr. Goodrich said the current system determined that some traffic signals, such as at State and University Parkway, were more important because of the traffic volume. They were "master signals." Others were "slave" signals because they were dictated by what the master signal did. With the continuous traffic counts signals could be "peer-to-peer" signals rather than "master/slave" signals. On State Street they would be able to control how much traffic got on the signals every quarter mile; it would pour the "pasta" in at different locations.

Mayor Brunst expressed concern that more lights would be counter-productive.

Mr. Goodrich said that, years ago, the traffic operations department decided to squeeze off time on side streets to get State Street to flow better, but there were complaints so they adjusted to let more people in at those locations. Even signal spacing made a difference, so they would address that. Streets with a better grid system had more capacity. He said Orem had a good grid system, except at State Street.

Mrs. Black noted that much of the plans concerned north-south traffic. She asked if ignoring the east/west streets caused problems for north/south.

Mr. Goodrich said improving east/west streets would improve north/south traffic on State.

Mayor Brunst asked if more cars would be idling and causing more pollution. Mr. Goodrich said the even spacing of the signals would keep traffic flowing. Mayor Brunst said he would like to see how other cities had done this and been successful.

Mr. Goodrich said UDOT had gone to Australia to find a similar system, so this was still an unknown locally. He said UDOT weighed the advantages of reducing the friction factors over spending the money to widen the roads. He said that, as redevelopment occurred, friction factors could be reduced. For example, McDonalds was planning to reduce the number of accesses from both State Street and Center Street when they expanded. Also, raised medians would reduce friction factors while still allowing left turns at various locations.

Mr. Goodrich said UDOT had increased ridership by increasing the frequency of buses. He said the State Street Master Plan provided for possible light rail in the future, as well as other options. They were also looking at increasing the number alternate north/south corridors.

Mr. Goodrich said they planned to come back on December 8th for final approval of the master plan.

5:00 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, 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; Gary Giles, Police Department Director; Charlene Crozier, Library Director; Jason Bench, Planning Division Manager; Paul Goodrich, Transportation Engineer; Keith Larsen, Traffic Operations Engineer; Sam Kelly, Engineer; Neal Winterton, Water Division Manager; Reed Price, Maintenance Division Manager; Steven Downs, Assistant to the City Manager; and Jackie Lambert, Deputy City Recorder
EXCUSED	David Spencer

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.

The Council adjourned at 5:53 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 (electronic), 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; Gary Giles, Police Department Director; 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	Jonah Humes

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE Jackson Thurman

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no minutes ready for approval.

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

Mrs. Black **moved** to reappoint Greg Brown to the CDBG Advisory Commission. Mr. Andersen **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**.

Recognition of New Neighborhoods in Action Officers

There were no new neighborhood officers recognized.

REPORT – Metropolitan Water Board

Mr. Winterton introduced Jack Jones, Chairman of the Board for the MWBCD. Mr. Jones gave a history of the board. He said that, thanks to the Board members throughout the years, they now felt comfortable about the amount of water they have purchased for Orem's needs. He said the relationship with the City was very good and none of it would have been accomplished without cooperation. Mr. Jones then introduced the members of the Board of Directors who were present: Alec Lott, Bill Gillman, and Mr. Tschirki.

Mr. Winterton said he had assumed that role of water manager in April 2015. He said the board had acquired a few irrigation canal shares in the past year. They had also gone through an adjudication by the State, and it was determined that the City's water rights were intact and in good shape. He said the City had significant shares in irrigation companies and those rights would be adjudicated in the coming year. The City would need to be prepared to explain its use and need for the water.

Mayor Brunst asked how long Mr. Jones had served on the MWBCD. Mr. Jones said he had served for thirty-eight years and would be ninety years old on the coming Friday. Mayor Brunst mentioned that Orem had been awarded "best tasting water in the state." Orem's great water supply was in large part due to the vision the water board members.

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.

Carolyn James, resident, said she lived two blocks from the UVU campus and represented the Sunset Heights community. She said they were opposed to the Ivory or ICO development in their residential neighborhood. The proposed plan—two blocks from her home—was for a six-story, ultra-high density student housing with over 1,100 beds on a five-acre parcel and could have as many as 3,000 students once fully constructed. She noted that this would be the tallest and most densely populated zone in the Orem's history. She asked the Council to wait to see if existing apartments were filled since the proposed project would decrease property values; reduce privacy; block views; increase traffic, noise, and light; had inadequate parking; was a threat to children's safety; and would probably increase crime rates. She said Orem's motto was Family City USA and not "Apartment City USA."

Craig Doxey, resident, said he lived in Sunset Heights and was also opposed to the Ivory project. He said there would be six buildings running the length and width of the property, five stories high, with only a seven- to twelve-foot setback. He said it would be double the density of BYU student housing with no density cap. He echoed concerns that property values would decrease, and family neighborhoods would become student rentals. They worried it would mean the destruction of their neighborhood. He asked the City to turn down the zoning request and open the door for a discussion. Mr. Doxey said the City Code stated that PD zones should be sufficiently restrictive to protect the character and quality of neighboring properties. The proposal protected neither.

Richard Dewey, resident, said he lived in the Sunset Heights neighborhood. He said he bought his first home there in 1991 and had moved twice in the same neighborhood because it was a hidden gem. He was a retired police officer, not for Orem, but he chose to live here because it was Family City, USA, and a great place to raise a family. He provided the Councilmembers with a crime map and asked that the City slow things down concerning apartments until they could see the effect they would have. He said the project could not be done without rezoning. Noting that light areas indicated higher crime, he said every light area was in high-density housing. They were fertile hunting grounds for auto burglaries.

Dora Schoenfeld, resident, said she had lived in Orem for about 20 years and liked how it was. She said it appeared that the Orem City Council had an agenda, embracing a socialistic type of government which had total control without listening to the voice of the people. She said she supported everything that had been said about not more high-density housing. She urged each Council member to search their consciences as to what their agenda was as representatives as the citizens of Orem City and to let them keep the current environment.

Barbara Petty, resident, said she wanted to speak about the proposed raises for the mayor and council. She thanked them for their service and the good things they did. She was not against them being paid. People should not be excluded from serving because they were not wealthy. However, their salaries and benefits were paid by the citizens of Orem, and she found it curious that they were considering a raise to benefit themselves. She said many in the City were working

multiple jobs just to provide necessities for their families. She assumed that most of the councilmembers had other sources of income and that their check from the City was a convenient supplement which helped them maintain a nice lifestyle. She said they should ask who would benefit from such a raise, how it would bless the citizens of Orem, and whether or not such a raise would show compassion for the poor. She said the Council should consider why they would get an increase without giving the citizens some relief from fees or taxes.

CONSENT ITEMS

There were no Consent Items.

SCHEDULED ITEMS

MOTION – Canvass and Certification – 2015 Municipal General Election Results

The City Recorder recommended that the City Council complete the canvass and, by motion, certify the 2015 Municipal General Election results. Mr. Bybee presented.

He said the Council, acting as the Board of Canvassers, would be asked to certify the results and to declare the three candidates with the highest votes to be elected. He noted the Councilmembers-elect elect would take the oath of office on Monday, January 4, 2016, at noon in the City Council Chambers.

Mr. Bybee reported the election night results received from the County Clerk that afternoon at 2:00 p.m. that day, as follows:

Mark Seastrand	8,665
Debby Lauret	8,149
Sam Lentz	8,093
Hans Andersen	6,225
Claude Richards	5,025

Mr. Bybee also reported that the local option sales tax question was not passed. There were 6,217 “Yes” votes and 7, 333 “No” votes.

Mayor Brunst said that in the Primary, with the Vote by Mail (VBM) system, 10,929 people voted, which was close to 25 percent. In the General the total was 13,908, which was over 32 percent. He said that was double the turnout from four years ago. He said that the VBM system had worked very well. He expressed appreciation for all who ran during the Primary and General elections.

Mrs. Black **moved** that the City Council:

1. Certify the election results with the following changes:

City Council
Mark Seastrand .....8,000 .....to 8,665
Debby Lauret .....7,509 .....to 8,149

Sam Lentz .....7,430 .....to 8,093
Hans V. Andersen Jr. .....5,633 .....to 6,225
Claude C. Richards .....4,527 .....to 5,025

2. Declare 4-year term City Council candidates Mark Seastrand, Debby Lauret, and Sam Lentz to be elected.

Mr. Andersen **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**.

6:30 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING – Budget Amendment – Compensation
ORDINANCE – Amending the Current Fiscal Year 2015-2016 Budget to amend Compensation of Elected Officials

The City Manager recommended the City Council hold a public hearing to discuss amending the compensation of elected officials and, by ordinance, amend Fiscal Year 2015-2016 Budget.

The City Council appointed an ad-hoc citizen committee to evaluate the compensation offered to the City of Orem's elected officials. The Committee examined the time commitments of the legislative positions as well as the compensation offered to elected officials in cities with the City Manager form of government and of a similar size as Orem. The current salary level of the Mayor was $26,400/annually and the City Council was $13,200, respectively.

Mr. Manning said he recognized how difficult this was for the Council and Mayor to discuss their compensation. This was an opportunity to review the options and recommendations. He said the ad hoc citizen committee did a very thorough job evaluating the positions of mayor and city manager and deciding whether the mayor should be part- or full-time, as well as considering compensation. They considered expectations, roles, issues, concerns, etc. In June and July they did research, speaking to Orem's elected officials and staff, as well as officials and staff in other cities throughout the state. Their recommendation was for the Mayor to stay part-time, but recognizing the role's responsibilities had increased. Mr. Manning said the question of part- or full-time was not so much a question of hours, but was more a question of whether or not this position was something people would seek to do citizen service, or would seek for the compensation it gave. The committee decided the mayor should be considered a citizen serving for a period of time and then going back to the community.

Mr. Manning said the committee also recommended that the City establish a process for prioritizing time and demands, and allocating assignments so there was some fairness among the councilmembers.

Mr. Manning reviewed the current compensation for the mayor and councilmembers, which had been in place since FY 2008. He said that, prior to that, it had changed annually. He said currently the Mayor earned double the salary of Council. The recommendation from the committee was to increase the salary for the council members, and change the compensation for the Mayor from two times to three times what the council was compensated. They also recommended that there be a committee to look at the compensation on a regular basis. The recommendation was that changes should be made at the end of a term of office. They

recognized that this was difficult since the terms of the councilmembers were staggered. The committee recommended that all councilmembers receive the changes at the same time.

Mr. Manning continued, saying the budget impact was fairly minimal and, if approved, should take effect in January, 2016. He said that, for the balance of the current year, the budget—if this item were approved as proposed—would change $10,800 for the council and $18,600 for the mayor, for a total change of $29,400. When the variable benefits were added, the total change to the current fiscal year budget would be $36,600. He said the purpose of the current hearing was to amend the budget by ordinance.

Mayor Brunst said the salaries of the council and mayor had not been changed for seven years. He said there had been an increase given a year ago to employees, who had not been given an increase for about five years prior, and another modest increase to employees this year.

Mr. Andersen said one Mr. Stocks' recommendation was that no pay increase happen until the election took place two years from now, when there could potentially be a new mayor. He said Mr. Manning was using minutes as his authority for saying the compensation should be raised. He said he emailed Kevin Stocks to clarify if he had understood Mr. Stocks' recommendation on the timing and was told his understanding was correct.

Mr. Manning said he took the information he presented from the report of the committee.

Mr. Andersen expressed concern that the Council did not have the minutes yet from that meeting. He reiterated that, at the September 8, 2015, meeting, he had asked a direct question of Mr. Stocks, and Mr. Stocks had said any change would take place at the next election. Mr. Andersen said he asked Mr. Stocks to clarify if that meant two years from now, and Mr. Stocks said it did. He asserted that the minutes the Council had not yet received were incorrect and suggested that Mr. Manning go back and read them. He stated that Mr. Manning should not say that this was what the committee recommended, when it was not.

Mr. Davidson said he appreciated the work and efforts of the compensation committee. He said they were an advisory group. They made the recommendations, but the ultimate decision rested with the Council.

Mr. Macdonald said his understanding was that the numbers Mr. Manning presented were correct, but that there might be a question as to when it would be implemented.
Mayor Brunst asked when raises that were given in the past had been implemented. Mr. Manning said implementation of those raises did not wait for election. He said they had been handled as part of the normal budgeting process, taking effect in July.

Mayor Brunst opened the public hearing.

Kathy Gowans, ad hoc committee member, said the goal of their recommendations was to create conversations so the Council could make decisions. As a result of the email question Mr. Andersen sent out, the committee members had met and chatted. She said her email response to that question was the following:

> "If the council decides compensation adjustments should be made, we would suggest reviewing and implementing changes for all positions at the same time."

She said it would not make sense to stagger implementation but to do all the same time. Their recommendation would not get in the way of implementing a change at the first of the year, if that was what the Council chose.

Mr. Andersen asked if Kevin Stocks said the same thing. Ms. Gowans said he had written his response, and then the three of them discussed the issue. She said Mr. Stocks had emailed Mr. Andersen before the three committee members talked.

John Reinhard, resident, said that for the most part he supported the proposal and appreciated their efforts. He wondered, other than the money, what benefits elected officials received. He asked if their benefits continued once their term was up.

Mrs. Black said it was called the guillotine; when they were out, they were out.

Sharon Anderson, resident, said she appreciated the time the City Council and Mayor did for Orem. She questioned how the raise helped the citizens since they would foot the bill. It seemed strange that the public servants would be asking for an increase when so many were living in hardship conditions.

Melodee Andersen, resident, said it seemed strange the Council could vote their own wages up. She said she thought the citizens should vote on it. Then, if Council members did not live up to what the citizens wanted, the citizens would not have to increase their wages.

LaNae Millett, committee member, said the charge given to them was to review the salary of the Mayor and the city council and city manager, which led to avenues where they could review the service being given and the time being put in, and to see how it compared to other cities in the state. She said they recognized the importance of being open and equal and implementing in a timely manner. She said they had recommended implementing at the end of a term, because they were analyzing only the mayor. Their intent was not to suggest that half the Council receive an increase two years after the other half did. She echoed Mr. Davidson's comment that the ad hoc committee was advisory; the decision was the Council's.

Mayor Brunst closed the public hearing.

Mayor Brunst then said the City Council was the legislative branch of the City, and it was their responsibility to vote on compensation packages, including their own. He reiterated that neither the mayor nor the councilmembers had received a raise in eight years, and it was proper to look at the service given by the mayor and the council. People would be surprised how much time and energy the councilmembers put in. He said that when he was first elected, he understood this was part-time so he set his schedule accordingly, but soon realized it was a full-time job where he spent between forty to fifty hours a week out doing the job. He said he served on committees, supported charities, worked with the State legislature, and spent hundreds of hours with various economic development projects. He said he felt what the citizen committee had suggested was proper and correct.

Mr. Sumner said he had served under three mayors and recognized it was a tough job with a large time commitment. He said he had watched the mayor perhaps more closely than the others and was grateful for the time he had given in his service. Mr. Sumner said the mayor's office was

the face of the city, and he felt Orem needed to keep up with other communities. He asked how they should talk about the proposal.

Mayor Brunst said there were three issues to consider: the Mayor's wage, the Council's wage, and when to start it.

Mr. Seastrand said he appreciated the comments that had been made. He said every decision made on the Council was tough and had a big impact. No decision was taken lightly. He said he had spoken at length about the issue of mayoral compensation with former Mayor Washburn. When the City Council had considered increasing his wage, he had declined. He said he was retired, and it was his passion to serve the city. But he recognized that the mayor was asked to give countless hours. It was difficult to work a full-time job *and* be the mayor. He said compensation would be the wrong reason to run for office. Mr. Seastrand said he recognized the additional requirements and expectations for the mayor and felt comfortable increasing that wage. He said it was not a full-time wage, more like a very heavy part-time position. While he felt the City Council's compensation should stay the same, he believed the mayor's compensation should be increased.

Mr. Macdonald said he was humbled and honored to serve. He said he had never been paid so much for volunteering, never been paid so little for working. He did not know, before the Mayor brought this up to the Council, that they would consider the wage amounts, and he had suggested the citizen committee. As part of his own study of the issue, he spoke to five other mayors, and spoke about how cities were governed and compensated. He echoed Mr. Sumner's comments about how much time and effort Mayor Brunst gave. He was comfortable with the increase for the mayor. He said some candidates spent almost as much on their election as they earned when elected, so many citizens were not willing to run. People said they would be happy to serve, did not want to go through the meat grinder that was an election. He said they were certainly mindful of citizens who struggled financially and sought to serve them, but the compensation was not a huge issue for those who were financially comfortable, but he was happy to listen to the committee's recommendation, particularly concerning the mayor's compensation.

Mrs. Black said she felt like she could speak differently because she was leaving the Council. She had no dog in this fight, but she had been in the fight for nine years and knew what this fight was like. She said that at first she did not even know she would get a salary; she just wanted to serve. She said nobody on the council was a money-grubber, but she had realized, after getting into the council, that the members were worth some compensation. She said she had no problem with the Council receiving what the committee recommended, because she knew they earned it. She said she also had no problem moving from two times to three times the council's pay for the mayor, but not more. She said that, up there on the dais, they all had the same legislative power and responsibility. The reason the mayor got more, was that he had more of an outreach assignment. She said all of the councilmembers had outreach assignments, but the mayor had more. She was in favor of whatever the decision on the raise for the Council, but thought the mayor should get the three times that amount.

Mr. Andersen said he went back and looked at the report given by the committee, and the charge they were given was to evaluate whether the position of mayor should be designated as part-time or full-time. He said they gratuitously offered to give a pay raise to the Council, but this was not part of their charge. He said now the tail was wagging the dog. He said it was agreed that the

mayor would not get a raise, but then they decided to raise them all together. He said the Mayor did have more responsibilities and was paid twice as much, and he agreed that the mayor did more work than that. He said the problem was that there were six cities in this state that had this form of government. He said they were putting a Band-Aid on a problem and instead should change the form of government. He said they should put a face on legislation what was introduced to the City. He said that the propose ordinances were arranged by the CM, and he could keep things from the council as he saw fit. He said he did not believe a Mayor would do that type of thing, plus there would be a face on ordinances that were being passed. He said they should have been changing the form of government, not putting a Band-Aid on a poor form of government.

Mayor Brunst said that when he brought this forward, it was with the idea that the form of government would not change, nor would the roles of city manager and mayor. He said it was strictly looking at compensation for the Mayor and Council since no increase had occurred in seven years.

Mrs. Black said she felt compelled to answer those comments about the form of government. She said it was great, and she was grateful for it. She mentioned David B. Haight, who was a former mayor of Palo Alto, California. She said that Betty Washburn, widow of former Mayor Washburn, said Mr. Haight and Mayor Washburn met. She said that when Mayor Washburn told Mr. Haight what kind of government Orem had, Mr. Haight said it was the best form of government there was. She said she respected his opinion and experience. This form gave the City a professional city manager who was a steady influence in the City, not somebody who could be changed by the whims of political pressures. She said that was a blessing for the city. She said the Council could hire or fire the city manager; they held that power. She said this was a more economic form of government, as Orem paid a lot less to employees than did a city like Provo. She said Provo paid a great deal of money to both a city administrator and a full-time mayor. She said each legislator hired their own staff, so in terms of cost, Orem's form of government was exceedingly superior.

Mr. Macdonald said the form of government was the most popular in the United States. He said it was not as popular in Utah, but it was the most popular in country, and was on the increase. He suggested they think long and hard about that.

Mr. Spencer said he knew how many hours the Mayor put in above and beyond the other council members. He said he had no problem with mayoral increase, but would vote no on a city council increase. He said that if they still wanted the mayoral salary to be as high as it would have been with an increase to the city council's pay, which was the baseline, they could increase the mayor's pay to 3 ½ times the current city council pay.

Mayor Brunst **moved**, by ordinance, to amend the Current Fiscal Year 2015-2016 Budget to amend Compensation of Elected Officials; that the salary of the mayor be increased to three times that of the City Council and that the City Council receive a raise from $13,200 to $15,000; to establish a committee to regularly evaluate the salaries of elected officials on four-year basis; and that the change take place January 1, 2016. The motion failed to get a second.

Mr. Macdonald **moved**, by ordinance, to amend the Current Fiscal Year 2015-2016 Budget to amend Compensation of Elected Officials; that the salary of the mayor be increased to three

times that of the City Council and that the City Council salary remain at $13,200; to establish a committee to regularly evaluate the salaries of elected officials on a four-year basis; and that the change take place in January, 2016. Mrs. Black **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**.

6:00 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING – State Street Master Plan
RESOLUTION – Adopting the State Street Corridor Master Plan and amending the City of Orem General Plan to include the State Street Corridor Master Plan as Appendix A

The Development Services Department requested the City Council approve, by resolution, the State Street Corridor Master Plan and amend the Orem City General Plan by adopting the State Street Master Plan as Appendix A.

The City of Orem partnered with UDOT, MAG, UTA, and the City of Provo to select IBI Group in September 2014 to complete the State Street Corridor Master Plan. The purpose of the plan was to provide long range recommendations regarding transportation improvements, land uses, economic development opportunities, urban design guidelines, and high density housing options for the corridor. The plan was organized into five main sections: vision and framework, mobility, land use, urban design, and implementation.

An extensive public outreach effort was launched to seek public input regarding the plan, including six public open houses, noticing to all businesses in the study area, three public engagement websites (which had over 35,000 page views from 11,000 unique visitors), presentations to citizens' commissions and councils, and other presentations and outreach opportunities. In addition, the City mailed 3,504 notices to all property owners and businesses located within the State Street Corridor plan area inviting them to a luncheon on November 9, 2015 where City staff explained and addressed questions concerning the proposed plan. The input received from the various public outreach efforts was the primary force in developing the major goals, objectives, and recommendations of the plan.

Major objectives of the plan were developed based on public input, best practices, and staff and City Council guidance. These objectives included:

1. Create a boulevard on State Street.
2. Provide flexibility to incorporate future transit.
3. Develop a safe and complete bikeway along State Street.
4. Connect State Street to Orem Boulevard.
5. Develop unique and strategic growth areas.
6. Create an identifiable downtown and center for the community.
7. Develop a strong open space network along State Street.
8. Preserve and connect existing neighborhoods.
9. Create a family-oriented environment.
10. Encourage economic development.

This was a long range plan to guide future development and provide recommendations to City staff, the Planning Commission, and City Council for future development along the corridor. In placing the plan in the City's General Plan, it was the intent of City staff to begin incorporating these goals and objectives into the relevant land use, transportation, housing, and urban design

sections of the General Plan. This plan was a developer-driven approach to redevelopment, meaning that it provided recommendations for changes that could be incrementally implemented as private development and redevelopment occurred. It was an advisory document and not a mandate for development.

The Planning Commission recommended that the City Council approve the State Street Corridor Master Plan and amend the City of Orem General Plan to include the State Street Corridor Master Plan as Appendix A. City staff supported the Planning Commission recommendation.

Mr. Bench introduced Dave Nicholas from IBI. Mr. Bench said that IBI had helped develop this plan, starting in September of 2014. They had used thirteen different methods to get the word out to elicit participation to come up with the best plan for the citizens of Orem. Other groups that helped included the Planning Commission, the City Council, and various committees. They had given twelve different presentations to the various city commissions. There was a technical committee made up of UDOT, UTA, MAG, representatives from Provo City, and many employees of Orem City. These groups gave not only time but also funds to help develop this plan. A lot of business owners, property owners and community organizations had also participated. A lot of citizens had participated online and in public hearings. He said this was the biggest outreach plan he had seen in his time at Orem City, trying to get everybody involved in the plan.

Mr. Bench said that part of why they took this route to do a master plan was that, according to the Governor's office, Utah County would grow over 1 million people in 25 years. That would be an increase of 425,892. The same report indicated that Orem City would increase by 23,960. He said about 7 percent of that growth would come from children and grandchildren of current residents. He said that the number of vacant properties left in Orem was minimal, including the newly annexed area. If the City rezoned all the remaining property as R8, the typical residential zone, there would be a total of only 1,160 lots. That would only accommodate about 3,800 people. He said the proposed plan showed how to accommodate that growth by consolidating it on State Street.
Mr. Bench said the State Street Corridor Master Plan, which would become a part of the General Plan, focused on State Street. He said it was an advisory document and did not mandate the City or Council to follow the General Plan. He said the General Plans were recommendations; they were advisory. He said this was a market driven plan. The City would not dictate how parcels were developed, but would work with developers and property owners to increase their potential, and everyone's potential in Orem. He said the Council would be the authority on anything coming forward. He said the plan limited the impact on single-family neighborhoods, and helped maintain Family City USA.

Dave Nicholas, IBI, said he appreciated the time and participation of those who had worked on the plan, and said it was an unbelievable result and something to be proud of. He said it had been created by citizens and staff, and a lot of energy and enthusiasm had been brought to the process. He said the plan was generated by a lot of public input, through many different mediums. He said the plan consisted of a 100-page report with 5 appendices and an existing conditions report. He said the five key issues identified from the public input were mobility, aesthetics, identity, safety, and economics.

Mr. Nicholas said the first section was Vision and Framework, which was made up of the Vision Statement, design principals, basic goals, and plan objectives. He said the Vision Statement was very powerful and he hoped all would read it and understand it, and he reiterated that it was generated through public input. He said it was a guide to future growth with the goal of economic development initiatives, meaning to attract private investment

Mayor Brunst said the plan was a guide for future growth; nothing was set in stone. He said the City needed a plan for the future.

Mr. Nicholas agreed. He said it also intended to guide and inform transportation solutions. He said that State Street was the major vehicular corridor, and it needed to become multi-modal in the future, providing additional choices besides vehicular. He said the plan was also about community identity and image, giving Orem City a downtown. A goal was to promote the family-friendly culture, and that was something woven through the plan. There was also a goal to provide an attractive urban lifestyle alternative for growth.

Mr. Nicholas said those goals were supported by design principles which incorporated the five key issues stated above, as well as responsible land use and family-friendly urban design. He said the committee and consultant team used those goals to create the ten plan objectives listed above.

Mr. Nicholas explained the next section of the plan which was Mobility and covered the first four objectives. He explained that "boulevard" included the concept of beautification but was primarily about transportation. He said that creating a boulevard would maintain current traffic capacity and possibly increase it. By adding medians and consolidating some curb cuts, friction would be reduced, resulting in a more and safer environment. When the 79 percent of respondents who felt that State Street needed improvement were asked what one thing they would change, their first request was to make State Street more attractive. Their second request was to improve the pedestrian experience, third was more choices in transportation, and fourth was creating a sense of place.
Mr. Nicholas said that the first four objectives were to improve the flexibility of the vehicular network. He said that by using Orem Blvd. and creating a smaller block pattern, the area would be more walkable, more friendly, and a better economic engine from land use perspective. It was recommended that two new signals be added, at 200 South and 600 South, for better east/west connectivity.

Mr. Nicholas said the next section of the plan was Land Use and related to the next three objectives. Transportation and land use needed to be looked at together, as they were the keys to driving change and economic development. The plan identified five key nodes or growth areas, and these were locations where future transit stations would likely happen. He said each growth area would have unique characteristics which would give them a sense of place, including an identifiable downtown. He said this would not happen overnight, but that the City should focus on the corridor from Center to University Parkway as the core toward downtown Orem. He said the idea of a downtown was anchored on the north at Center Street, the civic and employment center, and on the south by the dining, shopping, entertainment district at University Parkway, and it was all tied together by the arts and culture district at 800 South. He said those were the key elements that made up downtowns throughout the country.

Mayor Brunst said Orem was different from a typical city with a downtown, but that was an asset to be amplified and improved upon.

Mr. Nicholas said the public would like to see more open space along the corridor. They thought it needed to be made more family friendly by adding plazas, pocket parks, event venues, etc. This would also improve safety and pedestrian connectivity.

Mr. Nicholas said the planners also worked to preserve existing neighborhoods. Adjacent to the State Street corridor, there were well-established single-family residential neighborhoods, so they worked to identify key growth nodes where growth could occur within a boundary and not impact or infiltrate into the surrounding neighborhoods, but rather provide better goods and services to attract people from those neighborhoods to the State Street corridor. He referenced the current population density areas, around I-15 and University Parkway, and the projected changes in population density by 2040 which would be more along the State Street corridor. He said the goal to preserve a family-friendly environment was woven all through the proposed plan.

Mr. Nicholas said a big strategy of the plan was to encourage economic development. The economic growth would need to support itself, so the City could help guide that growth. He said the plan supported the City's Economic Development Strategic Plan to provide long-term success, and to increase property values and tax revenues.

Mayor Brunst pointed out that the plan encouraged mixed-use facilities with retail on the bottom and residential on the top as residential development increased along State Street. He also reiterated that it would be along State Street and not in the neighborhoods.

Mr. Nicholas said if that could occur, it would be market driven. There might be horizontal mixed-use conditions. He said that when they looked at more compact, walkable, transit-oriented development patterns they typically saw structured parking wrapped with ground floor retail. Mr. Nicholas then summarized the six key sections of the report. He shared some simulations which showed how State Street would look with added landscaping and medians, different curb cuts, etc., including potentially allowing for transit to run down the corridor. He said that the existing land use within the five growth areas consisted of about 11 percent residential, 9 percent office, and 74 percent retail/commercial, with about 6 percent industrial. He said the proposed changes twenty-five years out, predicted a change to about 64 percent residential; 22 percent office space; and only 14 percent retail/commercial. He said those ratios of land use were similar to other transit-oriented work around the country, which allowed for less need for vehicles as people would live, work, and shop in the same area and could utilize public transportation. He said the land between the nodes would be left as-is. He also showed a predicted increase of about 190 percent in property tax value with the projected changes and a taxable sales increase of about 40 percent.

Mayor Brunst asked if property tax revenue would go up more than sales tax revenue because office space was up. Mr. Nicholas said that was correct. He said the sales tax revenue would still increase about 48 percent even though the amount of space was reduced. He said it would be the type of space that would generate more dollars per square foot.

Mr. Nicholas said that 2040 the corridor could accommodate up to 75 percent of the projected residential growth, or about 9,400 residential units and about 18,000 residents within the growth nodes. He said there would be about 4,000-5,000 new jobs in the additional office space.

Mr. Nichols said the land-use section of the plan outlined a five, ten, and twenty-five year vision within each node. He used the Center Street area as an example, where over the five, ten, and twenty-five years it was predicted to be a little heavier on the office space than retail or residential.

Mr. Nichols said the urban design section of the plan dealt with the look and feel, or the image and identity of the area was addressed. He said this was where good principles abounded and good planning practices could be implemented. He said it was about creating a sense of place through recommending appropriate places and uses for parking because parking could take over a situation and needed to be managed appropriately. It was also about developing open space, and looking at signage and visual clutter. He said it dealt with improved walkability, livability, and function through streetscape enhancements. The urban design components were critical to the overall sense of place, identity, and image.

Mr. Nichols said the last section of the plan was about implementation. He said the general policy updates were actually marching orders for the staff, the Planning Commission and the Council to use in developing action strategies. The first of these was to adopt the plan and update the General Plan. He said there would be updates, amendments, and further studies through the entire corridor. That section included specific action plans for each growth area.

Mr. Nichols said there were four appendices in the plan, the first being about the multiway boulevard strategy which had been studied throughout the first part of the process. He said the second was the LYRB economic report. The third was a brand audit and image report prepared by Blakesly Advertising. The fourth was a report on the safety impact of adding medians to the corridor, prepared by UDOT. He expressed his appreciation for all who had worked on the plan over the fourteen months.

Mayor Brunst thanked them for a job well done. He noted that, since State Street was not a City road, UDOT helped fund the study, as did Provo, UTA, and MAG, along with Orem City.

Mr. Seastrand said he had spoken with a lot of residents about the issue and there were concerns about the mass transit option down Sate Street. He understood that State Street was designated as the preferred route for a mass transit option if it were ever needed, and he asked why that was the best location.

Mr. Nicholas said MAG had recently prepared an updated regional transportation plan, and had identified a corridor for light rail along the Geneva Road corridor. He said the options had been discussed throughout the process and that the consensus was that a State Street location would provide better opportunity down the road for attracting business and growth. He said that, allowing that to be on the radar, told MAG that this was the City's vision, and MAG was there to support the cities. He said the goal of the idea was to build in flexibility for that to happen in the future.

Mr. Seastrand asked if the theory was that if development went as projected, it would be an option to alleviate traffic congestion.

Mr. Nicholas said that once density got to a point where ridership would be valuable, it would be an option under the vision of the plan.

Mr. Seastrand said there was a perception that State Street would be reduced to two lanes with mass transit, thought the drawings indicated it would stay three lanes each way. He asked for clarification.

Mr. Nicholas said they never looked to reduce capacity, only to maintain or increase capacity. He said the reported maintained all three lanes in each direction.

Mr. Seastrand asked if the planners anticipated that traffic would increase beyond what it currently was if the plan were established.

Mr. Nicholas said that the boulevard concept with its raised medians and consolidated curb cuts would decrease friction and improve the capacity and flow. He said they also recommended signals at 200 South and 600 South and a new street system between State Street and Orem Boulevard, which would help the flow and east/west connectivity.

Mr. Bench clarified that UDOT, while participating on the committee, had said that they could not reduce the number of lanes on State Street, and so they never looked at that.

Mr. Sumner said he appreciated the effort going into the plan. He said he had spoken with neighbors, a businessman and a developer, and he felt there were a lot of questions still out there, and a lot of fear of the unknown. He said it was important to communicate moving forward. He expressed concern about the demolition of some businesses, and about the City purchasing rundown areas and selling to developers. He asked if that meant condemnation. He also referenced a part that said a city could not make plans to improve the community without coming into conflict with individual property rights. He said that frightened him. He thought that also frightened a lot of people about what might come.

Mr. Nicholas said it was never intended to be a property capture plan, but was an effort to create a vision for what the city wanted the corridor to be like in the future. He explained that the plan said the City could assist strategically down the road in property acquisitions and helping private development progress in the corridor. He said it was a plan for the City to improve the safety, identity, and image, and improve economic environment so that private investment and the market could drive the show.

Mr. Sumner said he agreed with what was being said, but the vision said differently.

Mr. Davidson said that over the years the City had worked with property owners in the assemblies of properties. From time to time it was necessary for the City to acquire property in order to facilitate a road or construction of a park or other types of amenities. He said there were hundreds, if not thousands, of property owners along the State Street corridor, so part of the role that the City potentially envisioned was trying to facilitate the acquisition or the assemblage of

parcels along the corridor so that development could take place. He said the City had a particular expertise in that area because they had done it on many projects. He said the City could work with property owners along key corridors for something like a road expansion. He said the City would not necessarily be the developer but could be the facilitator of that kind of thing. None of it had ever been done under threat of condemnation, but with willing property owners who negotiated and worked with the City and developers. He said the City would be the facilitator rather than the catalyst.

Mr. Sumner asked if light rail would eliminate street parking on State Street.

Mr. Nicholas said that was the recommendation in the report.

Mr. Sumner asked what the next process would be for each node, if the plan were approved. Mr. Bench said they would look at the City Center node first and it would take several months to get that going. He said they would in no way force anyone out of business or to leave; everything would be market and developer driven. He said the City would facilitate it through the zoning process, but they anticipated a lot of citizen and business owner participation. The City could facilitate, and would anticipate more citizen participation and from property owners. He said they would not bring anything to the Council without the participation of the citizens

Mr. Sumner said that it was important to include the people within the node in the discussions, and that there be a good channel of communication. Mr. Bench said that in a recent meeting they sent out about 3,000 notices to businesses and property owners, got about 100 responses, and had about 50-60 people at the meeting. He said they would continue to do that kind of outreach. He said a lot of the planning was driven by the comments of property owners and citizens.

Mr. Andersen said one of his concerns was with brand messaging and communications plans. He said some people he had spoken to were concerned that the plan said revitalization of the five nodes would not happen organically. He then read from the plan the following:

> The curious mix we have here in Orem of laissez-faire capitalism, pioneer frugality, and conservative limited government operations have created the State Street that we have today.

He said that when he ran for office in 2011 he did a lot of polling, asking what was the ugliest thing on State Street, and everybody mentioned Midtown Village. When he told them that Orem City Council put up $7 million in bonding to help that happen, they blamed “this bunch” (indicating the Council). He said someone told him it would not have happened without the seed money to pay for the parking, that it only ended up at $4 million and it got paid off last year.

Mr. Andersen continued quoting from the plan:

> Clearly, in order to create a better solution for our families and the families that will call Orem home in the future, we’ll need a different approach.

He wanted to know what the Council was promoting instead, if State Street was a creation of capitalism, pioneer frugality, and a limited government.

Mr. Nicholas said the primary goal was to create a vision, and that had not been done before. He said it was a different approach to planning, to create vision that would guide growth rather than allowing happenstance to occur over time.

Mr. Andersen asked how that would happen, if it did not happen by private enterprise, with limited government. He asked what would be different and where the money would come from to pay for it. He also asked what percentage of businesses would be gone because of the plan.

Mr. Nicholas said he could not answer the last question, but the intent of the plan was to attract private development and have it be market driven and paid for by private enterprise.

Mr. Andersen asked if that was not subsidies, identical to University Mall—$58 million, 70 percent of it being paid for by the Alpine School District. He said that, according to the February 24th plan, that was to be driven by economic development with subsidies (referring to the use of RDAs).

Mr. Bench said CDAs were tools available for use any city in the state. He said that did not mean the City would use the tool, but it was available for use by the Council in the future. He said it was quite common.

Mr. Andersen said the plan stated that 35 percent of existing businesses would be gone. Mr. Nicholas said that was a reduction of total square footage of retail space within the five areas. He said that, with the development of a more compact, walkable development pattern, the types of retailers changed. There would no longer be big-box or mid-box retailers within those growth areas, but smaller, more boutique, higher-end businesses that would gross a higher volume per square foot. He said it would be an improvement in the quality of retail and an increase in sales tax.

Mr. Andersen said he thought that would eliminate businesses.
Mr. Bench said that would be the decision of the business owners. He said the plan did not eliminate anything and did not force anyone out of business or out of Orem. He said the plan would concentrate the opportunities for business owners within the nodes and would give them the opportunity to perhaps relocate or work within the node. It would still be up to the individual business owners to make the plan work. He said it was a long-term vision that would require the businesses to help make it work.

Mr. Andersen asked if it was IBI that came up with the list of businesses that would be limited in growth. Mr. Bench said that list had come from City staff. Mr. Andersen asked if zoning would be a part of nudging businesses out. Mr. Bench said he did not anticipate that, but it could be a part of the neighborhood meetings and could be a discussion that could come up in the future.

Mr. Andersen said at the node around University Parkway and State Street, one quarter of the node was the mall, which was done with an RDA, $58 million worth. He said if RDAs were the most common method of accomplishing that, he saw more $58 million dotting the area, running the little guys out and helping the rich get richer. He said the University Mall developers laid out what they would do if the City gave them a bunch of taxpayer money. He said those big buildings that had a 68 percent discount on their property taxes for twenty years would still want fire and police protection, and they were not paying their fair share for those services. He said he saw a repeat of that in the five nodes. He said he was concerned that the taxes for the little people would grow while the rich got richer.

Mr. Andersen then commented on the BRT and the railroads coming down. He said the County had just had a vote on the BRT and 57 percent had said no.

Mr. Bench said that vote was not for the BRT—that the BRT was already funded on the Parkway.

Mr. Andersen said that was where the money was headed, whether it was called BRT, UTA, or FrontRunner. He said they were all the same umbrella. Mr. Andersen said the 57 percent of the citizens of the County voted against giving them any more money. He asked how the City could change people's attitudes and make them want to ride the BRT when they did not even want to fund it.

Mr. Bench said the proposed plan was a long-term, minimum 25-year plan. BRT was something that could be considered in the future, according to the plan. He said that if it did not make sense to put BRT in, they would not do so. He said that if, in the future, the City chose to put in light rail, the preferred place to put it would be down State Street, since it bisects the city. He said this plan did not dictate where it should go.

Mr. Andersen said anyone should be concerned when an organization came into Orem and said problems had been created by pioneer frugality, capitalism, and conservative limited government expectations, that it was what created Orem's problems and they were going to fix it with redistribution of wealth, helping the rich get richer, and running smaller businesses out.

Mr. Bench said they were not redistributing wealth, but it was a long-term plan of how the City could develop State Street.
Mrs. Black said the bottom line was there had not been a plan on State. That was why it grew the way it did, and now they wanted to develop a plan. She did not see any hidden conspiracy in that plan.

Mr. Andersen said that, to him, there were a lot of beautiful pictures, but until he raised the question they had not discussed how it would be paid for or how it would affect property rights. It was like running for class president, and offering incentives like ice cream. He thought that would downgrade current businesses and put people out of their property rights.

Mr. Seastrand said when Brigham Young came to Salt Lake, he had a vision for the entire valley that was reflected in the great city planning there today. Mr. Seastrand said the proposed plan was looking to the future, knowing there would be issues of traffic, housing, and preservation of neighborhoods. If they went with no plan State Street would continue to be what it currently was, which most people did not like. The plan allowed people to see where things were going and what was behind the changes. He said the business owners he had spoken with could see positives coming with greater accessibility and exposure, and better traffic. He said they felt the plan gave them more options than in the past. He felt they saw a vision they could connect to, instead of more of the same. He said the real question was what the vision should look like, and that was where the discussion came in and why they brought in outside opinions from other areas which had already managed growth. He said the vision changed it from a congested area to a place that was lovely to look at, had businesses thriving, and was a great place to call home. He said this plan was not to go backwards, not to take away rights, and not to take from the poor to give to the rich. He said this was about making Orem a better place.

Mayor Brunst said that, in a recent survey, 70 percent of residents requested that something be done about State Street. He said the planners had received public input through email notices, open houses, discussions, citizen commission presentations, back to school nights, utility notices, etc., over fourteen months. He said this was a huge effort from the citizenry, the businesses, major government transportation agencies, and a qualified group of advisors. He said it would not force anybody to go anywhere, but it was a vision for the future and it was the Council's responsibility to move forward with it. He said Sate Street needed attention.

Mayor Brunst opened the public hearing.

Jim Fawcett, resident, said he was against the proposed plan totally. He said the General Plan was already in place, and it had been in place since he had moved here. He said this would be a UTOPIA the City would regret later. He said he liked having multiple outlets from shopping areas, but this talked about having public parking garages. He wanted to know who would pay for that in the nodes. He said this was an Envision Utah idea, enforced on Orem using transit-oriented developments. He said it was not Orem's idea. He went to an Economic Development Strategic Plan meeting and when they were asked where they wanted a "downtown" the people said right there, meaning the City Center. He said they were told that University Place was where they wanted it. He said they drew a long circle making downtown all the way down there. He said that this plan would tell private property owners that they had to put their buildings right up against the street. Form-based code would make businesses nonconforming and they would not be able to get loans.

Monta Rae Jeppson, resident, said she had served on a committee with the Mountainland Association and on the UTA Board of Directors. She said she was told then that Orem and Provo were just farm communities, and Orem's main street was just one long road from one end to the other. She was offended by that comment, and she showed the assistant manager of UTA the more affluent areas, and told him Orem was not a "Podunk" farming community. Since then, she said, State Street had been an embarrassment to her, knowing what others in the area thought of it. She said that, even before the Olympics, she had asked MAG why this valley could not be upgraded like Salt Lake and Ogden. She said that the design committee had taken on the task of making it look like a real downtown. She said she was on a citizen's committee and had seen it, and it would be beautiful. She was excited to see it come about, and not let Orem die. Regarding comments that things had always been one way, she said people were just used to seeing it one way. She said they did not notice what other people moving in or visiting have said. She thanked the City for moving in the direction to make the Orem beautiful. She also commented that she agreed with the wages increase for the city council and the mayor.

Sara Bateman, resident, said she moved to Orem fourteen years ago. She came out to meetings and open houses, and tried to engage in the community. She said she was excited about the State Street Master Plan and its vision. As for transportation, she said that a few years ago she had lived in Singapore and used public transit everywhere, and appreciated the efficiency of it. Last month she went to SLC for five days, taking FrontRunner and Trax, and the parking lots both were full, indicating there was a market for those services. She commented that having a planning document for the nodes would help reduce future friction with buildings like Jive. She said she disagreed with the location of that building, but having a master plan would have allow places to put those buildings where they were a more natural fit.

Brian Kelly, resident, said he had talked to a State senator about the Jive building, and she had made a point that if the citizens were not involved with the master plan, that was a grave concern to her. He said that, concerning the Jive building, people felt steamrolled and not listened to. He thought that Jive-type buildings were going to go in all over the city. He commented that he had seen some young millennials at a sushi bar who were upset that they could not share the cost of one plate. He believed that some millennials would buy homes, but all of the apartments going in would bring this type of immigrant: millennials who did not want to spend money. He said there was trouble coming down the road and Orem needed to be prepared. He said there were a lot of millennials and Generation Xers who wanted to raise their families in Orem, but would not because of all the apartments.

Melodee Andersen, resident, said she wanted to talk about pages 84 and 85 of the plan. After quoting from those pages she asked what was wrong with laissez-faire capitalism, pioneer frugality and conservative limited government that the plan called a "curious mix" which had created State Street the way it was now. She said those things had been major factors to making the country great. The statement was a direct attack on Mormon culture and pioneer heritage. She said those teachings had made Orem "Family City USA." She felt the State Street plan said that frugality was bad,; capitalism was bad; and conservative, limited government was bad. She said "our pioneers" and "our prophets" taught people to avoid debt. The plan would put excessive debt on families and destroy them. She said that money issues were the number one cause of divorce in the nation. The cost of the plan was not known. She felt that Orem citizens were being manipulated into thinking that being old fashioned was stupid and out of date. She said that, even without pages 84 and 85, the plan was declaring war on Mormon culture by putting Orem deeper in debt and by trying to turn Orem into an advanced urban environment. She was not against development, but was against subsidies and government intervention in private affairs; socialized transit; and socialized internet; etc. She said the Council was doing what Washington did when it passed Obamacare and then read it later. She said there was no guarantee that this plan would not turn around and bite the City like Midtown and UTOPIA did, if the economy took a downturn. She said that was the excuse when Midtown failed. She said the huge subsidy to mall was one example of this plan, while a third of the business space would be eliminated. She asked that the Council take a second look at the plan and the burden it would put on Orem residents; stand up for freedom, pioneer frugality, and conservative limited government; and vote down the plan.

Merlin Weekes, resident, said he wanted to recognize the importance of planning. He had travelled in other parts of the world and saw that in Japan they had an excellent transit system. What he liked about it was that it was owned by individual companies. He noted a national movement called Agenda 21, which had a goal of helping the environment by stopping automobile traffic. He said it promoted high rises and a lot of traffic by rail, cycling, walking, etc. He was troubled that there was not a plan to keep people well employed. He noted that in Los Angeles they found that people wanted to drive their cars and there was a negative impact on people where traffic was limited, particularly hitting low income employees. He said that longer transit times reduced people's ability to earn. He said automobiles needed to keep moving at a effective rate. He felt that putting rails down the middle of the street and removing parking and would heavily impact businesses. He wanted more information from a better cross section of the citizens before moving forward.

Addison Jenkins, resident of Provo, said he was a prospective college graduate and former Orem employee. He was about to graduate and needed to find somewhere to live, and the way Orem was now he would never consider living here because of mobility issues; the kind of housing; and the kind of jobs available. He referenced the language on pages 84 and 85 of the plan regarding capitalism, pioneer frugality, laissez-faire, and said that people were confused about the laissez-faire part. He said that, the way Orem was now with separated land uses, factories or certain types of businesses could not be built right next to homes, but when people were allowed to put whatever kind of business they wanted on their private property there could be problems. He said the problem was not capitalism or pioneer frugality; it was when somebody wanted to put an auto shop next to a daycare. He quoted that "Where there is no vision, the people perish" and said that this was just a plan. He said this plan would allow capitalism to do what it did best, which was to harness the values of pioneer frugality and capitalism while using principles of planning and design that allowed everybody to make the most of the land they owned. He reiterated that the plan proposal was a plan, a vision for people to refer to. He said that the amount already living here would double, and if we did not have plans in place, we would get what State looked like now.

Judith Skousen, resident, said she had been to a lot of the cities in the world and their mass transit was great, but Orem was not huge, like those cities and did not want to become huge. She wanted to know the reasoning behind the huge buildings in the city. She especially wanted to address the idea that the plan wanted to reduce the use of private vehicles by slowing traffic and eliminating convenient parking places. She said that automobiles were superior to the alternatives because they had more flexible cargo and carrying capacities; allowed direct point-to-point service; allowed self-scheduling; saved time; had far better multi-stop trip capabilities; were safer; and had a more comfortable and controllable environment. She said that limiting automobile use would punish working mothers the most. Superiority of autos also expanded worker access to jobs; improved purchasing options; lowered consumer prices; and widened social options. She noted a study that said a 10 percent reduction in travel time increased worker productivity 3 percent and increasing from 3 mph walking to 30 mph in cars created a 900 percent increase. She cited a Harvard study that said, for people who did not have a high school diploma, owning a car increased their monthly earnings by $1,100. She said cars were the only way to amass enough customers to sustain large stores.

Brayden Santo, resident, said he saw a documentary about city design as it related to public health. The documentary said that the ways cities had been designed had been making people sick. He said cities were designed for cars, not for people, with physical activity removed from people's lives. He said Orem's flawed city design had restricted opportunities for people to make healthy choices, which contributed to public health epidemics. He said that 100 years ago the spread of communicable diseases was addressed with effective city design, with running water and sewage. He noted that problems today included heart disease, diabetes and obesity. He believed the State Street Master Plan would help design Orem creatively for people and would be a public health solution for all.

Brittany Harris, resident, said she spent twenty years of her life in Orem. She loved growing up here, and she was blessed to go out and see the world and she could see the benefits of a plan like this, which provided mobility for a younger group, especially those without cars. She said some could not afford cars, but still needed jobs, and this plan provided more transit and housing opportunities. She loved that it addressed a specified area. The plan would keep close-knit

neighborhoods, as well as create places to go and be social and see a lot of people. She said citizens could interact with more people and get different perspectives. She felt it would add to what Orem already had.

John Reinhard, resident, said he lived relatively close to State Street. He felt the City needed a plan. He said he still had concerns, but having a plan was better than no plan. In relation to neighborhood preservation, he was concerned that there was no declaration for preserving areas outside of the nodes. At the Planning Commission meeting, a staff member had mentioned the intent for areas now zoned C2 to stay that way in hopes of supporting big box commercial development, but he could not find that in the plan. He wanted an appendix speaking to the non-node areas. He was concerned that a developer would come in, find cheaper land outside of the nodes, and ask the city to allow them to move outside of the node areas. He wanted to see a commitment to the node idea to keep developers in line.

Sam Lentz, resident, said there had been a candidate at the "Meet the Candidates" event joking that the way to fix the growth problem was to stop having kids. He commented that he and his wife had already broken that rule, and the growth in Orem was not artificial growth but was natural from children and grandchildren. He said that this plan did not decide that Orem would grow, but provided a framework to manage that growth. He said the plan was not a mandate for a 35 percent reduction in retail square footage, but rather it was a forecast since the retail space was declining due to online commerce and mail delivery. He said that the plan allowed Orem to grow into a modern economy that protected Family City USA. He noted that the plan did not belong to the mayor, the city council, city staff, or consultants; it was the residents' plan, and thousands of residents had participated in the process. He said he had been a part of the open houses and email surveys. He said a vote for this plan would be an acceptance of the will of the people.

Leslie Nelson, resident and member of the Traffic Advisory Commission, said she had not seen at the meetings any of the people who were speaking against the plan. She was in favor of the plan. She said she was a sixth generation descendant of Utah pioneers, and had gone to Santa Barbara recently. She said the population there was almost exactly the same as Orem, but they had implemented city planning. A major fire in Santa Barbara in 1926 had provided the opportunity to improve the city, and it was now beautiful and attracted people and money from outside of the city. She referred to UTOPIA and noted that she was on her third provider of crappy internet at her house since she did not live close to the infrastructure and because of the lies told to keep UTOPIA from growing. She said she would hate to see similar obfuscation slow down improvements to Orem. She believed the Council understood the value of long-term planning, and hoped the residents would as well. She felt the plan would provide a greater standard of living. She appreciated the work done by all the parties, and the vision that allowed opportunities for pioneer descendants as well as new people to the area.

Sharon Anderson, resident, said she agreed that planning was important but she had some concerns about the plan. She said she had spoken to people around the city, and said this was not their plan. She accepted that 79 percent said they wanted improvement in Orem, but that was like asking someone if they would rather go on a vacation to Mexico, Italy or Tahiti. In the question, the information was not given about the cost of the vacation. She felt like these kinds of pie-in-the-sky questions were what this plan was doing. She said cost was not discussed, like making a list for Santa Claus. She believed there was a great deal of illusion about the public involvement,

She said some of the community members were Planning Commission members; her Neighborhoods in Action chair did not know she was on the committee; business participants included Woodbury, Taco Bell, and seven others who did not own property on State Street. She said that more than half of the steering committee was city staff and employees. She felt the plan was not responding to the citizens. She said that IBI was a global firm found on five continents, and was not sensitive to the particular needs of Orem. She said they promoted public/private partnerships that gave privileges to certain businesses.

Mickey Cochran, resident, said he had lived in the same house for thirty-one years. He said he loved this place. He said he had been involved for fourteen months in a neighborhood planning advisory commission. He said he had not seen anybody in that room at those meetings, and they lived in his neighborhood. He said this plan was part of the Master Plan, and was only one portion of it. He said people ought to get online and read it. He said he had been intimately involved in looking at it for fourteen months. He said he had gone out of his way to look at ways to improve the city. He said there were going to be ten separate neighborhood plans, and there was a vison for that. The proposed plan was visionary, and most of people in the room would be dead before it was finished. He asked what kind of legacy they would leave their children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren. He said he was willing to talk to anyone there about what the scriptures say about the vision of the Earth. He said they were there because they wanted to keep their families and their communities growing and vibrant. He said nobody was talking about getting rid of capitalism or laissez-faire or limited government, but about preserving what made the community great. He said that was what the plan would do. He said there would be private capital. He said the people there should get involved and not just come to a meeting when the plan was completed just to complain. He said they should be part of the solution. He said the Council should vote for it. He said he knew some of the people who worked for IBI and they were some of the greatest engineers in Utah, and this was their community, too. He urged the council to vote for the plan.

Mayor Brunst closed public hearing.

Mayor Brunst said he was in favor of the plan and thought it was an excellent vision to help the City move forward. He said he would like to eliminate the first paragraph on page 84.

Mr. Seastrand said he appreciated the comments and recognized the different perspectives. He expressed appreciation for all who participated in finding a vision for the future of Orem. Regarding Mr. Fawcett's question about parking, he suggested that people look at Center Street and University Avenue in Provo. He said that was a good idea of what the nodes could be like, with office buildings, restaurants, shops, beautiful landscaping, walkability, and connectivity with the community and the world. He said the parking structures in the back of the buildings maximized the utilization of that prime land. He said no businesses were driven out, but they were converted into a thriving part of the Provo community. He said it drew people to that part of the city. He envisioned the City Center area being even better than that in terms of beauty, aesthetics, and functionality. He said the businesses would build the parking because that would make them successful.

In response to Ms. Skousen's concerns, Mr. Seastrand said he was not against cars, but realized that more cars were coming. He said the plan was to make things more effective for that increased number of cars. He said the worst thing a city could have was congestion, which would

cause cars to leave the main corridors and drive quickly through the neighborhoods. He said the idea was to make the corridors more successful and able to handle the growth. He added that mass transit a solution for those who did not have cars. He asked why FrontRunner was so effective, if cars were the only solution. He said he often rode the train and saw people stopped on the freeway. He felt mass transit offered a better experience.

Mr. Seastrand responded to Mr. Reinhard's concerns regarding the surrounding neighborhoods, saying that part of what the plan would do was focus on an area with challenges that would experience growth, and by keeping the growth in that area, it would preserve the neighborhoods. He said the plan identified where the growth would take place in order to preserve the safe, beautiful neighborhoods. He said the individual neighborhood plans would look to improve the safety, transportation, and appearance of the neighborhoods, allowing those who lived in the neighborhood could create their own vision and solution. People can look at their own area and come up with their own solutions.

Mr. Seastrand concluded that he liked many elements of the plan. He did not think it was perfect, but he knew future councils could modify and amend it based on what was actually happening. He said the plan helped give the City a shot at a positive solution.

Mrs. Black said that, the last time she ran for the council, one of her goals was to do strategic planning for the City with citizen input, and nothing would make her happier than to pass this master plan. She noted that State Street was five miles of road that needed to be taken care of and she believed the node idea would work. She said she might not be here in twenty-five years, but she would be smiling down from heaven. She was excited about the downtown area, the civic center area, etc. She was happy that the neighborhood plans would continue to happen, and that would extend to the whole city to make plans for their neighborhoods. She said that Orem had a bright, wonderful, vibrant future with this plan.

Mr. Andersen alluded to his flyer and its picture of the budget and said that, even if people didn't like it, it was straight from the City's website. He did not want to eliminate the comment on page 84 because it identified what the State Street Master Plan thought was the problem in Orem City. He said it was what had made Orem great; it was not a problem. He wanted the paragraph left in because it identified what people like him wanted to preserve, and what the City saw as wrong. He said people would not know what the City was attempting to eliminate unless it was left in. Mr. Andersen said nobody had mentioned that money would just be taken from one group to given to another group. He said that was how it was funded and that was how it was proposed and nobody wanted to talk about it. He said it would be paid for with subsidies. He said the mall was one quarter of one node, and that it was a $58 million subsidy. He said three-quarters of what was being built would not be built without a subsidy. He said subsidies created more of what should not be there. He said it was not private enterprise, it was subsidies, transferring wealth from one to another. As for parking, buses, and Frontrunner, he said 85 percent of the tickets on those systems were subsidized. He said that 85 percent of $17 dollars, left $2.50 that people paid for. He said that was not good.

Mayor Brunst said he was here forty-five years ago, and he remembered what Orem looked like before the mall, before UVU, and before the WordPerfect buildings, with drive-in theaters and such. He said that, back then, the City had a vision for five areas that could be something really special, and he had seen those things come to fruition: Macey's, WordPerfect, US Synthetic area,

University Mall, and the auto complex. He said it was interesting that by having good retail sales and those areas for jobs, property taxes had stayed low. He said people enjoyed a quality of life in Orem that few people had, including parks, arts, and recreation. He said it had been done before, and it was important to envision the future and work toward that.

Mr. Sumner said he realized it was only a plan and a vision, but he wanted to go on record that the Development Services office said they would involve property owners and businesses in this process.

Mayor Brunst **moved** to adopt the State Street Corridor Master Plan and to amend the City of Orem General Plan to include the State Street Corridor Master Plan as Appendix A, and to eliminate the first paragraph of page 84. Mr. Macdonald **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.

COMMUNICATION ITEMS

MONTHLY FINANCIAL SUMMARY – October 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.

Mr. Davidson noted that the Council had been given information regarding insurance open enrollment in their packets.

ADJOURNMENT TO A CLOSED-DOOR MEETING - Pursuant to Section 52-4-205(1)(c), Pending Litigation

Mr. Macdonald moved to adjourn to a closed-door meeting to discuss pending litigation pursuant to Utah Code Section 52-4-205(1)(c). 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. The meeting was held in room #107.

The meeting adjourned at 9:29 p.m.

CLOSED-DOOR SESSION

A closed-door session was held at 9:29 p.m. to discuss pending litigation pursuant to Utah Code Section 52-4-205(1)(c). Those in attendance were: Mayor Richard F. Brunst; Council members Hans Andersen, Margaret Black, Tom Macdonald, Mark E. Seastrand, David Spencer, and Brent Sumner; staff members Jamie Davidson, Brenn Bybee, Greg Stephens, and Jackie Lambert.

The meeting adjourned at 9:51 p.m.

Donna R. Weaver, City Recorder

Approved: January 12, 2016