

*Meet at the Aston at University Place at 3:00 p.m.*

**University Place Tour Agenda May 10, 2016**

3:00 – 3:30	Tour the Aston. Meet in the lobby at 730 East 950 South.
3:30 to 3:40	Drive to new parking lot at the north end of mall
3:40 to 3:50	View park construction
3:50 to 4:00	View interior mall improvements
4:00 to 4:30	Tour Office Building



CITY OF OREM  
CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
56 North State Street, Orem, Utah  
May 10, 2016

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

**3:00 P.M. TOUR – UNIVERSITY PLACE UPDATE & TOUR WITH WOODBURY CORPORATION**

**4:45 P.M. WORK SESSION – PUBLIC SAFETY TRAINING ROOM**

1. **DISCUSSION – CARE Award Deliberations (45 min)**

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

**PREVIEW UPCOMING AGENDA ITEMS**

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

**AGENDA REVIEW**

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

**CITY COUNCIL - NEW BUSINESS**

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

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

**CALL TO ORDER**

**INVOCATION/INSPIRATIONAL THOUGHT: By Invitation**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: By Invitation**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

5. **MINUTES of City Council Meeting – April 12, 2016**

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

**This agenda is also available on the City's Internet webpage at [orem.org](http://orem.org)**

MAYOR’S REPORT/ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL

- 6. **UPCOMING EVENTS**
- 7. **APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS**
  - Library Advisory Commission .....2 vacancies
  - Recreation Advisory Commission.....1 vacancy
- 8. **PROCLAMATION – Independents Week 2016**
- 9. **PROCLAMATION – Police Week 2016**
- 10. **REPORT – Heritage Advisory Commission**

CITY MANAGER’S APPOINTMENTS

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

PERSONAL APPEARANCES – 15 MINUTES

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

CONSENT ITEMS

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

SCHEDULED ITEMS

- 6:00 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING – CDBG Awards 2016-2017**
- 14. **RESOLUTION – Receive Public Comment and adopt the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Projected Use of Funds for Fiscal Year 2016-2017**

*PRESENTER: Steven Downs*

POTENTIALLY AFFECTED AREA: Citywide

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

Tonight’s public hearing is the first of two opportunities for public comment on the recommendations before the City Council officially adopts the Final Statement of Projected Uses of Funds for Orem’s 2016-2017 Community Development Block Grant. Following a second public hearing that is scheduled for May 10, 2016, at 6:00 p.m., the City Council will adopt a resolution approving the CDBG Final Statement of Projected Uses of Funds for 2016-2017.

Please see the allocation recommendations below:

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

Family Support & Treatment .....	\$11,000
Project Read .....	\$3,000
PERC .....	\$2,000
Center for Women & Children in Crisis .....	\$8,295
Community Actions Services .....	\$16,000
Mountainland Community Health .....	\$4,500
Literacy Resources .....	\$2,000
RAH .....	\$7,000
Friends of the Children's Justice Center .....	\$12,000
Friends of the Food and Care Coalition .....	\$7,000
Utah County 4-H .....	\$1,000
Community Health Connect .....	\$4,000
Kids on the Move .....	\$5,000
People Helping People .....	\$4,500
Experience Children's Museum .....	\$0
Rocky Mountain University of Health Professionals .....	\$4,000

Other

Habitat for Humanity .....	\$229,341*
Code Enforcement .....	\$130,000
Infrastructure .....	\$150,000
Administration .....	\$103,000
Section 108 Loan Repayment .....	\$105,000

*\* Subject to change based on end of year balance in current housing rehabilitation funding*

RECOMMENDATION: The Assistant to the City Manager recommends the City Council hold the second of two public hearings to receive public comment on the projected uses of funds for the 2016-2017 Community Development Block Grant and adopt the recommendation of the CDBG Citizen Advisory Commission.

**15. RESOLUTION – Adopting the City of Orem Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Tentative Budget**

*PRESENTER: Richard Manning and Brandon Nelson*

POTENTIALLY AFFECTED AREA: Citywide

BACKGROUND: On May 10, 2016, the City Council received a draft copy of the proposed Tentative Budget in preparation for this meeting. Prior to being presented with a draft copy of the budget, the City Council and staff have met in a series of public meetings to discuss guiding principles of this and future budgets, reviewed each of the Enterprise Funds and the General Fund, and the recommended adjustments to the City's Fees and Charges.

This budget does not contain any request to increase the property tax rate. Proposed fee changes will be reviewed in the budget presentation.

The Tentative Budget is available for review and to download at Orem.org.

RECOMMENDATION: The City Manager recommends the City Council, by resolution, adopt the Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Tentative Budget and set a public hearing to adopt the final budget on June 10, 2016, at 6:00 p.m.

COMMUNICATION ITEMS

- 16. There are no Communication Items.**

CITY MANAGER INFORMATION ITEMS

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

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

# DRAFT

CITY OF OREM  
CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
56 North State Street Orem, Utah  
April 12, 2016

## 2:00 P.M. WORK SESSION – PUBLIC SAFETY TRAINING ROOM

CONDUCTING

Mayor Richard F. Brunst

ELECTED OFFICIALS

Councilmembers Debby Lauret, Sam Lentz, Tom Macdonald, Mark Seastrand, and Brent Sumner

APPOINTED STAFF

Jamie Davidson, City Manager; Brenn Bybee, Assistant City Manager; Greg Stephens, City Attorney; Karl Hirst, Recreation Department Manager; Richard Manning, Administrative Services Director; Bill Bell, Development Services Director; Chris Tschirki, Public Works Director; Scott Gurney, Fire Department Director; Ned Jackson, Police Department Captain; Charlene Crozier, Library Director; Sam Kelly, City Engineer; Jason Bench, Planning Division Manager; Neal Winterton, Water Division Manager; Reed Price, Maintenance Division Manager; Ryan Clark, Economic Development Division Manager; Steven Downs, Assistant to the City Manager; and Jackie Lambert, Deputy City Recorder

EXCUSED

David Spencer

### DISCUSSION – Draft Utility Master Plan

Mr. Winterton gave a presentation on the Draft Utility Master Plan. He said the Master Plan and User Rate Study would come before the Council for consideration at the April 26, 2016, City Council meeting. He shared a graphic that illustrated the water utility in a city, and said utilities like water were taken for granted. He said the key points to a water utility system were water sources/rights, conveyance, storage, and distribution. Orem's water sources were wells, springs, and surface water. The surface water was stored in the Jordanelle Reservoir through the Central Utah Water Conservancy District (CUWCD). He said there were approximately 354 miles of pipe to convey the water throughout the city, as well as to the treatment plant, and every street had a distribution line in it.

Mr. Lentz asked about the process of providing water to Vineyard. Mr. Winterton said that Orem provided water to Vineyard wholesale, so any increases to Orem's water fees would see an increase to Vineyard as well. He said that if Vineyard needed a system upgrade Vineyard would pay for their upgrades entirely.

# DRAFT

1 Mr. Sumner asked if Vineyard had a per door connection fee for sewer like Orem did. Mr.  
2 Winterton said they did charge per door for sewer in Vineyard, but water was charged  
3 differently.

4  
5 Mr. Winterton said the issue of water infrastructure and meeting the needs of the city had been  
6 ongoing for many decades. He shared rate increases through the years and the equivalent  
7 amounts in today's dollars. He said people expected water to be clean, reliable, abundant, and  
8 responsibly managed. Orem had never had a water violation, and staff worked hard to ensure  
9 these expectations were met. He said one hot topic in water circles was conservation and  
10 sustainability. Utah's Governor Gary Herbert had set goals for water conservation efforts, and  
11 some legislation would change the way the water utility would be regulated throughout the state.  
12 The Master Plan identified 5 main areas of focus in the first 5 years:

- 13 • 10 million gallon water tank
- 14 • 2" and 4" undersized lines replacement
- 15 • Water reuse
- 16 • 2 new wells
- 17 • AMI – new meters/new meter transmitters

18  
19 Mr. Seastrand asked about developers needing to buy water shares when developing land. Mr.  
20 Winterton said most communities did that but in Orem they paid into a water right.

21  
22 Mr. Stephens clarified that there was a constitutional prohibition on the transferring of water  
23 rights. Orem had a Metropolitan Water District to allow for better flexibility which helped with  
24 community planning. Mr. Davidson said many cities used a similar system for the same reasons.

25  
26 Mr. Winterton shared graphs depicting percentages of water distribution pipes' lengths and  
27 diameters, seasonal demand for indoor and outdoor water use, and projected annual production  
28 requirements with and without conservation. He shared several maps showing existing pressure  
29 conditions in water lines during static and peak hours, future pipe projects, fire flow projects,  
30 build out with no projects and build out with projects. He said leaving conditions as they were  
31 would lead to several areas of low pressure. He said Orem was lucky in that gravity created a fair  
32 amount of the water pressure throughout the city. Mr. Winterton said some of the projects would  
33 address fire flow issues, mostly areas with 2" and 4" pipes that had insufficient capacity. He said  
34 they had planned carefully to address needs through the coming years.

35  
36 Mr. Winterton said the issue of building a 10 million gallon storage tank was pressing, as they  
37 would soon be in violation of drinking water system requirements. He said in years past  
38 operators would watch the tanks 24/7 to ensure they never emptied to dangerous levels, and so  
39 they had periodically made upgrades. Currently Orem borrowed storage capacity from CUWCD  
40 but that option was not going to be available much longer. The additional storage capacity was  
41 important not only to serve day-to-day needs but in case of a fire. He said the consequences of  
42 not building the tank were serious.

43  
44 Mr. Winterton said water reuse could be used for the entire city, and not only for the sports park  
45 and golf course near the treatment plant. They hoped to either construct an additional pipe or  
46 enlarge the existing distribution line for that purpose. He said Automated Metering Infrastructure  
47 (AMI) had been a hot button issue recently, but said the benefits of using AMI to read water

# DRAFT

1 usage were great. It helped the city get more accurate readings of usage and pressure, which  
2 could identify leaks and other issues, but also helped consumers be more aware of their usage.  
3 When consumers were aware of how much water they were using, they could adjust for cost and  
4 conservation. AMI was a tool for data collection to have more accurate readings in specific areas  
5 to help refine planning of projects. If AMI were approved in future, it would be an incremental  
6 rollout over a reasonable time period. The whole AMI system would cost approximately \$8  
7 million over the rollout period, but would garner much more in savings over the lifetime of the  
8 infrastructure.

9  
10 Mayor Brunst asked about legislation passed in the 2016 legislative session regarding water rate  
11 structures. Mr. Winterton said Senate Bill 28 (SB28) was passed requiring retail water providers  
12 to establish an increasing rate structure for culinary water and provide certain information to  
13 customers.

14  
15 Mr. Davidson said the effective date given at the legislature was May 10, 2016. He anticipated  
16 this would be the first of several bills in a multi-step plan to get everyone on the same page,  
17 whether they wanted that or not. He said tiered structure billing was a complicated system, and  
18 often confusing for customers. Mr. Winterton added that AMI alerts could help consumers  
19 control their usage and understand the tier structure better.

20  
21 Mr. Macdonald asked about summer rates versus winter rates. Mr. Winterton said Orem did not  
22 currently charge a summer rate and winter rate, but were moving toward that per changing state  
23 requirements. The current rate for indoor water use was \$0.58/1,000 gallons and meters were  
24 read from April to October.

25  
26 Mr. Lentz said water usage was higher in summer months than in winter months, so it made  
27 sense to have summer and winter rates. He said the current system incentivized conservation in  
28 winter months when conservation was more needed in summer months.

29  
30 Mr. Seastrand said years ago the Council had discussed a 20 million gallon tank to meet storage  
31 needs and that it would serve the system for a long time. He asked if additional water usage was  
32 feeding the need for the 10 million gallon storage tank. He said he was concerned about the cost  
33 of the 10 million gallon tank and wondered if conservation efforts might curb the need for it.

34  
35 Mr. Davidson said it was not necessarily additional water being used, but the storage of the  
36 water. Orem could no longer borrow storage space from CUWCD, and this was also a public  
37 health and safety issue. He said in order to save you first needed to spend, so putting up capital  
38 costs now for conservation, storage, distribution, reuse, etc. would see savings down the road.

39  
40 Mr. Winterton said Orem had between 2- and 3-million gallons in storage with CUWCD at any  
41 given time, but that option was going away and they needed additional storage to meet  
42 requirements from the State. He said conservation strategies could only go so far, and the  
43 population would continue to grow. They could conserve and reduce usage per capita, but the  
44 storage tank would also help address issues of distribution throughout the city. He said the  
45 Master Plan would outline capital projects in the next five years that would optimize the next  
46 fifteen years.

1 Mr. Seastrand asked if the Geneva Road area was a location they were considering for reuse  
2 programs. Mr. Davidson said that was most feasible, as the area had not been built out yet.

3  
4 Mr. Winterton reviewed the 5-, 7-, 10-year and bonding rate scenarios. He said they were  
5 looking at an increase of about \$2.80 average over ten years. He showed comparisons of water  
6 rates in surrounding and similarly sized municipalities in Utah, where Orem was the lowest. He  
7 said even with the proposed increases Orem would stay in the lower half – lower than Lindon  
8 and Spanish Fork. He said following the plan was critical in moving forward to meet the needs of  
9 residents, comply with State regulations and requirements, and maintain a clean and reliable  
10 water system. He said they hoped to bring the plan forward for adoption at the April 26, 2016  
11 City Council meeting.

12  
13 UPDATE – Envision Utah – “Your Utah, Your Future” Survey Results

14 Robert Grow, CEO of Envision Utah, presented results from the “Your Utah, Your Future”  
15 survey that was given statewide. He said conversations about water and other utilities,  
16 infrastructure and growth were taking place in every city in Utah. He said Utah’s current  
17 population was 3 million and by 2050 the population would grow to 5.4 million. The challenges  
18 with that kind of growth would be keeping life along the Wasatch Front convenient, affordable,  
19 and enjoyable for families. Utahns wanted to keep their children and grandchildren close, and  
20 build strong communities. He said Utah Valley was an important area with two universities and  
21 lots of growth opportunities for businesses. Mr. Grow said the survey asked respondents about  
22 eleven issues that would affect the future of Utah. 400 Utah experts were brought together to  
23 develop choices for 2050 and 52,845 Utahns responded to the survey to help get a better  
24 understanding of what Utahns want for the future.

25  
26 Mr. Grow said the four cornerstone growth scenarios were: A network of quality communities;  
27 homes, buildings, landscaping, and vehicles of the future; a thriving rural Utah; and future  
28 preparation through education. He said Utahns were never going to lose their love of single-  
29 family homes, but affordability would force some to look at townhomes, condos and apartments.  
30 The organization of centers was also a factor in how many trips a household made in a day for  
31 daily services which would play into costs for infrastructure. He said four out of five respondents  
32 said they wanted more walkable communities designed for walking, biking, transit systems and  
33 shorter/fewer car trips. Walkable communities would have lower taxes, more convenience and  
34 healthier residents. He said the simplest way to make housing more affordable was to give up a  
35 vehicle and walk or use transit options instead.

36  
37 Mr. Grow said people wanted organized and planned urban space with amenities because it was  
38 more convenient to get around without a car, it limited congestion, and it limited the space that  
39 would be dedicated for homes and business. He said there had been a seismic shift in people’s  
40 attitudes toward having smaller lots for homes and more land for agriculture and farming. There  
41 was a tremendous resurgence in those interests, and a more compact urban form helped with that.  
42 He said Orem had the most dynamic urban center in the valley with the four freeway  
43 interchanges. He said the reason Orem had four freeway interchanges was because of the Geneva  
44 Steel Mill, and that infrastructure put Orem in a unique position to be a dominant urban center.  
45 There were many simple things that could be done to keep trips down and make an area more  
46 walkable. He saw many cities revitalizing historic downtown centers for this reason, and said

# DRAFT

1 there was great opportunity along Orem’s State Street. He commented that Orem was ahead of  
2 the curve with the recent State Street Master Plan in considering the future growth of the city.

3  
4 Mr. Grow said many of Orem’s opportunities for growth and revitalization would be in older  
5 commercial areas. With internet sales ever rising, brick and mortar stores were trending smaller  
6 and smaller, which was something to consider from a tax revenue standpoint. Light rail was  
7 something to consider into the future as well, allowing growth to accommodate future transit  
8 systems. Mayor Brunst added that the future bus rapid transit line in Provo would run along the  
9 Plumtree retail center, which would be redone to accommodate the line.

10  
11 Mr. Grow said high-density housing and transit systems had been topics of much discussion. He  
12 said people worried about things they perceived as threats to the value of their homes which was  
13 their great investment. He had discussions with people complaining about “riff raff” living in  
14 high-density housing, and he pointed out that most of the “riff raff” living in those complexes  
15 were their children or their neighbor’s children, or they might be retirees looking for smaller,  
16 more affordable housing to live out their lives. Apartment dwellers were not drastically different  
17 from single-family home dwellers, just ten or so years younger. People in all walks of life needed  
18 somewhere decent to live. He commented that the LDS church hoped neighborhoods would be  
19 multi-age to sustain the church buildings long-term.

20  
21 Mr. Seastrand asked about working with UVU to accommodate both the growth of the university  
22 and the city. Mr. Grow said he had recently worked with Rexburg on this issue, and he suggested  
23 having city and UVU administrators meet regularly and coordinate joint planning. He said Orem  
24 would continue to see growth because of its location and amenities, but market forces would play  
25 their part as well.

26  
27 *\*\*The Council took a break at 3:50 p.m.*

28  
29 *\*\*The meeting resumed at 3:57 p.m.*

## 30 BUDGET DISCUSSION/PREVIEW – Enterprise Funds

31  
32 Mr. Manning turned the time over to Mr. Tschirki and Mr. Bybee to present information about  
33 city enterprise funds. He introduced six enterprise funds and their corresponding fund numbers:

- 34 • B&C Road Fund (20)
- 35 • Water Fund (51)
- 36 • Water Reclamation Fund (52)
- 37 • Storm Water Fund (55)
- 38 • Street Light Fund (58)
- 39 • Solid Waste Fund (57)

40  
41 Mr. Tschirki said these funds were different from other funds in the city because they supported  
42 100 percent of operations. He spoke to the B&C Road Fund and showed annual revenues from  
43 2003 to present. He said some road fund projects would be crack and slurry sealing which was  
44 done on an 8-year rotation with a year offset. Micro-surfacing would be done in key areas, as  
45 well as street overlay. He said they did not want to get to a point where a road showed significant  
46 failure. He said every year main city roads were restriped with smaller, local roads being  
47 restriped every other year.

# DRAFT

1 Mr. Davidson said one source of frustration for the city was when significant roads were not  
2 recognized as regionally significant and therefore did not qualify for MAG funding. 1200 West  
3 was one such road, and they hoped long-term to convince MAG that 1200 West was deserving of  
4 funding for reconstruction projects.

5  
6 Mr. Lentz asked about funding to expand 1200 West into a three-lane street. Mr. Davidson said  
7 the money currently allocated for projects on 1200 West was for maintenance, and expanding the  
8 road was something they hoped to do with MAG funding. Mr. Tschirki added that there was  
9 some funding saved specifically for improvements on that road.

10  
11 Mr. Tschirki reviewed Water Fund revenues, and water, distribution, and supply expenses. He  
12 said water treatment expenses were not directly tied to the Jordanelle payment, and this was the  
13 last year they were recommending an increase to cover that payment. That said, they fully  
14 expected treatment expenses to increase for costs of chemicals, improvements to the facility,  
15 human resource costs, power costs, etc. He said they were careful about replacement of  
16 equipment because of the expense, so they made sure equipment and vehicles were properly  
17 serviced and had met their useful lives. Mr. Tschirki said there were miscellaneous water fund  
18 projects including 2” and 4” water main replacements for undersized and aging pipes. He said  
19 they had saved around \$4 million over the course of recent years to address water reclamation  
20 needs.

21  
22 Mr. Tschirki reviewed Water Reclamation collection and treatment expenses, and proposed  
23 allocations for unplanned projects and repairs. There was a 4” lateral project for the cemetery to  
24 be completed within the year, as well as a project for the Carterville forcemain. The Carterville  
25 forcemain was to pump back up from a low spot to a higher spot and on to the treatment plan. He  
26 said hydrogen sulfide gas was a concern with pipes, and they would do a condition assessment  
27 this year; they also planned to conduct an odor-control study. Mr. Tschirki reviewed the Storm  
28 Water Fund projects including pipe installation upgrading from 12” to an 18” line near UVU to  
29 increase capacity.

30  
31 *\*\*Mr. Spencer arrived at 4:23 p.m.*

32  
33 Mr. Tschirki reviewed the Street Light Fund revenues and expenses. He said \$600,000 came into  
34 this fund from franchise tax revenues. He said the bond from 2001 would be paid off in  
35 December 2018. He said Rocky Mountain Power had a proposal for the City to consider  
36 purchasing 405 lights in the community that were currently owned by Rocky Mountain Power.  
37 He said it cost approximately \$58,000 a year to pay for the maintenance for 405 lights, so the  
38 City would save those costs for maintenance and would only have to pay for the power.

39  
40 Mr. Lentz asked if the lights were LED lights, and if they were not he asked if they could be  
41 replaced to garner even more savings. Mr. Tschirki said they were not LED but could be  
42 replaced if the City were to buy and save up for that. He said if the City purchased the 405 lights  
43 then Orem would own every street light on public land.

44  
45 Mrs. Lauret asked if there was a plan for reinvestment. Mr. Tschirki said that would be a  
46 discussion in the future.

# DRAFT

1 Mr. Sumner asked about the current Questar gas line project that was affecting Orem roads, and  
2 how that played into the schedule for road maintenance. Mr. Kelly said Questar would be  
3 responsible for repairing roads to their original state using trench patches and the like. Mr.  
4 Seastrand asked about outside projects tearing up new or recently redone roads. Mr. Tschirki said  
5 they aggressively charged for road cuts when a road was new to help offset those costs.

6  
7 Mr. Bybee reviewed the Solid Waste Fund, which was with the North Pointe Special Service  
8 District. He said when the Waste Management contract was renewed CPI and tipping increases  
9 were considered. For the upcoming budget year they anticipated the fund holding steady and  
10 seeing an increase of \$0.10-\$0.15 next year to cover costs at the transfer station. He said they had  
11 doubled the number of recycling cans throughout the city since 2011, and savings from the  
12 recycling program generally increased from year to year.

13  
14 Mr. Macdonald asked about the percentage of homes that used the recycling program. Mr.  
15 Davidson said about 60 to 65 percent of single-family homes did, and multi-family units were  
16 contracted separately though he believed many had recycling requirements for garbage and green  
17 waste.

18  
19 Mr. Bybee said the supply of green waste was increasing faster than the demand for the fertilizer  
20 it made. Excess green waste was compressed to a fraction of the size and then taken to the  
21 landfill.

22  
23 Mr. Lentz asked about the data for savings from compression. Mr. Bybee said it made for  
24 cheaper transportations costs. Mr. Davidson added that it was cheaper for a customer to get a  
25 green waste can than a second garbage can.

## 26 27 UPDATE – Provo/Orem TRIP Interlocal Agreement & Landscaping

28 Mr. Goodrich introduced the Provo/Orem TRIP (Transportation Improvement Project) Interlocal  
29 Agreement and Lease Agreement with UTA. He said they had considered some of the concerns  
30 that arose when they initially presented the landscaping plan along University Parkway, like  
31 saving parking spaces in critical areas, and made some changes to the scroll plot.

32  
33 Mr. Davidson said this had been a long-time effort with regular meetings on the subject. He said  
34 City Council had passed a resolution (R-2008-0021) with certain requirements for a bus rapid  
35 transit (BRT) system. They had been meeting with UTA for months to work through those  
36 qualifications and felt they were at a point where concerns had been resolved or identified for  
37 completion within construction of the project. He said they felt they had protected the interests of  
38 the city and wanted to bring the agreements to the Council for consideration on April 26, 2016.

39  
40 Mr. Goodrich said the project was shovel-ready and they hoped the plans presented to the  
41 Council met their requirements. He said the project was much more than adding a BRT  
42 component but also included improvements for roads and intersections. He said they were  
43 planning along major corridors to make sure they were not taking away transit opportunities in  
44 the future. There would need to be some improvements at the roundabout near UVU to allow for  
45 growth, as UVU was projected to grow by approximately 15,000 students in the coming years.  
46 He said they had submitted a federal funding request through MAG, and would use some  
47 funding to complete an environmental analysis.

# DRAFT

1 Mayor Brunst asked if getting the MAG funding would be a problem. Mr. Goodrich said his  
2 understanding was that the Provo/Orem TRIP was ranked high on MAG's prioritization  
3 schedule.

4  
5 Mr. Goodrich discussed some of the proposed changes to regain some of the parking spaces lost  
6 in previous versions of the plan. One change was to eliminate certain left turn opportunities  
7 along University Parkway to reconfigure parking lots and reclaim some of the lost parking  
8 spaces. They would also make some changes for safety reasons, and to improve flow through the  
9 intersections. They would work with property and business owners in the area to make sure the  
10 configuration worked for all parties. He said if they were able to find savings through  
11 engineering or design they would do so.

12  
13 Mr. Earl said there were certain items that were not practical to list in the lease agreement, but  
14 they would plan for 15 percent contingency. The interlocal agreement was to put in place a  
15 mechanism for resolving issues that could not be dealt with in the lease agreement. It would  
16 establish an executive committee with UDOT, Orem, Provo, MAG, UTA, and Utah County to  
17 allow stakeholders to have a greater voice in making decisions. This committee would primarily  
18 deal with big issues like how contingency money would be spent. He said an executive  
19 committee had been functioning informally for months, and functioning well, but it was time to  
20 create a more formal committee.

21  
22 Mr. Davidson said this was a way for Orem to have significant input in how this project would  
23 proceed and be involved in key decisions to ensure that the project was successful. One of those  
24 key decisions was which type of bus to use along the proposed route: clean diesel or hybrid (half  
25 electric/half diesel). He said the hybrid had advantages over the clean diesel, but those had  
26 higher costs. A hybrid bus would cost approximately \$760,000-\$1 million each, but were faster  
27 and had more power to climb some of the steeper hills and required less fuel. He said Provo's  
28 Council had generally been leaning toward the hybrid bus option, and asked for the Council's  
29 opinion.

30  
31 Mr. Sumner asked if other cities were using hybrid buses. Grey Turner with UTA said hybrid  
32 busses were used on some local routes. He said this was not a new technology.

33  
34 Mayor Brunst thought there would be a benefit in using hybrid buses, as they had greater speed  
35 and power. There was also the public perception of using clean fuel technology.

36  
37 Mr. Lentz asked about operational cost difference between clean diesel and hybrid buses. Mr.  
38 Turner said it benefitted the entire project to have buses that could accelerate out of the stations  
39 faster. He said the functionality of day to day operations and fuel costs would be lower with a  
40 hybrid bus.

41  
42 The general consensus of the Council was a preference for the hybrid bus option, though Mr.  
43 Macdonald said he would like to know the cost of the hybrid over the lifetime of the bus.

44  
45 Mr. Turner said he would get that information to the Council. He said they would not suggest  
46 investing in buses that would be too costly over their lifetime. He said if the hybrid option was  
47 the decision of the stakeholders they needed to order the buses as soon as possible. Some

# DRAFT

1 agencies were waiting up to 9 months for vehicles after ordering, so they needed to think  
2 strategically about the timeline.

3  
4 The question was asked about contractors for the project. Mr. Turner said the contractors were  
5 Kiewit and W. W. Clyde. Mr. Turner asked Public Involvement Manager Chris McBride to  
6 address the Council.

7  
8 Mr. McBride said he wanted to address five things: key milestones, public feedback,  
9 commitment to the public, the project schedule and timeline, and the public relations plan. For  
10 key milestones, Mr. McBride said the design phase was 90 percent complete, with construction  
11 set to begin Summer 2018. Testing and start up would be Winter 2018, and the goal was for the  
12 system to be operational by Spring 2019. He said he had spoken with about 250 businesses and  
13 residents along the alignment for the project, and while he heard concerns about how  
14 construction would proceed and how it would affect people's homes he also heard lots of  
15 positive feedback about the project. The majority of respondents to a telephone survey believed  
16 that the project would provide transportation for students and people without cars, it would  
17 increase transportation choices for local residents, provide reliable transit to support a younger  
18 and growing population, and that it would take cars off the roads and help reduce traffic  
19 congestion. Mr. McBride said the commitment to the public was to follow the "rules of the  
20 road", which were to:

- 21 • Maintain existing traffic lanes
- 22 • Ensure safe and efficient access
- 23 • Minimize impacts
- 24 • Develop mutually-beneficial solutions

25  
26 Mr. McBride shared a map graphic of the planned construction phasing. He said the construction  
27 phasing was subject to change and dates were subject to change, but they intended to minimize  
28 impacts on the public and keep traffic flowing by maintaining the same number of lanes in  
29 operation. He said the communications plan identified four audiences: local elected officials and  
30 staff, businesses, Orem and Provo residents, and the media. He said they wanted to be proactive  
31 with the media and with residents to give them the tools to manage during construction and help  
32 them have a clear vision of the project and its progress.

## 33 34 **5:00 P.M. STUDY SESSION – PUBLIC SAFETY TRAINING ROOM**

35  
36 CONDUCTING

Mayor Richard F. Brunst

37  
38 ELECTED OFFICIALS

Councilmembers Debby Lauret, Sam Lentz, Tom  
39 Macdonald, Mark Seastrand, David Spencer, and Brent  
40 Sumner

41  
42 APPOINTED STAFF

Jamie Davidson, City Manager; Brenn Bybee, Assistant  
43 City Manager; Greg Stephens, City Attorney; Richard  
44 Manning, Administrative Services Director; Bill Bell,  
45 Development Services Director; Karl Hirst, Recreation  
46 Department Director; Chris Tschirki, Public Works  
47 Director; Scott Gurney, Fire Department Director; Ned

# DRAFT

Jackson, Police Department Captain; Charlene Crozier, Library Director; Steve Earl, Deputy City Attorney; Jason Bench, Planning Division Manager; Sam Kelly, City Engineer; Neal Winterton, Water Division Manager; Reed Price, Maintenance Division Manager; Ryan Clark, Economic Development Division Manager; Steven Downs, Assistant to the City Manager; and Jackie Lambert, Deputy City Recorder

## Preview Upcoming Agenda Items

Staff presented a preview of upcoming agenda items.

## Agenda Review

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

## City Council New Business

There was no City Council new business.

The Council adjourned 5:52 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 Debby Lauret, Sam Lentz, Tom Macdonald, Mark Seastrand, David Spencer, and Brent Sumner

### APPOINTED STAFF

Jamie Davidson, City Manager; Greg Stephens, City Attorney; Richard Manning, Administrative Services Director; Bill Bell, Development Services Director; Karl Hirst, Recreation Director; Chris Tschirki, Public Works Director; Scott Gurney, Fire Department Director; Ned Jackson, Police Department Captain; Charlene Crozier, Library Director; Jason Bench, Planning Division Manager; Ernesto Lazalde, IT Division Manager; Josh Story, City Arborist; Steven Downs, Assistant to the City Manager; Pete Wolfley, Communications Specialist; and Jackie Lambert, Deputy City Recorder

### INVOCATION /

### INSPIRATIONAL THOUGHT

Ernesto Lazalde

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Greg Stephens

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no minutes ready for approval.

# DRAFT

## 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

Mayor Brunst **moved** to appoint Carole P. Miller to the Arts Council. Mrs. Lauret **seconded** the motion. Those voting aye: Richard F. Brunst, Debby Lauret, Sam Lentz, Tom Macdonald, Mark Seastrand, David Spencer, Brent Sumner. The motion **passed unanimously**.

### PROCLAMATION – Arbor Day 2016

Mayor Brunst read the proclamation naming April 29, 2016, Arbor Day in the City of Orem. He said this was the 23<sup>rd</sup> consecutive year that Orem was recognized as a Tree City USA.

Mr. Seastrand **moved** to accept the proclamation. Mr. Sumner **seconded** the motion.

Josh Story, Orem City Arborist, said it was an honor to be recognized for the 23<sup>rd</sup> consecutive year. He said the designation of Tree City USA was not necessarily prestigious, but required an impressive amount of work to maintain and he was proud to have Orem be recognized.

Mr. Seastrand asked Mr. Story about Orem's trees. Mr. Story said Orem had approximately 6,400 trees that were cared for by him and two seasonal employees. Mr. Davidson showcased the flag Orem received from the Arbor Day Foundation.

Mayor Brunst called for a vote. Those voting aye: Richard F. Brunst, Debby Lauret, Sam Lentz, Tom Macdonald, Mark Seastrand, David Spencer, Brent Sumner. The motion **passed unanimously**.

## 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.

There were no Personal Appearances.

## CONSENT ITEMS

There were no Consent Items.

1 **SCHEDULED ITEMS**

2  
3 6:10 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING – R5 LDR to MDR – 1750 South 50 East  
4 RESOLUTION – Amending the General Plan land use map on property at 1750 South 50  
5 East in the R5 zone from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential  
6

7 Mr. Bench presented Philroy Brown’s request that the City Council amend the General Plan land  
8 use map on property at 1750 South 50 East in the R5 zone from Low Density Residential to  
9 Medium Density Residential.

10  
11 The applicant owned a home in the R5 zone and desired to have an accessory apartment.  
12 However, the R5 zone did not allow accessory apartments. He therefore proposed to amend the  
13 General Plan land use map for his property from Low Density Residential to Medium Density  
14 Residential (MDR). This would open the door for the applicant to request a rezone of his  
15 property from the R5 zone to the R6 zone where accessory apartments were allowed.

16  
17 The General Plan land use designation on the property was currently Low Density Residential  
18 (LDR). The LDR classification generally supported the R8, R12, and R20 zones. The MDR  
19 designation, which the applicant would like to apply to his property, generally supported the R6,  
20 R6.5 and R7.5 zones. The nearest MDR land use designation was approximately two blocks (825  
21 feet) to the north of the subject property.

22  
23 The General Plan was a guide for future growth and development. Although the General Plan  
24 was advisory and not mandatory, it was generally good planning practice for zoning to be  
25 consistent with the General Plan.

26  
27 The applicant rezoned his property several years ago to the R5 zone in order to have the reduced  
28 setbacks of the R5 zone. The R5 zone required side setbacks of at least five feet with both side  
29 setbacks adding up to at least 15 feet. In contrast, the R6 zone, to which the applicant would like  
30 to rezone his property, required a minimum side setback of six feet with both side setbacks  
31 adding up to 16 feet.

32  
33 The building permit for the applicant’s home showed a side setback of five feet on the north side  
34 and so if the applicant was successful in getting the General Plan change and a future rezone to  
35 R6, he would need to work with his neighbor to acquire extra property to meet the R6 setback  
36 requirements. In anticipation of this, the applicant had prepared a new subdivision plat that  
37 showed how his lot would meet all the requirements of the R6 zone.

38  
39 Staff held a neighborhood meeting regarding this application on August 13, 2015. There were no  
40 objections to the applicant’s proposal.

41  
42 The Planning Commission recommended that the City Council amend the General Plan land use  
43 map on property at 1750 South 50 East in the R5 zone from Low Density Residential to Medium  
44 Density Residential. Staff supported the recommendation of the Planning Commission.

45  
46 Mr. Bench said the Council zoned this land as R5 in 2000 to accommodate an existing structure  
47 on the property. It was zoned R5 with the stipulation that only four lots be allowed at that time.

# DRAFT

1 Some years later two lots were zoned back to R8, and two remained R5. The concern was that  
2 the R5 zone, at 5,000 square feet, was not big enough to allow for an accessory apartment. Mr.  
3 Brown was trying to bring his accessory apartment into compliance and so requested a rezone of  
4 the property to an R6 zone. There was a setback standard that needed to be met in the R6 zone,  
5 and Mr. Brown intended to coordinate with his neighboring property owner – his daughter – to  
6 accommodate the setback standard.

7  
8 Mayor Brunst asked about the accessory apartment on the property. Mr. Brown said it was  
9 originally a mother-in-law style accessory apartment that housed his aging parents. His parents  
10 had both now passed and he hoped to rent the apartment to a non-family member.

11  
12 Mr. Seastrand asked if the area had adequate parking to support the accessory apartment. Mr.  
13 Bench said the parking was adequate and requirements were met. He clarified that the apartment  
14 had not been out of compliance in its original use for his parents but needed to be adjusted for  
15 rental to a non-family member.

16  
17 Mr. Sumner asked about the neighbors' feedback. Mr. Brown said they had sent out a few  
18 notices but had not heard much from any neighbors. He said one neighbor expressed concern  
19 about the land being used for a high-rise apartment building but Mr. Brown assured them that he  
20 was simply fixing his mother-in-law apartment. Mr. Brown clarified for the Council that he was  
21 unaware that he was not meeting certain requirements and was doing what was necessary to be  
22 compliant with this property.

23  
24 Mr. Seastrand asked about the size of the lot. He asked if a zone change created a problem for  
25 that area. Mr. Bench showed the area map and said it was approximately 6,000 square feet. He  
26 said it was not a problem, and had met previous requirements.

27  
28 Mayor Brunst asked about the property that would be acquired to meet setback standards. Mr.  
29 Bench said the other property owner was Mr. Brown's daughter and he was confident they could  
30 work to solve the issue.

31  
32 Mr. Lentz asked what the next steps were for Mr. Brown. Mr. Bench said there were other fees  
33 involved in the next steps, and so Mr. Brown first wanted to make sure the zone change was  
34 approved by the Council. He said the plans would be brought back to the City Council soon for  
35 consideration, though he was not yet sure of the timeline.

36  
37 Mayor Brunst opened the public hearing. There were no public comments, so Mayor Brunst  
38 closed the public hearing.

39  
40 Mr. Spencer **moved**, by resolution, to amend the General Plan land use map on property at 1750  
41 South 50 East in the R5 zone from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential. Mr.  
42 Lentz **seconded** the motion. Those voting aye: Richard F. Brunst, Debby Lauret, Sam Lentz,  
43 Tom Macdonald, Mark Seastrand, David Spencer, Brent Sumner. The motion **passed**  
44 **unanimously**.

# DRAFT

1 6:10 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING – PD-22 – Fairfield Inn Sign Requirements  
2 ORDINANCE – Amending Section 22-11-35(L)(16)(b)(7) of the Orem City code  
3 pertaining to signage requirements in the PD-22 zone at 800 North 1200 West  
4

5 Mr. Bench presented the applicant's request that the City, by ordinance, amend Section 22-11-  
6 35(L)(16)(b)(7) of the Orem City code pertaining to signage requirements in the PD-22 zone at  
7 800 North 1200 West.  
8

9 In May 2011, the City Council amended the PD-22 zone to allow a total of three (3) pole signs  
10 west of 1200 West. One of the three pole signs was allowed to be eighty (80) feet tall with a sign  
11 area of 300 square feet and oriented towards Interstate 15. The applicant installed the eighty  
12 (80) foot sign with the allowed 300 square feet advertising the TownePlace Suites.  
13

14 The applicant recently completed the new Fairfield Inn and would like to place an additional sign  
15 panel on the eighty (80) foot pole sign for the Fairfield Inn. The applicant therefore requested  
16 that the PD-22 zone be amended to allow an additional sign of equal size (300 square feet) to be  
17 located on the 80 foot sign below the already existing sign. The proposed amendment would  
18 allow two separate signs on the 80 foot pole but would not allow either sign to be larger than  
19 300 square feet.  
20

21 Although the TownePlace Suites and the Fairfield Inn were located on separate parcels and the  
22 Fairfield Inn was located in the HS zone while the TownePlace Suites was in the PD-22 zone, the  
23 two hotels and the existing Maverik convenience store were part of a commercial complex which  
24 allowed the two hotels to share a sign.  
25

26 If the applicant were to construct a sign on their own property and not share the eighty (80) foot  
27 tall sign, they would be subject to the requirements of Sign Zone "E." Sign Zone "E" allowed a  
28 maximum sign size of 300 square feet and a maximum height of thirty-five (35) feet, or twenty-  
29 five (25) feet above the deck of the freeway, whichever was greater. Allowing the larger sign to  
30 be shared could eliminate the need for an additional pole sign along Interstate 15.  
31

32 The Planning Commission recommended that the City Council amend Section 22-11-  
33 35(L)(16)(b)(7) of the Orem City code pertaining to signage in the PD-22 zone at 800 North  
34 1200 West. City staff supported the Planning Commission recommendation.  
35

36 Mayor Brunst asked if the Fairfield Inn sign would be made of the same materials and to the  
37 same quality as the sign for the TownePlace Suites. Mr. Bench said it would be the same  
38 materials.  
39

40 Mrs. Lauret asked for clarification on the option for a second sign pole. She asked if the current  
41 proposal was to include the sign on the existing pole. Mr. Bench said they did have the option of  
42 a separate sign pole of their own, but the maximum height for that pole would be 35 feet. Sharing  
43 the pole for the sign would allow for additional height.  
44

45 Mayor Brunst opened the public hearing. There were no public comments, so Mayor Brunst  
46 closed the public hearing.  
47

# DRAFT

1 Mr. Spencer **moved**, by ordinance, to amend Section 22-11-35(L)(16)(b)(7) of the Orem City  
2 code pertaining to signage requirements in the PD-22 zone at 800 North 1200 West. Mayor  
3 Brunst **seconded** the motion. Those voting aye: Richard F. Brunst, Debby Lauret, Sam Lentz,  
4 Tom Macdonald, Mark Seastrand, David Spencer, Brent Sumner. The motion **passed**  
5 **unanimously**.

## 6 7 **COMMUNICATION ITEMS**

8  
9 There were no Communication Items.

## 10 11 **CITY MANAGER INFORMATION ITEMS**

12  
13 There were no City Manager Information Items.

## 14 15 **ADJOURNMENT**

16  
17 Mr. Lentz **moved** to adjourn to the meeting. Mr. Spencer **seconded** the motion. Those voting  
18 aye: Richard F. Brunst, Debby Lauret, Sam Lentz, Tom Macdonald, Mark Seastrand, David  
19 Spencer, Brent Sumner. The motion **passed unanimously**.

20  
21 The meeting adjourned at 6:26 p.m.

## PROCLAMATION

**WHEREAS**, Independents Week provides a time to celebrate the independence of the members of the community of Orem and the entrepreneurial spirit represented by our core of local independent businesses; and

**WHEREAS**, the individual decisions every community member makes today affect the future of Orem; and

**WHEREAS**, Orem's local independent businesses help preserve the uniqueness of the community and give us a sense of place; and

**WHEREAS**, Orem's core of independently-owned businesses give back to this community in goods, services, time and talent; and

**WHEREAS**, the health of Orem's economy depends on our support of businesses owned by our friends and neighbors; and

**WHEREAS**, Orem's independent business owners and employees enrich community members' shopping experiences with their knowledge and passion; and

**THEREFORE**, as we celebrate Independents Week 2016, we acknowledge that the ability to choose the direction of Orem lies within each of us.

**NOW THEREFORE**, I, Richard F. Brunst Jr., Mayor of the City of Orem, Utah, do hereby proclaim the week of July 1-7 2016, as

## INDEPENDENTS WEEK

in the City of Orem and salute our community members and locally owned independent businesses who are integral to the unique flavor of Orem and honor their efforts to make Orem the place we want to live and work.



Dated this 10<sup>th</sup> day of May 2016

\_\_\_\_\_  
Richard F. Brunst Jr., Mayor

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jackie Lambert, Deputy City Recorder

# PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS, there are approximately 900,000 law enforcement officers serving in communities across the United States, including the more than eighty dedicated members of the City of Orem Police Department; and

WHEREAS, nearly 60,000 assaults against law enforcement officers are reported each year, resulting in approximately 16,000 injuries; and

WHEREAS, since the first recorded death in 1791, more than 20,000 law enforcement officers in the United States have made the ultimate sacrifice and been killed in the line of duty; and

WHEREAS, the names of these dedicated public servants are engraved on the walls of the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial in Washington, D.C.; and

WHEREAS, hundreds of new names of fallen heroes are being added to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial this spring, including 128 officers killed in 2015 and many officers killed in previous years; and

WHEREAS, May 15 of each year is designated as Peace Officers Memorial Day, in honor of all fallen officers and their families and U.S. flags should be flown at half-staff;

NOW THEREFORE, I, Richard F. Brunst Jr., Mayor of the City of Orem, Utah, do hereby proclaim May 9-15, 2016, as

## POLICE WEEK

In the City of Orem and publicly salute the service of law enforcement officers in our community and in communities across the nation. We urge all citizens to salute the service of law enforcement officers in our community and in communities across the nation.

Dated this 10<sup>th</sup> day of May 2016

---

Richard F. Brunst Jr., Mayor

ATTEST:

---

Jacqueline J. Lambert, Deputy City Recorder

CITY OF OREM  
**CITY COUNCIL MEETING**  
 MAY 10, 2016



<b>REQUEST:</b>	<b>6:00 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING – CDBG Awards 2016-2017          RESOLUTION – Receive Public Comment on the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Projected Use of Funds for Fiscal Year 2016-2017</b>
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	City of Orem City Manager’s Office
<b>FISCAL IMPACT:</b>	\$808,636

**NOTICES:**

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

**SITE INFORMATION:**

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

**PREPARED BY:**  
 Steven Downs  
 Asst. to City Manager

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**The Assistant to the City Manager recommends the City Council hold the second of two public hearings to receive public comment on the projected uses of funds for the 2016-2017 Community Development Block Grant and adopt the recommendation of the CDBG Citizen Advisory Commission.**

**BACKGROUND:**

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

Tonight’s public hearing is the first of two opportunities for public comment on the recommendations before the City Council officially adopts the Final Statement of Projected Uses of Funds for Orem’s 2016-2017 Community Development Block Grant. Following a second public hearing that is scheduled for May 10, 2016, at 6:00 p.m., the City Council will adopt a resolution approving the CDBG Final Statement of Projected Uses of Funds for 2016-2017.

Please see the allocation recommendations below:

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

- Family Support & Treatment - \$11,000
- Project Read - \$3,000
- PERC - \$2,000
- Center for Women & Children in Crisis - \$8,295
- Community Actions Services - \$16,000
- Mountainland Community Health - \$4,500
- Literacy Resources - \$2,000
- RAH - \$7,000
- Friends of the Children's Justice Center - \$12,000
- Friends of the Food and Care Coalition - \$7,000
- Utah County 4-H - \$1,000
- Community Health Connect - \$4,000
- Kids on the Move - \$5,000
- People Helping People - \$4,500
- Experience Children’s Museum - \$0
- Rocky Mountain University of Health Professionals - \$4,000

Other

Habitat for Humanity - \$229,341\*

Code Enforcement - \$130,000

Infrastructure - \$150,000

Administration - \$103,000

Section 108 Loan Repayment - \$105,000

**\* SUBJECT TO CHANGE BASED ON END OF YEAR BALANCE IN CURRENT HOUSING  
REHABILITATION FUNDING**

DRAFT

RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
BLOCK GRANT STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
OBJECTIVES AND USE OF FUNDS AS REQUIRED BY THE U.S.  
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT FOR  
FISCAL YEAR 2016-2017

WHEREAS the City of Orem qualifies as an Entitlement Community under the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Community Development Block Grant Program and has been allocated \$608,636 for the 2016-2017 program year; and

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

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

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

WHEREAS the City Council held public hearings on March 29, 2016, and May 10, 2016, to consider citizen comments regarding CDBG expenditures and has reviewed these suggestions and proposals in a manner fair to all residents of Orem and pursuant to law.

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

1. The Community Development Block Grant Statement of Community Development Objectives and Projected Use of Funds, which is attached hereto as "Exhibit A" and incorporated herein by this reference, is hereby adopted and shall be submitted to the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development as part of Orem's formal request for the 2016-2017 grant amount of \$608,636, Housing Rehab program income estimated to be \$15,000, as well as reprogrammed money in the amount of approximately \$185,000.
2. This resolution shall take effect immediately upon passage.

DRAFT

3. All other resolutions, ordinances, and policies in conflict herewith, either in whole or in part, are hereby repealed.

PASSED AND APPROVED this **10th** day of **May** 2016.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Richard F. Brunst, Jr., Mayor

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Donna R. Weaver, City Recorder

COUNCIL MEMBERS VOTING "AYE"

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

COUNCIL MEMBERS VOTING "NAY"

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**FINAL STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
OBJECTIVES AND PROJECTED USE OF FUNDS  
PROGRAM YEAR 41  
JULY 1, 2016 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2017  
GRANT NO.: B-14-MC-49-002  
CITY OF OREM, UTAH**

The City of Orem intends to meet the requirement of seventy percent benefit to low and moderate-income persons in the aggregate use of funds to be expended during the program year 2016-2017.

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

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

The targeted local objectives include the following:

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

The HUD national objectives include the following:

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

DRAFT

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

<b>ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>FUNDING ALLOCATION</b>	<b>LOCAL OBJECTIVE</b>	<b>NATIONAL OBJECTIVE</b>
CENTER FOR WOMEN AND CHILDREN IN CRISIS	\$ 8,295	1	SL-3
CHILDREN’S JUSTICE CENTER	12,000	1	SL-3
COMMUNITY ACTION SERVICES	16,000	1	SL-3
COMMUNITY HEALTH CONNECT	4,000	1	SL-3
FAMILY SUPPORT& TREATMENT CENTER	11,000	1	SL-3
FOOD AND CARE COALITION	7,000	1	SL-3
KIDS ON THE MOVE	5,000	1	SL-3
MOUNTAINLAND COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTER	4,500	1	SL-3
LITERACY RESOURCES (OREM LITERACY CENTER)	2,000	1	SL-3
PARENT EDUCATION RESOURCE CENTER (PERC)	2,000	1	SL-3
PROJECT READ	3,000	1	SL-3
RECREATION AND HABILITATION	7,000	1	SL-3
PEOPLE HELPING PEOPLE	4,500	3	EO-1
UTAH COUNTY 4-H	1,000	1	SL-3
EXPERIENCE CHILDREN’S MUSEUM	0	3	EO-2
ROCKY MOUNTAIN UNIVERSITY OF HEALTH PROFESSIONALS	4,000	1	SL-3
HABITAT FOR HUMANITY*	229,341	2	DH-2
CITY OF OREM – CODE ENFORCEMENT	130,000	1	SL-3
CITY OF OREM – SECTION 108 LOAN REPAYMENT	105,000	3	EO-3
CITY OF OREM – PUBLIC FACILITIES, STREETS/SIDEWALKS	150,000	1,4	SL-3
CITY OF OREM – PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	103,000	ALL	ALL
CITY OF OREM – BUSINESS REVOLVING LOAN FUND	0	3	EO-2
TOTAL	\$808,836		

**\* SUBJECT TO CHANGE BASED ON END OF YEAR BALANCE IN CURRENT HOUSING REHABILITATION FUNDING**

DRAFT

**CDBG FINAL STATEMENT**

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

CDBG FUNDING SOURCES AVAILABLE FOR USE:

CDBG Fund Allocation	\$608,636.00
-Repayments in the Housing-Rehabilitation Loan Fund	15,000.00
-Reprogrammed Money	185,000.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$808,836.00</b>

The City of Orem intends to meet the requirement of seventy percent benefit to low and moderate-income persons in the aggregate use of funds to be expended during the program years through 2016-2017.

CITY OF OREM  
CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
MAY 12, 2016



<b>REQUEST:</b>	<b>RESOLUTION- Adopting the City of Orem Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Tentative Budget</b>
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Jamie Davidson - City Manager
<b>FISCAL IMPACT:</b>	\$100,675,498

**NOTICES:**

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

**SITE INFORMATION:**

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

**PREPARED BY:**

Brandon C. Nelson,  
Accounting Div Mgr

**APPROVED BY:**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**The City Manager recommends the City Council, by resolution, adopt the Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Tentative Budget and set a public hearing to adopt the final budget on June 10, 2016, at 6:00 p.m.**

**BACKGROUND:**

On May 10, 2016, the City Council received a draft copy of the proposed Tentative Budget in preparation for this meeting. Prior to being presented with a draft copy of the budget, the City Council and staff have met in a series of public meetings to discuss guiding principles of this and future budgets, reviewed each of the Enterprise Funds and the General Fund, and the recommended adjustments to the City's Fees and Charges.

This budget does not contain any request to increase the property tax rate. Proposed fee changes will be reviewed in the budget presentation.

The Tentative Budget is available for review and to download at [Orem.org](http://Orem.org).

# DRAFT

RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

A RESOLUTION BY THE OREM CITY COUNCIL ADOPTING THE CITY OF OREM TENTATIVE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016-2017 AND SETTING A PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE ADOPTION OF THE FINAL BUDGET ON JUNE 14, 2017, AT 6:00 P.M.

WHEREAS on May 10, 2016, the City Manager submitted a tentative budget to the City Council; and

WHEREAS the City Council desires to adopt the tentative budget as required by State law; and

WHEREAS the City Council desires to make the tentative budget available for public review and comment at least ten days prior to the public hearing; and

WHEREAS the City Council desires to set a public hearing for June 14, 2016, at 6:00 p.m. to receive additional public input on the budget.

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

1. The City Council hereby adopts the tentative budget attached to this resolution as Exhibit "A".
2. The City Council will conduct a public hearing to adopt the final budget for Fiscal Year 2016-2017 on June 14, 2016, at 6:00 p.m.

PASSED AND APPROVED this 10<sup>th</sup> day of May 2016.

---

Richard Brunst, Mayor

ATTEST:

---

Donna R. Weaver, City Recorder

DRAFT

COUNCILMEMBERS VOTING "AYE"

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

COUNCILMEMBERS VOTING "NAY"

---

---

---

---

---

---

---