

AMERICAN FORK CITY COUNCIL
OCTOBER 29, 2019
WORK SESSION MINUTES

Members Present:

Bradley J. Frost	Mayor
Kevin Barnes	Council Member
Staci Carroll	Council Member
Barbara Christiansen	Council Member
Rob Shelton	Council Member
Clark Taylor	Council Member

Staff Present:

David Bunker	City Administrator
Camden Bird	Community Services Director
Wendelin Knobloch	Associate Planner
Terilyn Lurker	City Recorder
Stephanie Finau	Deputy Recorder
Aaron Brems	Fire Chief
George Schade	IT Director
Timothy Merrill	Legal Counsel
Adam Olsen	Senior Planner
Darren Falslev	Police Chief
Derric Rykert	Parks and Recreation Director
Scott Sensanbaugher	Public Works Director

Also Present: John Woffinden, Brett Thomas, Greg Lowe, Kent Millington, Andy Spencer, Joe Rich, Josh Walker, Cody Hill, and one additional person.

WORK SESSION

The purpose of City Work Sessions is to prepare the City Council for upcoming agenda items on future City Council Meetings. The Work Session is not an action item meeting. No one attending the meeting should rely on any discussion or any perceived consensus as action or authorization. These come only from the City Council Meeting.

The American Fork City Council met in a work session on Tuesday, October 29, 2019, in the City Administration Office Conference Room, located at 51 East Main Street, commencing at 4:00 p.m.

1. Discussion with Jibe Media on the City's rebranding.

Greg Lowe and Brett Thomas gave a quick overview of the project. Mr. Lowe said both he, Mr. Thomas, and the Council had a meeting where they discussed the previous round of City logo designs. They took the feedback from that meeting and prepared new logos for the City. They included some more coloring and differentiations. They added namely an icon that was important to the City and not just a monogram; they added a scene that was popular in that meeting (meaning some kind of scenery or building). Mr. Lowe asked how the Council would like to proceed on the new designs.

Mayor Frost asked if the two designers had one slide with the designs all together. Mr. Lowe said no, they were all separated. Mayor Frost wanted staff to weigh in on the choices as well. Mayor Frost was not too keen on the bird design, neither was Council Member Clark Taylor.

Mr. Lowe and Mr. Thomas went over the various logos they had prepared in detail, and explained their choices in design.

Logo #1: Council Member Barbara Christiansen liked the year and the sun rays/wagon wheel spokes.

Logo #2: This was a similar to option to the previous, but the font type gave it a different feel. Council Member Rob Shelton mentioned that the Council should look at the use of the logo: every department would have the same logo City-wide. He asked if the thought was that the designers would add the department name below it. Mr. Lowe responded that yes, part of the discussion was to add departmental iterations. Council Member Shelton asked if this was for all departments or if some departments would be pulled out from that modification. Council Member Taylor thought they wanted all departments to eventually use this logo. Council Member Taylor said liked the display colors better: the deeper red and the blue; he also liked the font but wondered if it would get old (compared to number 24). Mr. Thomas thought the font already felt nostalgic; if the Council wanted something more contemporary this design would not be it.

Logos #3 and #4 were based on Council Member Staci Carroll's suggestion. She liked a few different ones, especially logo #2.

Council Member Barnes said he did not like the Est. on the logos.

Regarding logos #5 and #6 (Concept 3), Mr. Lowe and Mr. Thomas wanted something patriotic. They tried to incorporate an eagle icon and said it may not be a classic enough look and that they could modify it possibly to feel more classic American. Mayor Frost asked if anyone liked the eagle design. Council Member Taylor and Council Member Carroll did not like the eagle. Camden Bird asked if they wanted a different eagle design, but Council Member Carroll did not feel like the Eagle fit with American Fork. Council Member Christiansen said it looked too much like Eagle Mountain.

Mr. Thomas said an important part of logo design was that at the beginning of any logo, something was presented that did not look or represent anything that was currently within the brand, but that it did represent something that was memorable. If the eagle was something memorable, it was important to consider.

Concept 4 (logo #7) design included a mountain, sunset, and lake. Council Member Christiansen mentioned that the design looked like the lines below the mountains could be words despite not being words. Most people liked the mountains. Council Member Taylor liked the font. Council Member Barnes liked the fact that the M and the N matched in the font (unlike the Eagle designs). Council Member Carroll wondered what it would look like without the lines.

Concept 5: This design was included in color, even though the Council had had kicked it out of the last round.

Concept 6A: This design combined the mountains with the wagon wheel and sun rays. The mountains were not generic; they were crafted specifically for American Fork. Council Member Carroll liked this design; she said she could see both the wagon wheel and the sun very well. The full circle was a good choice. The rusty red color could be changed.

Concept 6B was another iteration of previous design.

Regarding Concept 7, Mr. Lowe said this was pretty true to a wagon wheel. It was similar to an option the Council previously liked.

Mayor Frost said choosing a logo was a significant decision for the Council and asked what the best method would be to refine the options they currently had down to one. Mr. Lowe said every organization approached this challenge differently. The Council needed to remove their personal bias as much as they could to determine what the best logo for the City was, and to not ask the question “was this my favorite logo.” Mr. Thomas added that as a designer, he would say to pick the simplest one; there was beauty in simplicity.

Council Member Christiansen mentioned one of the logos looked like a Ferris wheel when it was lower. Mr. Bird asked if the Council felt like they could get what they wanted from these designs, or if they needed to work through more designs and other ideas. Council Member Taylor said it would be helpful if the Council could determine a color pallet they liked. Rusty red vs Americana red. Mr. Lowe stated they could come back with different options.

Mayor Frost asked what colors the Council liked. Council Member Christiansen liked the American flag red/blue. Council Member Taylor was also leaning toward those colors. Council Member Carroll was okay with other colors of red.

Mayor Frost asked if the Council wanted to keep the wheel. He asked one attendee if he understood what the wagon wheel stood for, in which the attendee replied, “pioneer heritage.” Council Member Taylor explained American Fork was the “hub” of the county, the center of the county.

Council Member Taylor liked the fewer number of spokes in the logo. He asked what the Council wanted to see font-wise. Mr. Thomas stated the current designs displayed three different fonts. Council Member Carroll said it got to messy to have a stylized font with a mark in her opinion. Mr. Thomas explained two of the fonts (in logo 26/27) were originally presented as wording only but were added to the mark later. Mr. Lowe said the Council could choose to have the entire logo together or they could separate them for different projects; it was up to them.

Mr. Lowe said the Council could decide and chose what they liked. They needed to decide on the font, logo, and color of the design. Aaron Brems said he liked the red, white and blue; he asked if the designers could change the font on the one (logo #19) and add America flag colors. Council Member Taylor said for the longevity of the City, he liked the strong font even though it was not a custom font. He also liked the traditional red, white, and blue.

Council Member Kevin Barnes said the design on page 19, the A and the F were the capital letters (they were a little small). He was having trouble with the ESTD on that design and asked if the designers could take it off and just leave the year instead. He also like the more block font, the

mountains, and the wheel coming all around. He thought the wheel was important. The City logo could teach the students about the history of the city.

Mayor Frost asked if the designers were getting the information they needed from the Council. Mr. Lowe said yes: red/white/blue, wheel, and simpler font. Council Member Carroll stated she liked the City Hall logo. So did Council Member Christiansen.

Council Member Shelton said any of them would work for him; this was not his area of expertise. His only comment was on how the logo would be pushed through all the departments and the efficiency of its use. Council Member Carroll liked the designs with the hill. Council Member Christiansen liked the two designs where the wheel was more complete, but not completely connected. Mr. Lowe said the designers could build an online survey where the Council's choices were ranked. Council Member Barnes said liked the City Hall design, but that it looked a lot like a church and that might be an issue.

Mr. Lowe would take some of the ideas presented here and make new options and distribute them through an online survey.

2. Discussion with UTA on current services, community engagements, and future service planning.

Kent Millington was present to address the group. He represented Utah and Tooele counties as a member of the board of trustees at UTA. There were three full-time board members who ran UTA, and recently added a new executive director, Caroline Ganob, who reported to the Board Members. He wanted to give the Council a report of what they had done and the successes they had, and then the future opportunities the group was exploring.

The Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system started in Provo/Orem. It ran from the Orem Frontrunner Station up through Utah Valley University around Brigham Young University and down through Provo to the Provo Frontrunner station. A year ago, the ridership through the school year was about 10,000 per day; about 75% of the riders were students (he could tell because of where the riders entered and existed the bus system, and because of their ID card use). UTA thought the summer ridership would drop off, but it did not and stayed around 7,000. This fall, the busses ran at about 14,000 riders a day. That represented about 10,000 cars not driving through Orem or Provo; both universities (UVU and BYU) had noticed a significant drop in the number of parking passes sold. Both schools were paying \$1 million a year to this organization for the next 10 years. Faculty and students rode for free. The student passes got them on Frontrunner. UTA had noticed that 130,000 rides on Trax in Salt Lake County from students to schools. Students rode Frontrunner North and then Trax throughout Salt Lake. This had been a big success.

They also wanted to point out that they had rearranged around Thanksgiving Point. UTA had a bus that circulated from the Lehi Frontrunner station to all the office buildings. The ridership was growing. The bus ran all day long so people could ride the buses to the restaurants and that took a lot of pressure off the roads. Building on that, there was a discussion of putting a BRT system down State St. down Highway 89 in the Provo Frontrunner station to the Lehi Frontrunner station. They were exploring that option right now. Some of the cities were excited about the possibility. American Fork's service was mainly the 850 Bus that ran through town. The 850 Bus had just over 2,000 riders between Provo and Lehi. Definition of a rider: A rider is counted every time someone got on a bus, not necessarily how many different rides someone completed in one day (one person could get on and off three times, which would be counted as three total riders).

Mr. Millington continued, and said they moved the 850 Bus from leaving every 30 minutes to every 15 minutes and their ridership doubled. There was a demand. That was driving the thought of a BRT throughout the Utah County. There was a lot of discussion about extending Frontrunner down to Payson; there was a significant amount of activity planned for the future in Payson (adding UVU satellite campuses for example). The more immediate thing impacting frontrunner's operation was the establishment of a station at Vineyard. In the next month or so the company would have identified the funding necessary for completion, both for the station and to build another track between Vineyard and American Fork. They were mandated by the federal government that they had to impose "Positive Train Control" (PTC) as a result from train commuter rail accidents. PTC was an automated system that would slow the train down as a safety measure. There were double tracks at the stations already. UTA was looking to double the track between Vineyard and American Fork so there would not be a delay because the Vineyard station was close to the Orem Station.

David Bunker asked if they would have to change the platforms in American Fork because of the double tracks. Mr. Millington said no, they would build the Vineyard one to look just like the one in American Fork.

Mayor Frost asked if all the crossings would have to be modified to fit two rails. Mr. Millington said yes, that was correct, where the double track would be. Mayor Frost further asked if there were any bridges, and if that was even possible. Mr. Millington said not down in American Fork.

Council Member Taylor clarified that there would be three tracks. Mr. Millington said yes: two for frontrunner and one for Union Pacific. Mr. Bunker asked if there was enough Right of Way. Mr. Millington answered yes; the engineering and testing had been done.

Council Member Shelton asked if they had the trail crossing on 200 South that was supposed to go to the North side of the road. This was the perfect opportunity to work with UTA to get that trail moved. Mr. Millington said yes, and if the Council had those concerns, please let UTA know. Mr. Bunker stated they had brought that issue up. Mr. Millington said American Fork had about 700 people a day using Frontrunner.

Council Member Shelton clarified about the parking lot, and stated it was full on a regular basis. It was great to see increased ridership, but UTA needed to make sure they had the parking situation taken care of. He would love to know what the concrete, long-term plan was for the American Fork station. Mr. Millington stated they had discussed the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) area and the development in the area South and West of the station. Part of the plan needed to accommodate increased parking and it probably would not be horizontal.

Council Member Shelton if Mr. Millington was familiar with the City's flyover concept. Mr. Millington was not but thought maybe the engineers were. All things were possible for working out the best solution to parking.

Council Member Shelton asked when it came to financing, if there were ways the Council could partner with UTA for funding and if it would fast-track a project. Mr. Millington said it was amazing what could happen when you find the money. Most of the 4th quarter tax passed by the County would be used to pay off the BRT Provo/Orem project and he had approached the county

about that funding; he stated the state legislature was already considering the 5th quarter tax which would go directly to mass transit, and that this decision would have to go through the County.

Mr. Millington stated all options were actively discussed in regard to how UTA worked to make it easier for the City to develop their city and making it easier for the citizens to get around. UTA was trying to help the City figure out how to move people in and out of the city. They needed to think ahead on how to get people moving around considering the projected population boom of Utah County.

Mr. Millington stated he was available and represented Utah County. If the Council had questions, ideas, or complaints to please contact him. Council Member Shelton asked what the timeline was on the East/West going out to Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain for busses or tracks. Mr. Millington stated that tracks would cost a few million dollars. UTA was looking at express busses to get people moving from those cities. The timetable could be as early as next summer for the busses to start.

Council Member Shelton said at one time the UTA wanted to use busses around the Meadows area. If tracks were ever developed, they were meant to go on the Union Pacific tracks. Mr. Millington said they were thinking of putting in a bus (BRT) down State Street would accomplish that.

Council Member Shelton referred to the funding and asked if UTA had a good relationship with UDOT. Mr. Millington said yes, they were meeting with Carlos. Mr. Millington stated he represented the State Transportation Commission representing Utah County on the Commission; they were close collaborators with UDOT on these expansions.

Council Member Carroll said in regard to the BRT down State Street, that she was really interested in this idea and felt it would be a great opportunity for the City. She did not really want the sidewalks taken out to expand the road, however. Mr. Millington stated he understood that concern and that the project would have to be engineered carefully and UTA would make sure they worked closely with the City for the downtown area. Council Member Shelton suggested they use Pacific Drive; it would put them closer to the Meadows area to make a loop.

Council Member Carroll said Mr. Millington mentioned the 5th quarter cent sales tax and asked if he had more details. Mr. Millington said it was passed by the legislature, but the County needed to implement it by 2023.

Mr. Bunker spoke to connectivity and felt getting people to these facilities was important. The City had proposed a transit loop that would be more like a shuttle and he showed what the City had proposed. If there was a transit, it would improve the City especially if connected to the Frontrunner station. Mr. Millington explained this would be similar to the Thanksgiving Point shuttle loop; he was all for moving people around, but the question was the funding.

3. Discussion on the budget for the Patriot Station Community Reinvestment Area (CRA).

Mayor Frost said this was briefly discussed at the RDA Board meeting. They had met as a subgroup and pointed out some concerns with the budget numbers. They included some of the things that were needed for the City and other entities. They were hoping to get interlocal agreements signed with the other taxing entities by the end of the year/first part of the next year. He wanted

the Council to discuss what was in the budget, if it was enough, and if it needed to be increased/decreased.

Council Member Shelton said the train station concerned him because there was a lot of money that was going to an aesthetically pleasing aspect and the flyovers. He felt those funds were better utilized toward matching funds for the transit loop build.

Council Member Carroll asked if the Council could give some background on the train station idea. Mayor Frost explained there was a developer who acquired a large piece of property and wanted more of a destination place - someplace that may have shops where people could wait for the trains. This number was a placeholder. Council Member Shelton said the developer indicated they were going to pay for it all originally and work with UTA, but it appeared the momentum had slowed. He looked at the options and felt the money would be better spent on helping people get in and out of the area.

Mr. Bunker said this number included other things. One of the components was a Transit Reinvestment Zone (TRZ); pulling the transit confluence into that agreement to include a parking structure to utilize the frontrunner in the right way. The transportation elements would be put in that, then approach to a TRZ.

Council Member Shelton said the flyover was just as critical as 200 South. The \$10 million was by far the largest expense. He asked how important a train station was to the Council – he asked who would be take on the maintenance and operation of that and if it would the cost dip into general fund. He would rather spend the money elsewhere. Council Member Carroll thought that maybe they could use that money for a parking structure. She understood the TRZ needed to have some changes made to the law; she did not want to have to wait for that. Mr. Bunker stated they could do that.

Council Member Shelton wondered about the parking structure and if they built it and then rented it out to UTA.

Council Member Shelton said he was not familiar with the theatre option. Mayor Frost stated this went back to when they were entertaining that theatre idea. Council Member Shelton thought this money could be better spent towards a parking structure. Council Member Carroll thought the theater could instead be something similar to facilitate community gathering, which could be beneficial. Council Member Shelton said it came down to needs vs wants. The Council needed to get the life-safety elements in first; if they could not get people in and out, they would not come to use the community gathering assets because it would be too hard to get around in that area. Council Member Carroll liked the idea of having money for an indoor project that would draw others to it. She wanted to keep the heart in it. It was a balance. Council Member Shelton wanted to look into the history of the projects and found they were mostly funding infrastructure.

Mayor Frost said the developers and property owner wanted to create a heartbeat in the area. It would be unique and would have a lot of draw.

Council Member Taylor noted there were already people living there. He stated that Mr. Millington had mentioned the parking structure would not be horizontal; he asked if what they were talking about would be separate. Mr. Bunker answered that there are some people who would

be interested in a parking structure and that it could possibly be separate. Council Member Taylor thought that they could partner with other people to get a large parking structure.

Mr. Bunker explained the idea was to create a plaza at the train station with the development on the side. He did not know what the vision was now. Council Member Shelton was still concerned about taking a third of this budget for this one item – he wondered again about needs vs wants of the city, and if this was the best use of the \$10 million figure. The question was who the owners of this would be – the City or UTA.

Council Member Taylor said he was recently in Arizona and there was a project that was in cooperation with the City and a private developer. He could see this would be an amazing development but was not interested in spending \$10 million on the train station.

Mayor Frost said it was safe to say that if the City struck train station, and asked to just change the language so it had a bit broader interpretation so this had the ability to be used for transportation and/or even a parking structure. Council Member Shelton would rather call it a flyover. Mayor Frost thought they could leave that broad enough. Council Member Shelton felt that the \$10 million train station would be a hard sell to the school district. He stated they had talked to Woodbury and UDOT, and the Council needed to have matching money and adjust the budget accordingly.

Council Member Barnes asked who would operate the theatre. He was not opposed to the theatre but was curious. Mayor Frost said this was an incentive to get the developer here. The theater language could be changed to be broader and give them some options.

Council Member Barnes asked what the education campus was. It was noted that this was for the school district, for public schools to be enticed and supportive of this build.

Mr. Bunker said 200 South was more than half the budget, \$22.4 million. The community gathering/civic space, what Mayor Frost discussed, needed to be made special so make it successful long term. They were looking to create a development where people wanted to come to that area. The top part of the budget was the utilities and necessities and the last part was quality of life.

Council Member Shelton said it was great to have money for capital projects, but the concern he had was money for operating and maintenance expenses. Since there was none present, it would come from the general fund which was already tight. He wanted to see some sort of joint venture and some explicit language regarding operation expenses. He would love for that to be included, and wanted it spelled out in the primary documents.

Mr. Bunker said \$2.5 million would not be enough for a theatre. The budget number he heard from other groups was closer to \$10 million just for that alone. Mayor Frost asked if everyone was comfortable with the numbers and just wanted the language changed to be broader.

Council Member Carroll said on the road itself, the Council was imagining gathering spaces. She asked if that was included in the landscaping. Mr. Bunker said the trail was not included in this budget as it was funded through a different mechanism. He went on to explain the area and the proposed modifications.

Council Member Christiansen said needed to take a broad-range plan. She was worried about the high population density and crime affecting community closeness. The public would get more of a feeling of community if they had something like this.

Council Member Shelton worried about the City over expending itself. Council Member Carroll did not think they were talking about the City taking on maintenance/operating costs. But a venture or private partnership of some kind she was in favor of.

Council Member Taylor said \$2.5 million would not be enough to build anything, but a partnership would work. Mayor Frost said the developer wanted to bring nightlife to the area.

Mr. Bunker said for all of the budget, the Council was creating a “but-for” argument to the taxing entity committee. Some of these, like 200 South and other community gathering and civic spaces, were necessary in order for them to develop the TOD in the way they wanted.

Council Member Shelton asked if they could re-word the theatre and train station. Some of the entities they wanted to partner with may feel better if they were broader in their description. He thought they could buy in the flyover which was a better regional impact.

Council Member Christiansen said they may have more tax value as a result of this project, meaning money would come in sooner, faster, and more reliably, because there was a broader base.

Council Member Shelton said Mayor Hadfield stated that the best time to get the money for the flyover was when Lehi was finishing up with their expansion projects (because there was always money left-over from UDOT projects). Mayor Frost would have to check to see if there was leftover money and ask about a 15-20% match on this. Council Member Shelton asked about bonding; Mr. Bunker stated they would have to bond for the 200 South project.

Cody Hill updated the tax base on the tax year 2019; he thought it would be better with the other taxing entities to update it from 2017. Mr. Bunker thought it would hurt them because the values had already increased so much between 2017 and 2019. Mr. Hill thought it was a good pitch because it was not too high. Mr. Bunker thought 2018 would be better; Council Member Carroll agreed. Mr. Bunker said if they took that base year, and calculated what that would automatically be generated now, what tax increment that would be producing, and could be used to pay the debt service with those tax increment dollars right off the bat; Mr. Hill would look into that.

Council Member Shelton said the two issues were the payment of the debt and the collateralization. He thought it was a million dollars in rough numbers that the City was collateralizing for sales tax, which had started to concern him. He wondered what percentage they would be collateralizing.

Mayor Frost said they would change some language on this. He asked Scott Sensenbaugher if he was still close on the budget numbers and if the Council needed to make adjustments. Mr. Sensenbaugher thought it was fairly close; the numbers were fresh from February.

The Council discussed some details from the packet. Council Member Shelton wanted to know if they had numbers from the three years prior. Mayor Frost said the City had a great track record with RDAs and getting them big returns. This would not be the only one. The City had good relationships that could go a long way.

Mr. Bunker asked what numbers/years the Council felt comfortable with. The general consensus was that they were okay with 2018. It was noted that when this CRA was pitched in the past, the taxing entities were okay with it.

Council Member Shelton commented that speeds on 200 South were insane. It was narrow and had a bad surface with a ditch on the side. With the trail being built, the Council needed to be concerned with traffic safety. He was concerned about the adding a four-lane road and whether they could they build it in segments. Mr. Bunker said they did have a phasing plan for 200 South but would like to get four lanes through the core area.

Mayor Frost asked what the next steps were. Mr. Hill stated the next step would be to look at the tax years 2017 and 2018 revenues and what debt service those would cover and choosing a year. They would revise the budget and plan accordingly. Then they give a 30-day notice on the budget and hold the public hearing. They would also adjust some of the language to be broader.

Mayor Frost said when they went for public notice, if they could let the entities know individually and in a special way.

4. ADJOURNMENT

The work session adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Terilyn Lurker".

Terilyn Lurker, City Recorder