

AMERICAN FORK CITY COUNCIL
SEPTEMBER 1, 2020
WORK SESSION MINUTES

**This meeting was held electronically.*

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:

Camden Bird	Community Services Director
Wendelin Knobloch	Associate Planner
Terilyn Lurker	City Recorder
Anna Montoya	Finance Officer
Cherylyn Egner	Legal Counsel
Adam Olsen	Senior Planner
Darren Falslev	Police Chief
Scott Sensanbaugher	Public Works Director

Also present: Josh Walker, Kristina Weismann, Ryan Beck, Cameron Martin, and Leota Coyne

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 electronically in a work session on Tuesday, September 1, 2020, commencing at 4:00 p.m. Mayor Frost welcomed everyone and explained the meeting would be held electronically due to COVID-19

1. Presentation by Envision Utah on an update of the Valley Visioning project.

Cameron Martin thanked staff and elected officials for their time. He explained that the Valley Visioning efforts started in 2018 by the Utah County Chamber of Commerce. He presented an overview of the project, explaining that 2,749 people took an online survey and 12 public workshops were held across the valley. In total, over 11,000 residents throughout the County became involved with this project. Envision Utah then went out and benchmarked that data against a random sampling survey to substantiate the survey findings. Through these efforts, they were able to identify and bring to light all the wonderful aspects that various cities had to offer. They identified six priorities to focus on with this project: Housing, Transportation, Air Quality, Agriculture and Open Space, Water Quality and Quantity, Workforce and Education.

The time was turned over to Ryan Beck to present the phases and findings of this project. He explained that Phase 1 took place between Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 and was labeled as

“Listening.” It was during this first phase that the survey was distributed, and the 12 workshops were held across Utah County in the following cities: Pleasant Grove, Highland, Lehi, Eagle Mountain, Provo, Payson, Spanish Fork, Orem, and Springville. Mr. Beck explained that Utah County was projected to double in population by 2050. The vast majority of that growth would be from new births. He then presented the survey findings, which identified the aforementioned priorities, and noted that American Fork had been identified as having a city center. Mr. Beck then explained Phase 2, which was labeled as “Scenarios.” He presented several conceptual drawings and aerial maps when discussing the following potential scenarios:

Scenario A: Current Conditions

- Growth continues as it has for the last 20 years.

Scenario B: Organized Centers

- Growth occurs in mixed-use centers near high capacity transportation.

Scenario C: Westward Growth

- Growth primarily occurs west of the lake into Cedar Valley.

Scenario D: Southern Growth

- Growth primarily occurs south between Provo and Santaquin.

Scenario E: Urban Infill

- Growth is primarily accommodated in existing urban areas.

Lastly, Mr. Beck presented Phase 3— “Vision”—which enumerated the following overall goals:

- Provide convenient transportation choices
- Support housing options
- Provide open space and recreation opportunities
- Support local agriculture
- Manage water wisely
- Foster a well-educated population
- Ensure clean air

Council Member Staci Carroll asked for clarification on the difference between a city center and metro center. Mr. Beck explained that a metro center would be the highest density and would be similar to downtown Provo, Salt Lake, or Ogden.

Mayor Frost stated that Envision Utah had done amazing outreach as part of this project. He asked Mr. Martin and Mr. Beck if they had a template the City could use based on the work they had done. Mr. Beck and Mr. Martin both explained that the purpose of this project was to provide data points to help the City make informed decisions with regard to development. Mr. Beck added that they did not want to strip the City of its ability to make decisions; rather, they sought to provide goals and strategies.

Josh Walker indicated that Envision Utah spent a lot of time developing the maps presented as part of the presentation. He felt that American Fork had a good plan in place to accommodate growth. It was noted that anyone could contact Mr. Walker, Mr. Martin, or Mr. Beck with any questions.

2. Annual Open and Public Meetings training.

Cherylyn Egner, Legal Counsel, provided the following information as part of the annual open and public meetings training. She noted that this training was mandatory and checked annually by the auditor.

Public bodies included: Administrative, advisory, Executive, and Legislative bodies. Public bodies were to take their actions openly and conduct all deliberations openly. Meetings required the convening of a public body, a quorum, and a discussion or public comment about a matter over which they had jurisdiction or advisory power. The definition of convening was:

...the calling together of a public body by a person authorized to do so for the express purpose of discussing or acting upon a subject over which the body has jurisdiction.

A 24-hour public notice needed to be posted at the City office, Utah Public Notice website, and the newspaper or through a media correspondent. Agendas shall provide “reasonable specificity” to notify the public as to the topics to be considered at the meeting. A governing body could not take final action on something not listed on the agenda. Closed meetings could be held to discuss the following topics: Character, competence, health of an individual; pending or reasonably imminent litigation; purchase, exchange, lease of real property or water shares; and allegations of criminal misconduct.

Per Utah Code 52-4-210:

Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to restrict a member of a public body from transmitting an electronic message to other members of the public body at a time when the public body is not convened in an open meeting.

Ms. Egner explained that one major change included no anchor location for electronic meetings was currently needed. She then noted the following:

- Generally, an anchor location was required.
- If certain criteria existed, it was permissible to hold a meeting without an anchor location.
- The City had already adopted a Resolution addressing this issue.

Per Utah Code 52-4-207:

- A public body may convene and conduct an electronic meeting without an anchor location if the chair of the public body:
 - a) makes a written determination that conducting the meeting with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location;
 - b) states in the written determination the facts upon which the determination is based;
 - c) includes in the public notice for the meeting, and reads the written determination at the beginning of the meeting; and
 - d) includes in the public notice information on how a member of the public may view or make a comment at the meeting.

3. Adjourn

The work session ended at 4:37 p.m.



Terilyn Lurker