

AMERICAN FORK CITY COUNCIL
OCTOBER 6, 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:

David Bunker	City Administrator
Wendelin Knobloch	Associate Planner
Rebecca Andrus	City Engineer
Terilyn Lurker	City Recorder
Aaron Wilson	Engineer
Aaron Brems	Fire Chief
George Schade	IT Director
Cherylyn Egner	Legal Counsel
Adam Olsen	Senior Planner
Darren Falslev	Police Chief
Scott Sensanbaugher	Public Works Director

Also present: Kent Millington, Mary Delamare Schaffer, Claire Woodman, Shane Marshall, Eric Rasband, Grey Turner, Mary DeLoretta, and Robert Clayton

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 6, 2020, electronically, commenced at 4:00 p.m. The agenda shall be as follows:

1. Update from Kent Millington on UTA services during COVID-19.

Kent Millington explained that he intended to report several studies and efforts that had been initiated to increase transit availability throughout Utah County. He wanted to give a general overview to put things into context because his colleagues would go into further detail later on in the work session. He expressed his intent to frame their presentation in a larger context.

Mr. Millington discussed the first study that looked at the point of the mountain. He informed them that for the last year they had conducted a diligent study and increased efforts to extend transit capability from South Salt Lake County into Northern Utah County. The study reviewed the needs of the area with the mindset that there would be continued growth and development over

the next two decades. Mr. Millington explained that there was an increased need for transit capability at the Silicon slope and Thanksgiving Point areas due to expected growth. He further explained that the study looked at the transit needs and capabilities to bring traffic up over the point of the mountain and connect into Lehi. The study had resulted in a proposal that was in the works. Mr. Millington expected them to receive firm results by the end of the year.

Mr. Millington then briefly discussed the Central Corridor Study. He explained that it was a major study that looked at the creation of a transit corridor that started in Lehi and went down to Provo. He further explained that the transit corridor would traverse American Fork completely. He reminded them that his colleagues would go into further detail on that study. He described how the first study began in Sandy and went to Lehi, how the second study began in Lehi and went to Provo, and how the third study that had just been started would go from Provo to Santaquin. He said the third study was the South Utah County Study.

Mr. Millington described the new South Utah County Study. He stated that the study looked at transit capabilities from bus and rail systems. He noted that they owned the rail all the way to Payson. He further stated that the study would look at what to do with the transit corridor. He requested that the Council keep in mind that although only one of the studies went directly through American Fork, they should be looked at as a whole because the entire system impacted American Fork. He noted that the entire corridor was a 55-mile corridor that began in Sandy and ended in Santaquin. He explained that Utah County had experienced a lot of growth and expressed the opinion that if they expected people to live in Utah County, they needed to be able to provide transit options outside of I-15.

Mr. Millington explained that the corridor that ran from Sandy to Santaquin added a system that was almost as long as the Frontrunner system that currently ran in the area. He asserted that because American Fork was right in the center of the corridor, the City would become a key player in efforts to expand transit capability. He appealed to them to think of the studies in a larger context as they heard more details from his colleagues. He said they had the potential to enhance transit capabilities from South Salt Lake County to Santaquin. He voiced the idea that the Central Corridor Study was a significant part of a larger effort to move people across a significant part of the Wasatch Front.

Mr. Millington mentioned that he hoped the City and its citizens were aware of an effort called the Northlake Shore Study. He explained it was promoted by Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG). The study requested input from the citizens and could be found at mountainland.org/NLstudy. He communicated that the study asked for input on trails, transit, and roadways, and he encouraged the City to respond, and to in turn encourage its citizens to respond. He said it was a significant study that affected American Fork directly, and strongly suggested they provide input.

Mr. Millington discussed a service to be provided on Election Day. He said that Tuesday, November 3rd would be declared a free fare day. He disclosed that all modes of transport would be free for everyone on Election Day. He requested that the citizens be told and noted that they would also publish the information. He hoped that free fare would encourage people to get out and vote.

Mr. Millington wrapped up his overview of the studies and the free fare day. He urged one more time for the Council to put the Central Corridor Study in the picture of a much larger transit

corridor through Utah County. He repeated that more details about the study would come from his colleagues, then handed the floor over to Mayor Bradley J. Frost.

2. Presentation by Central Corridor Transit Study Team on the progress and findings of the BRT (Bus Rapid Transit) from Lehi to Provo.

Mayor Frost introduced Shane Marshall of UTA to discuss the Central Corridor Transit Study. Shane Marshall introduced his colleagues, Eric Rasband and Mary Delamare Schaffer, and handed the floor over to them.

Eric Rasband thanked the Council for the opportunity to visit and discuss the study. He said it had been a fun and different study. He explained that he worked for the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) and was asked to manage the study. He expressed gratitude towards his work partner, Mary Delamare Schaffer, and said they were both excited to move the project forward. Eric Rasband then confirmed with the Council that they had received the presentation that was sent over.

Mr. Rasband gave a brief recap of the study. He specified that they had worked with UTA, MAG, and seven other agencies along the corridor. He listed them from south to north: Provo, Orem, Vineyard, Lindon, Pleasant Grove, American Fork, and Lehi. Mr. Rasband reported that the study was funded when Orem City submitted an application to MAG to request study funding. He stated that the initial seed money grew from the desire to study the transit along the central part of the valley.

Mr. Rasband explained that Orem City Manager Jamie Davidson had met with the City managers of the other seven cities, and they realized that the funding they had received from MAG was not quite adequate. Mr. Rasband further explained that Orem City Manager Jamie Davidson asked for contributions from the other agencies, to which American Fork had contributed around nine thousand dollars. Mr. Rasband said that in response, the seven agencies, UTA, and MAG all contributed additional funding, which allowed the study to get underway. He said they had worked with the local governments over the last year and had received a lot of support for the study.

Mr. Rasband communicated that they had begun in August 2019 and had looked at high capacity transit improvements. He revealed that the executive committee had selected a preferred alternative the week prior. He explained that they had started with seven corridors and had narrowed it down to the one best option. He mentioned that in segment one there was a rail alignment that was jointly owned by UTA and Union Pacific Railroad.

Mr. Rasband informed the Council that they had worked with the point of the mountain group to make sure there was efficient collaboration, and to assure that the concerns of both groups were addressed. He announced that they had selected bus transportation as their mode but noted that the point of the mountain group had not chosen their mode yet. He further said that through their study they had identified a transfer location at the point of the mountain, and they planned for it to occur adjacent to the Adobe location in the Silicon Slopes. He indicated that if the point of the mountain selected bus traffic transit as well, he expected the ridership numbers to increase.

Mr. Rasband outlined the proposed transit route. He noted that on the route down through Lehi they may be required to jump out to State Street at some point. He said there was some question about the customers that used the rail alignment into Lehi and stated they would have to figure out

the details with Union Pacific Railroad. He said that they needed to determine the rail use in that location in order to decide if they needed to jump onto State Street at that point.

Mr. Rasband explained that if they decided to jump out onto State Street, they would need dedicated bus lanes down the center of the corridor into American Fork. He mentioned that there were design options in American Fork that they would discuss later in the meeting because he wanted input from the Council. He then communicated that out of American Fork and into Pleasant Grove, it would go down North County Boulevard, along 700 North and over to State Street in Lindon. It would then continue down State Street through Lindon, Orem, and Provo, and past the Utah Valley Regional Medical Center.

Mr. Rasband referred to Vineyard's plans for aggressive mixed-use development in their town center. He said the plans included 9 thousand residential units and 1.2 million square feet of office and retail space. He voiced the opinion it provided an opportunity to pick up and serve that community. He recommended a branch system to come in past the hospital in Orem, as well as to higher density development areas in Orem. He said that the project would move forward as one project, branch system included.

Mr. Rasband went over features that created the robust north-south, high capacity transit spine. He said it would provide key connections to new and redevelopment areas in all the impacted locations. He noted that they would look for TOD opportunities along the corridor, as well as connections to Frontrunner, UVX, point of the mountain, and possibly down to the south part of the county. He stated that the alignment served all of the communities who had participated in the study and expressed that they were excited to find something that would serve the community.

Mr. Rasband talked about American Fork area specifics, which included the evaluation of station locations. He specified potential stations at Lehi Main Street, Pacific Drive, Center Street and Main Street. He asserted the need to determine how to transition from Pacific Drive and State Street over to Main Street. He said that they had discussed several options in talks with staff.

Mayor Frost said that they needed to consider the transition from Pacific Drive into State Street because that corridor was vital to American Fork. He also expressed concern that the flyover from the TOD was not relevant in the traffic patterns, and in the patterns that would bring people to the TOD. He then said subject to all the people that would drive along the corridor with the shortest distance between the corridor and their TOD, MAG would go back and they would reinfuse the flyover as a viable option because it would not just be limited to local traffic. He stated it would be used for traffic that came into the corridor and used to get to the Frontrunner. He noted the Frontrunner was just another transit component that got people places quicker. He said he had watched the flyover, and he and his staff were concerned to see where the flyover was relevant in the funding projects. He expressed gratitude for BRT who had put the issue back on the map as something that was extremely important to the City. He then circled back to the issue of how to transition from Pacific Drive into State Street.

Council Member Shelton stated he had met with UDOT and UTA on the 2015 flyover referenced by Mayor Frost. Council Member Shelton mentioned that they always saw mass transit as important as they would have busses. They had talked about a bus system down in the Meadow Development. He thought everything discussed in the past had supported that. He said that in previous discussions with UTA it was always presented as a desire to tie in the bus route and transit into the American Fork Station. However, he voiced the opinion that it seemed that they now said

they wanted to tie in a bus route and transit at the Lindon or Vineyard station instead. Council Member Shelton noted that American Fork had high density just like Vineyard had and asked if there was potential for a branch mode to go to the TOD. He said he did not know how many units that would take, but he saw the issue as critical. He expressed concern that he hoped American Fork was not left out of the TOD and the ability to tie into the BRT.

Mary Delamare Schaffer was asked to weigh in on the additional connections east-west. She said there had not been a meeting that she had not raised the issue of connectivity to the American Fork station. She disclosed that she lived in American Fork and agreed with Council Member Shelton on the issue. She stated that they did not expect this project to go to the American Fork Station, but said they needed to provide connectivity for the Frontrunner to the station. She further said that it had been part of the discussion to provide Lehi, American Fork, and now Vineyard with connectivity to the system.

Council Member Shelton suggested that if the Vineyard branch was to be part of the project, it felt critical to get American Fork a part of it as well. He said it was critical given the limited traditional forms of transportation in the south end of town. He said they had developed that area to be transit-oriented, so if American Fork could be added into that project it would be awesome.

Mr. Rasband said that the American Fork connectivity would be part of a project managed by Scott Sensanbaugher. He said they believed that would be the solution to tie in the Frontrunner to the TOD. Mary Delamare Schaffer admitted heartbreak that there was no current transit from State Street to the American Fork station. She revealed that the station was referred to as the secret station because it was hard to get to unless one lived in American Fork. She confirmed that Scott Sensanbaugher would be on that study. Mary Delamare Schaffer pointed out that transit was always attracted to ridership, and that when those numbers bloomed, they would grow into the most efficient and effective transport system. She felt that it was illogical to not have connectivity from the project to the Frontrunner.

It was noted that American Fork had originally wanted the station at a different location where it would not be as hidden, but UTA put the station where it was now. It was critical they find the solution, because they had been left as a City to deal with the results.

Public Works Director Scott Sensanbaugher thanked Eric Rasband and Mary Delamare Schaffer because they had mentioned the upcoming study. He articulated to Mayor Frost and the Council that Eric Rasband and Mary Delamare Schaffer had both been incredibly helpful with the development. Mr. Sensanbaugher said that they had the scope completed and would keep them updated on future progress.

Council Member Carroll requested information and insight on why Lindon would receive the connection in the study when American Fork did not have the same justification for that particular study. She also communicated she was thrilled that there had been progress.

Mr. Rasband suggested that in discussions with staff, that conversation about getting the downtown district of American Fork to take advantage of revitalization opportunities was part of the focus they had in the discussions as they moved forward. He clarified that for Vineyard, the connection was to the community and not to the Frontrunner. He said that out of the communities in the study area, Vineyard was the only one that did not have a connection. He then passed the floor to Claire Woodman.

Claire Woodman thanked the Council for having them and introduced herself as a consultant who had worked closely with Eric Rasband, Mary Delamare Schaffer, and a lot of other staff on how to best serve American Fork with the project. Ms. Woodman said she had had one on one conversations with many staff members and had discussed areas of concern. She expanded that one of those concerns was how to make the connection from the rail corridor get onto Main Street. She said there had been many options discussed prior, and that she had prepared three options to discuss and to convey the different tradeoffs. She noted that the study would move into the environmental stage soon and they would gather more information to help determine their recommendation for the preferred alternative at that point in time.

Ms. Woodman outlined the three different options for the transit transition. Option one would come off of the rail corridor onto State Street and come down south and connect to Main Street. Option two would come off of the rail corridor onto Pacific Drive, and then go down 300 West to Main Street. The third option would come down Pacific Drive, go south on 100 West, and hook onto Main Street from there.

Ms. Woodman discussed how the transit designer and team had talked about the options and determined considerations for each to best serve American Fork. She offered the first consideration about the project in general. She expressed that there had been a strong desire from all of the communities to have the service be in exclusive lanes which would operate outside of traffic. She pointed out that this had more of an impact on properties and businesses. She said that a lot of the concepts in the presented options talked about exclusive lanes, but they had the ability to explore other options that did not have exclusive lanes.

Mayor Frost asked for a brief description of how they would use the rail corridor as a BRT corridor. Ms. Woodman responded in short that they would pull up the tracks, pave it, and drive busses on it. Mayor Frost thanked her for the clear and concise answer. Mr. Rasband thought there was a parallel that MAG had recently funded that looked at additions next to the alignment, but also acted as an active transportation path. He said that with their initial exploration it seemed like there were areas where they could fit that, but he revealed there may be some areas where they would need to acquire additional right of way. He said they were in coordination with UTA on how to get those two projects to work more closely together. Ms. Woodman clarified that although they called it a rail corridor, they operated under the assumption that the rail would not operate on it, only BRT would. She remarked that they needed to clean that language up as they moved forward.

Ms. Woodman continued with considerations for the corridor transition. She said that when they jump out of the BRT corridor, which operated along UTA's current right of way onto State Street, there would be impact on the businesses and properties if they operated in exclusive lanes, which was desired by the community. She listed that the most notable impacts included left hand turns into properties and traffic considerations. She stated that an exclusive lane for busses through State Street and Main Street would be doable but would have its challenges. She said there would be complicated intersections given the properties and car dealership on the south side of Main Street. She explained that those were the most visible tradeoffs for that corridor, although they would dive further into those impacts in the environmental study phase.

Ms. Woodman discussed the 300 West option, and acknowledged that due to its residential nature, a high capacity transit along that corridor would be a big change for residents. She cautioned that

they would need to take quite a bit of right of way. She also communicated that the 300 West option existed with the assumption that they would do a mixed flow traffic and not exclusive lanes, which eliminated residential property impacts. She added that they would need to make roadway improvements and add signage and striping, and articulated that it would change the character of the residential street.

Ms. Woodman continued that the 100 West option had similar residential considerations to consider. It also required a traffic signal at 100 West and Main Street to accommodate busses. She explained they would need to reorganize traffic signals. She pointed out that if they were to take the bus transit along Pacific Drive, it would provide the opportunity to clean up the rail corridor and the rail crossing that came across west of 100 West. She said it gave them the opportunity to possibly consolidate those access points and improve Pacific Drive.

City Administrator David Bunker asked for clarification about the removal of the rail line along the corridor. He asked if the rail lines would be removed throughout American Fork and if there would be no rail needs anywhere through the city. Ms. Woodman answered that she assumed it would be removed up until the point they would jump out of the corridor and onto a roadway. Mr. Rasband added that they were still in coordination with Union Pacific Railway to determine their customer needs in that area. He elaborated that there was a train that ran at least every six months, and they wanted to determine if it was for a customer or to maintain right of way. He mentioned that the oil company nearby was a customer, and further expressed the need to determine ownership and customer location.

Mr. Bunker queried that if they removed the track all the way to 100 West, would it be a safe assumption that they could remove the tracks east as well. He asked if there was a line that came from the south into American Fork that would counteract that idea. Mr. Rasband confirmed there was a line that came from the south. Mr. Bunker postulated that they could terminate at the last customer from the south. Mr. Rasband confirmed and said he thought it was Rhinehart Oil. Mr. Bunker said that that would allow them to remove the difficult crossing at Pacific Drive. Mr. Rasband reiterated that they needed to obtain more information from Union Pacific.

Council Member Barnes informed them that he had an office close to the track, where he heard a train go by at least a couple times a week. He said it went all the way down Pacific Drive and seemed like more than just an engine out for a test drive. He said this was a concern they should be aware of. Mr. Rasband stated they were in the process of identifying staff at Union Pacific, as they had recently had a staff reduction which had created problems for many projects in the State.

Shane Marshall presented the assumption that the BRT and any rail use would not coexist. He declared that if BRT were to come that far on the rail corridor, it would mean they had done something to remove the rail customers. He said he was unsure of who those customers were, and they would need to discuss it further in the environmental phase.

Council Member Carroll asked if there would be a dedicated lane if they were to choose one of the residential options of 300 West or 100 West. Ms. Woodman said they could, but it would require property acquisition and residential displacement. She further said it was too early to give a ballpark range but based on the width of the roadways and the addition of a dedicated transit lane, there would be substantive property impacts.

Mr. Marshall clarified that they had yet to decide if there would be exclusivity or not. He thought that they needed to discuss the tradeoffs and decide whether an exclusive lane was the right choice. He stated that if there was exclusivity, there would be right of way impacts, and if there wasn't, there would be less so.

Council Member Carroll voiced she wanted to weigh the option of exclusivity in the residential areas as to which of the given corridor options would be best. She further inquired how the service would be affected if there were no dedicated lanes. Mary Delamare Schaffer said that they absolutely could operate an exclusive lane but referred to the UTX line in Provo. The neighborhood had not wanted the impact of an exclusive lane, so they did not build one. She cautioned that they remain aware of the residential impacts and thoughtful of what provided the right balance.

Council Member Rob Shelton brought forward Church Street as an alternative corridor option. He confessed he did not know if they had looked at or discussed the option but noted that the City had talked about the potential closure of Church Street already. He explained that approximately 75% of Church Street was owned by the City and voiced the opinion that the impacts would be minimal. He also mentioned that it was a wider street than the residential options, and they could probably fit a dedicated lane. He conceded that one negative aspect was it would take parking from the bank, but said the City already had a contract with them for parking that could be looked at. He proposed that Church Street was possibly a better corridor option. He further said that it was right in the heart of the downtown, and maybe there could be a stop on Pacific Drive if that had not already been specified.

Mr. Rasband explained they had discussed north-south lines that looked at Center Street and Church Street, but the biggest concern they had was the impact to public safety and the emergency services' ability to respond. He said it was certainly an option they could evaluate. City Administrator David Bunker mentioned that they had talked in a previous meeting about Center Street and its impact on public safety, and to access for fire and police departments. He said it would require a signal where Church Street tied into State Street to get the transit system onto the road effectively. He said that they would need signals at Church Street and Main Street and mentioned it may be problematic with how close it was to Center Street. He expressed there were complexities in all the corridor possibilities

Ms. Woodman said they had identified the original three options based on feedback from citizens about the desire to have a connection west of Center Street. She assured them that they could look at Church Street as an additional option and mentioned there was a desire to connect onto Main Street a little earlier.

Council Member Shelton gave his support for the Church Street option, and voiced the opinion that there were no impacts to public safety. He suggested they make it exclusive to just busses, which would reduce traffic flow and subsequent safety issues. He also mentioned that it was not the exit used by the fire department. He explained that they used the one on Center Street. He felt that it had the least amount of impact on residents, and that he would not personally want a high traffic transit route on his street. He also noted general concern with the State Street option because traffic issues that currently existed may be more problematic.

Senior Planner Adam Olsen said he was a proponent of the 100 West connection because of the progress made to open the downtown area to higher density usage. He also said that 100 West

was already zoned commercial and would be a prime location for redevelopment and higher density. He gave his support for the 100 West option because it got into downtown and transitioned into Main Street, and he felt that could be beneficial.

Mayor Frost said it was important to understand that wherever they made the north to south connection to land back on State Street, they would lose off-street parking. He stated that the farther west they went, the more on-street parking they would eliminate.

Council Member Shelton voiced concern in regard to transportation and what surface levels were at that moment. He said State Street would be widened. He asked if they would take the transit lane down the center of the road like in Provo. He also mentioned he had several ideas. One idea was that they moved the connection into State Street further east for efficiency in reference to the traffic down there. He commented that he was an hour late to pick up his kids from school because the freeway had shut down. He said it took an hour to complete a 15-minute commute. He expressed concern with traffic issues such as that and theorized it may be better to get it off the main traffic way. He said that he did not see 100 North to State Street as that big of an issue if it was moved further east.

Mayor Frost said he could land there with Council Member Shelton. He said that he could agree with the sentiment with the knowledge that in discussions with people who had a vision for the area, it would take out a lot of dreams and hopes they have. He felt there was no way to appease everyone. He stated that as elected leaders they had to think about what was good for the collective. He said he felt comfortable as long as they landed back on State Street and had two lights within a block.

Council Member Shelton recommended that perhaps the way to look at it was to first go north on Pacific Drive all the way to 300 East. He said to look near the police station, and the south side of the road had not yet been developed. He explained there was a lot of potential right of way to be used. If they went to 300 East it would take up the rail tracks all the way behind Chipman Village and connect right to 300 East. He mentioned that this option would also go down a residential street, but he said it was another option to explore. Council Member Christiansen said that at that point, 300 East was wide. Council Member Shelton agreed and said they had just put in a light there too.

Mary Delamare Schaffer reminded the Council that the decision did not have to be made that day, and that there would be many more discussions, studies, and research as they moved forward into the next phases. She guaranteed that they would need a lot of input.

Ms. Woodman communicated that a lot of good ideas had been presented and invited them to think about the locations they wanted to serve in their communities. She reminded them that Center Street had been identified as a desired station location, and that if they came in east they would miss that request. She recommended that they keep in mind the key locations they wanted to serve, and to look at options to get there.

Council Member Shelton mentioned that in a meeting with Council Member Carroll, Mr. Bunker and a planner, they had the radical idea to turn Pacific Drive into a downtown corridor for mass transit. He said this would probably still allow space for a station there. He inquired about whether or not they would provide parking with that option, such as the stations in Orem and Provo.

Ms. Woodman said it depended on the station locations, and if there was a place to provide parking. She said that when she met earlier with people, they expressed concern for loss of on-street parking. She mentioned the idea to possibly work with a partner to create a parking garage. She stated there were options to explore there, but they would need to provide something to compensate for the loss of parking as it was important to people. Mary Delamare Schaffer noted that UVX did not provide additional parking.

Council Member Carroll provided an alternative view of the Church Street option. She commented that the only discussion she had been a part of to close Church Street had been to turn it into a pedestrian corridor. She said that option would need a lot more discussion, as it did not align with what she had previously talked about. She also expressed the opinion that Church Street was basically their only downtown access to a public parking place or potentially another parking structure. She said that was the only road that accessed it.

Council Member Taylor agreed with Council Member Carroll about Church Street. He said that he liked the idea of 100 West because it was already so awkward where it met Pacific Drive. He thought it provided a good opportunity to make necessary changes. He said based on what Senior Planner Adam Olsen had said about high density, it seemed to make a lot of sense. He acknowledged that nothing was finite now and expressed his appreciation for their time and willingness to educate them on the issue.

Council Member Christiansen said that with the thought of use and roads, she liked the State Street option. She said that although it may be more problematic to construct, and may be more expensive to implement, it fit the needs of public use the best.

Mayor Frost asked if there were any more unexpressed thoughts. He remarked that they now had at least three more options to explore. He expressed appreciation for their presence at the meeting, the update they gave, and their openness to input. He said it would go to residents to weigh in also.

Ms. Woodman wanted to push that they had entered the final phase of public involvement. They had worked with staff to push people to leave comments and input and had received a lot of good feedback thus far. She requested one last push to hear from constituents.

Council Member Shelton asked when the decision would be made, and whether it would be made by UTA or by Council vote. Mr. Rasband said that they had met with the executive team the week prior, which consisted of the City managers and Mayors from each impacted city. He said that they had received direction to move forward with the alignment although there were still a few minor details to iron out. He noted that they needed to do additional engineering, and that MAG had funded the environmental process, which they hoped to move to after this phase was complete.

Mary Delamare Schaffer reminded the Council that Mayor Frost was on the executive committee for alignment. They had not reached a detailed level yet but said they all had a seat at the table about how the decision would be made. She said other cities would look to American Fork. She acknowledged the efforts of Mr. Olsen, Mr. Bunker, and Mayor Frost, and thanked them for the time they spent to get to the current point. She mentioned that the environmental study would use a new consultant group. She also expressed gratitude for Mr. Rasband and noted that as a UDOT employee in charge of the UTA project, he truly worked for the community. She said the partnership had been a great experience.

3. Discussion on roadway widening on 200 South.

Public Works Director Scott Sensanbaugher offered his thanks to Mayor Frost. He expressed interest with how all the topics discussed in the meeting were ultimately connected. He presented that idea to assure that there was coordination amongst the different efforts. He then moved forward with an update on 200 South.

Mr. Sensanbaugher delivered a brief overview of the 200 South project. He mentioned the importance of the North Lake Shore Study, and then he showed the master plan, which included the two flyovers. He pointed out that the first flyover was at the intersection with Pioneer Crossing, and the second was over the tracks at 700 West. He was gratified to see that the North Lake Shore Study showed all of the elements and their importance. He mentioned he gave comments on the report and gave a stamp of approval on behalf of American Fork. He reiterated that it all connected. He also pronounced how stunning the growth was down in the TOD and displayed a drawing that showed the TOD area. He pointed out the percentage of that area that was in some form of approval. There were areas already approved, areas that were under construction, and areas that were completed. He reiterated how large the percentage of approved areas there were in the TOD shown. Council Member Shelton noted that he had talked with a realtor earlier in the day, and White Horse reported it had sold out most of its units within two days.

Mr. Sensanbaugher confirmed that it was one of the completed areas he showed on the map. He said it was phenomenal in terms of growth, and that it was important to do what they could to stay ahead of it. He then presented an aerial photo from Google Maps that showed the two ways into the station. He explained the two access points, and then explained how the project they designed rebuilt the road either in full or in part from the intersection all the way to the freeway. He noted that they had received funding from MAG to build a roundabout on 300 West just north of the freeway. He mentioned that they would have a flyover to get to Pioneer Crossing. He said it was shown on the North Lake Shore Study.

Mr. Bunker explained one reason why 300 West was viable for the BRT to turn onto State Street was because it was a convenient location for a station. He stated that if they had a station or connection at that point, it would also be within walking distance of the TOD area. He said it would allow people from the TOD area to walk to the BRT station, and it would facilitate more people at that point. He also mentioned that it went directly to the Frontrunner station, and that there was a light that existed already in that location.

Mr. Sensanbaugher reiterated how it really all was one topic and connected together. He then switched to the final screen and presented where they were at with the design. He mentioned that the UTA colleagues had seen it, and that the design was complete short of final assembly of bid documents. He offered thanks to Mary Delamare Schaffer, Mary DeLoretto, and Grey Turner for their attendance. He said the key was where it affected UTA, and that the two entrances would most likely be converted to right in, right out only. He added that they would need to obtain some of the parking lot.

Mr. Sensanbaugher provided a summary of the work needed in the parking lot. He explained that the row of stalls that ran north and south would need to be shifted to the north and rebuilt. He noted it would be a loss of 24 stalls, but he proposed they would be made up in a different area. He then identified the bus turnaround, the location for the interim parking before the flyover, the intended flyover location, and the entrances and exits on the map. He said that they would lose

the 24 spaces, but they would gain 94. This equaled a net gain of 70 parking spaces. He thanked everyone again for their input and willingness to discuss the project.

Mr. Sensanbaugher then gave a further update on the plans. He informed the Council that the plans were done, but they were still on the search for additional funding. He notified them that they had received funding to build a water line through the corridor, and that they would proceed with it immediately. He said it did not require any right of way. He further said the water line provided desperately needed water to an area with exponential growth.

Mr. Sensanbaugher informed them that the bidding had opened a couple hours prior. He assured Mr. Bunker that they were under the engineering budget, and that he would send the details later on. Mr. Sensanbaugher said he would have exact numbers by the next morning. He further stated it was on the agenda for the next week to award the contract. It was noted that the construction of a water line would cause disruption on 200 South, and for UTA that meant some inconvenient days with construction overlap. It was stated that they would do their best to allow the flow of traffic in and out of Frontrunner station. Mr. Sensanbaugher assured them that they would continue to coordinate, and they did not plan shutdowns on 200 South. He said that they hoped to keep two-way traffic available. He stated that they would have more information at a later point in time. He expressed the notion that they could not cut off traffic because of how busy 200 South was.

Mr. Sensanbaugher communicated that they could not move forward with the road itself without property acquisition from some of the privately owned land. He informed the Council that there had been preliminary discussions, and that it was now at the point to proceed with more diligence. He noted that when he showed the new City engineer the area, they visited with one of the property owners. They were informed that more in-depth conversations would follow soon. He addressed the UTA colleagues and stated that they were ready to engage in further discussions about the project.

Council Member Carroll showed concern in regard to the road being torn up. She had participated in previous talks about interim mitigations for safety, such as lights, and asked how soon that could take place. She asked how difficult it would be to acquire land for sidewalks and trails. Mr. Sensanbaugher responded that the land acquisition and permission was the only thing that held them up. He mentioned that they had reached out to the main property owners and had not had any success. He reiterated it was the only thing that prevented them from the installation of temporary safety measures. Council Member Carroll inquired about whether only the lighting could be provided. Mr. Sensanbaugher clarified that the measures he had referred to were in reference to a trail. He said that the difficulty with lighting was the access to power. He further said that they had looked at reusable solar lights as an option. He suggested that they visit with Mr. Bunker to see if they could proceed with something.

Council Member Shelton advised it would go a long way in the minds of the people if they showed action was taken on the project. He cautioned that some of the landowners echoed the sentiment that the City had given empty promises about the project. He further advised it would be a good step in the right direction. He suggested that they also increase communication with the landowners and citizens, especially with regards to the water line. Council Member Shelton had loved the Facebook suggestion that the City create an independent website to provide updates on the 200 South project. He reiterated that if the City were to take some of those measures it would go a long way in the eyes of the people. He offered another suggestion from the property owners that the trail be built on the north and not the south. He suggested that they could pipe the ditch

and put asphalt down on the north side. He thought it would be easier to accomplish, and it would be temporary.

Council Member Shelton voiced the opinion that they did not have adequate funding for 200 South, and felt that they needed to decide within the next three months if the economic development area needed to be an opportunity for funding or not. He said if not, they needed to determine how to make the road work. He stated that in a year from then, when the water line was completed, the road would be torn up and they needed to have a plan.

Mr. Sensanbaugher offered a few responses. First, he informed them that the numbers about the trail were based on if the trail extended from the sidewalk and down to the station. He said that the project could be moved to the other side but would require quite a bit more money. He then identified the places where they had tried to obtain the land on the visual.

Council Member Shelton recognized it was a more difficult option but noted that at least three affected landowners had suggested the change. Council Member Shelton added that the storm drain funds may be a viable option. He said they could use the funding to pipe the ditch, and that there may already be easements where they could pipe and put asphalt on. He restated that it would go a long way to show movement and progress by the City until further funding was received for 200 South. Mr. Sensanbaugher said he would get with Mr. Bunker to discuss the budget and options in depth.

Mr. Sensanbaugher shared that if their ability to obtain funding was pushed further out, they had been in talks with one of the developers. He indicated the developer on the map and stated that they had recently been approved by the Council. Mr. Sensanbaugher said that if they did not receive the funding until later, they hoped to work with the developer to build between 900 West and 700 West. He felt that if nothing else, that area was the most crucial to the project. He noted that even in that scenario, it would still involve the parking lot, the acquisition of land, and the other previously discussed items.

Council Member Shelton addressed an issue at the east side of the roadway where it went over the tracks. He said a number of citizens had mentioned the delineators put up by UTA had been consistently knocked down and flattened by farm equipment. He explained that the equipment needed a width of 18 feet to operate. He asked that this area be made two lanes in both directions over the railway tracks to accommodate farm equipment. He gave his full support of the idea and warned about the potential for legal issues if farmers could not get to their fields with their equipment. Mr. Sensanbaugher acknowledged the concern and said that there were potential legal issues that went the other way as well. He suggested they discuss it further in a different venue.

Council Member Shelton reiterated the need for the Council to listen to the people and show their willingness to hear considerations and concerns. He revealed that some of the landowners had sour feelings with the lack of communication and consideration. Mr. Sensanbaugher acknowledged it was the same person he had recently met with. He assured the Council that he had maintained regular communication with the individual.

Mary DeLoretto introduced herself as part of UTA. She thanked the Council for the invitation to join. She reiterated that there could not be any net loss of parking for UTA. She requested that they continue to work directly with Mary Delamare Schaffer's group about busses. She further

requested they made sure there was circulation in the plan, and that there would be no negative impacts on UTA's circulation. Mr. Sensanbaugher agreed with the sentiment.

Mayor Frost voiced the opinion that funding would ultimately land in the hands of MAG. He noted it was a lot of money and speculated that it could be a joint effort from MAG and UDOT. He said that the more people that use the service, the greater a necessity it would become. He further said that it used to be just local, but BRT was a game changer that tied them in.

Mayor Frost touched on the idea of transparency with everything they hoped to accomplish. He asserted that the real hidden gem in everything was Everbridge, the public notification platform. He stated that if people signed up with Everbridge, it had the scope and ability to keep people informed at their desired level. He further stated that if enough people used it, Everbridge could expand to offer other specializations such as tips on recycling or anything else people wanted. He voiced that people needed to use it and understand it. He mentioned that he had marketed to people in the past and indicated they would do more in the future. He voiced the opinion that Everbridge was the best tool they had to reach out to people, the only stimulation was they had to sign up. He said the number one area of importance was emergency preparedness but advised there were options for expansion.

4. Adjourn.

The work session adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

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

Terilyn Lurker, City Recorder